

TWENTY-EIGHTH

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

American Anti-Slavery Society,

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1861.

NEW YORK:

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

No. 48 BEEKMAN STREET.

1861.

20.
24

TWENTY-EIGHTH

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE


American Anti-Slavery Society,

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1861.

NEW YORK:
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET.
1861.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

REPORT FOR 1860.

THE lapse of time calls the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to add the record of another year to the annals of American Slavery, and of the enterprise inaugurated to achieve its downfall. The year whose history we are now to give is unsurpassed, if not unequalled, by any of its predecessors, in the greatness of its events, and the importance of their bearing on the Anti-Slavery cause. It has pressed home upon the nation, for prompt and final settlement, the issue which this Society has been so long presenting to its unwilling regard—"Shall Slavery or the Union perish?" What we have for so many years demanded, "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS," seems promising, or threatening, according to the state of mind with which the prospect is regarded, to become, ere many months, "a fact accomplished"; either by the triumph of armed rebellion rending the Union asunder irretrievably, at the bidding and in the interest of the Slave Power, or by the crushing of slavery, as the speediest and most effectual, if not the only, method of putting down rebellion, and reëstablishing the Union. Whether the nation and the Government will come to understand in time that such is the inevitable alternative, and will have the wisdom, energy and moral courage to accept and use aright the proffered opportunity, and thus to save the country by destroying utterly the cause of its calamity and peril, is a question which still awaits its answer, but we are sure cannot await it long. Events will not stand still for the convenience of belated conservatism or timid indecision; still less will they pause for the adjustment of delusive compromises between principle and policy, between a nation's awakening conscience and a slippery politician's schemes of statecraft.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

The year has witnessed a Presidential election the most memorable, taken with its accompaniments and apparent consequences, which the country has yet known. At the date of our last Report, the note of preparation was already sounding, and the mustering of the combatants had begun. On the 23d of April, 1860, the Democratic National Convention met at Charleston, S. C., to make its nominations and lay down its Platform. Every State in the Union was fully represented, but not, as in former days, by the harmonious members of a great, united party. Most of the Southern delegates had evidently come determined to reject the favorite of the great majority of the Northern Democracy, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, and with him his doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty," and to commit the party unequivocally to extreme pro-slavery principles and measures; or, failing of this, to break up the Convention and wreck the party. Indeed, in view of subsequent events, there is reason to believe that the latter was the primary design of the Southern leaders; and that they pressed upon their Northern copartisans such demands as they knew would be rejected, so that they might make occasion for dividing the party and ensuring its defeat, and thus, in the success of the Republicans, obtain a pretext for seceding from the Union, and founding a grand slaveholding and slave-trading empire, pure from any taint of freedom. Be that, however, as it may, the South insisted that property in slaves should be regarded as no less sacred than any other property; that all the Territories should be open to the introduction of it; and that, wherever held or carried, it should be protected by the Federal Government. The Northern delegates, on the other hand, warned, by the signs of a growing anti-slavery feeling at the North, that yielding to such extravagant demands would bring upon them sure defeat, refused to be dragged into a position of such deadly peril. They were willing to stand by all their old pro-slavery precedents; perhaps even, for the sake of still preserving an unbroken party, would have gone a little further slavery-ward than they had ever gone before; but to grant all which was asked was to incur too great a risk.

In the Platform Committee, the pro-slavery extremists had a majority of one—17 to 16—and reported resolutions, reëffirming the Cincinnati Platform of 1856, and adding declarations "that

Congress has no power to abolish slavery in the Territories; that a Territorial Legislature cannot abolish slavery in, or exclude it from, a Territory, or impair the right of property in slaves; that the enactments of State Legislatures to defeat the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law are hostile, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary; that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect the rights of person and property on the high seas, in the Territories, or wherever else its Constitutional authority extends; and that the National Democracy recommend the acquisition of Cuba at the earliest practicable period." Which is, being interpreted, slavery has a right to go where it pleases, and be protected wherever it goes; new domains ought to be acquired for its use; and the foreign slave trade (so we understand the allusion to "property on the high seas") should have the same protection as any other foreign trade. The resolutions reported by the minority also re-affirmed the Cincinnati Platform, recommended the acquisition of Cuba, "on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain," and denounced State legislation to defeat the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law; but, in relation to slavery in the Territories, declared that, inasmuch as differences of opinion exist in the party as to the powers of Territorial Legislatures, and the powers and duty of Congress touching that subject, the party will abide by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to it.

Considering that the decision of the Supreme Court, as now constituted, is morally certain to be in favor of the utmost demand of the Slave Power, one would think the very ultraists of the South might have been satisfied with this. Not they. They evidently felt that their time had come, and that a desperate push for all or nothing must now be made; so they obstinately resisted every approach to compromise, even though the middle ground offered them was almost wholly over upon their own side. After a stormy session of a week, filled up with warm debate and abundant propositions to amend and modify and harmonize, the vote was taken on the Platforms, and that of the minority was substituted for the other, by 165 to 138. The division was nearly sectional: 153 yeas being from the Free, and 12 from the Slave States; and 108 nays from the Slave, and 30 from the Free States. The entire delegation of two Northern States, California and Oregon, went with the South, and part of that of three others, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Pennsylvania,—more than half of the last. Nearly half of that of

Maryland and Missouri went with the North, about one-fifth of that of Kentucky, and a single vote each from Virginia and Tennessee. While every Slave State stood, by a majority,—ten of them unanimously and two others very nearly so,—on the extreme pro-slavery ground, three of the nominally Free States—two of them unanimously—refused to take the (only slightly less pro-slavery) position of the Northern majority, and joined the South. Thirteen Northern States unanimously, with one by five votes out of seven, and one by a majority of only a single vote, went against an *unconditional* surrender to slavery. Thus, although the Northern Platform had a majority of the delegates, a majority of the States stood on the Southern; the former having fifteen States, the latter eighteen, including moreover all but two or three, at most, in which the Democracy, even if united, had any chance for a single electoral vote, and all but one in which, in the event, it actually received any.

Next came the vote on adopting the substituted Platform. At the demand of the Southern delegates, it was taken on its several parts separately, and resulted in the adoption of all but the pledge to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court on the Territorial question. This was rejected almost unanimously; the Southern members refusing to support it because they would accept no compromise, and the Northern, because they would no longer bind themselves by an offer which they saw contemptuously spurned. Most of the delegates from Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Texas, Arkansas, South Carolina and Georgia, with a part of those from Delaware, then formally withdrew, leaving written protests against the action of the majority, and organized a separate Convention. Referring to this contest and its issue, the *New York Tribune* says:—"This Platform, [reported by the minority of the Committee,] it will be observed, is decidedly more pro-slavery than any one ever before adopted in any National Convention whatever. Yet, four years ago, when the predecessor of this Convention met in Cincinnati, BERTH MAGOFFIN, now Governor of Kentucky, brought to that gathering a draft of what he thought the South ought to demand; but put it aside unsubmitted because (he afterward told a friend) Mr. B. F. HALLETT, of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Platform Committee, reported a Platform more favorable to the South than he (M.) had thought proper to ask. And now, when the Northern Democracy readily offer all that and more, the South rejects it and demands still more, under penalty of disruption and defeat!"

The Platform disposed of, the Convention began, on the evening of the eighth day of its session, to ballot for a candidate, having first adopted a rule requiring a two-thirds majority of the original Convention to effect a nomination. The balloting continued through that evening and the next day and evening, without making any progress. DOUGLAS received about three-fifths of all the votes remaining after the secession, but only a bare majority of the original number. The residue were divided among six or eight competitors. No prospect of a different result appearing, on the morning of its tenth day, the Convention adjourned to meet in Baltimore on the 18th of June. Meanwhile, the seceders did nothing but organize, make speeches, adopt the Platform rejected by the regular Convention, adjourn from time to time to wait the action of the latter, recommend the holding of a Southern Convention in Richmond on the second Monday in June, and adjourn without day.

Great was the excitement, and diverse the opinions of leading politicians and the party presses all over the country, called forth by the explosion at Charleston. In Savannah, says a dispatch to the *Charleston Mercury*, "The announcement of the withdrawal of the Southern delegations was received with unbounded enthusiasm. Public sentiment here emphatically endorses the action of the South. The coöperation of the Georgia delegation with the other seceding States is cordially sustained, and men of all parties are rejoicing that the constitutional rights of the Southern States will be maintained by their delegates." One hundred guns were fired from the Battery, in honor of the secession, while "the attendant gathering was immense, and irrespective of party." From Montgomery, Ala., came a dispatch to the same journal, saying, "Our city is in a ferment. Public sentiment heartily sustains the position taken by the delegation from Alabama. The hope is generally expressed that the South will stand firm and united in the maintenance of her rights." HOWELL COBB, of Georgia, wrote a letter "fully and cordially sustaining the seceders"; and the "Federal officials generally, especially those from the South," declared themselves on the same side. The general expression from the States along the Gulf was of the same character as that which we have cited, though not without some mingling of dissent; while by not a few in the more Northern Slave States, the extreme ground was taken no less decidedly. The *Richmond Enquirer* said, in accordance with the sentiment of many in Virginia, that the claim of the South to Federal protection for slave

property in the Territories will never be abandoned. "The only platform that can make the Democracy again a national party is one that fully, unequivocally and unambiguously recognizes the right of protection, and the duty of all the departments of the Government to afford it." On the other hand, the Democracy of the North, and more especially of the Northwest, regretted or condemned the movement of the Southern extremists, some sadly, and some severely; some hoping for reünion and restored harmony, and some protesting with earnest, not to say indignant emphasis, the determination of the party at the North to stand firm against the turbulent faction, "whose object is," said the *Detroit Free Press*, "to break up the Democratic party, as a prelude to breaking up the Union. They have succeeded for the moment," the *Free Press* continued, "in defeating the popular will; but LET THEM STAND FROM UNDER. The time has come when the popular will must not be resisted, or, if resisted, when it will assert the terrible strength of its power." The delegates from Michigan, on their return, will be received, we doubt not, in a way which will attest the perfect and enthusiastic approval, by the Democracy of the State, of their conduct, and disclose to the whole nation something of the Northwestern popular feeling." The *Dubuque (Iowa) Herald* denounced the seceders as "a Southern fire-eating disunion faction, at the head of which stand DAVIS of Mississippi, YANCEY of Alabama, and SLIDELL of Louisiana, as its representative men. Combined with the Administration of JAMES BUCHANAN, they have sought to obtain control of the Democratic organization. The Administration hate DOUGLAS, while the Disunionists of the South want a slave code. Disorganizers as they are, they left the Convention and separated themselves from the Democratic party. By this act they have relieved the party from a vast deal of odium resulting from an association it could not prevent." The *Cincinnati Enquirer* said, "It has been demonstrated that the party will never submit to have incorporated into its Platform the miserable heresy that the people of a Territory have no right to prevent slavery, if such is their wish, and that it is the duty of Congress in that event to force it upon them by a direct enactment." The *Buffalo Courier* pronounced it "certain that the Democracy of the North will sustain the action of their representatives. * * * The Democracy of the North having in 1856 honestly advocated the doctrine of Congressional non-intervention which the South sanctioned, they could not sacrifice their self-respect by

voting for the protection of slavery in the Territories by Congressional legislation. To have yielded this fundamental principle would have been more than suicide; it would have been disgraceful cowardice and servility."

This kind of talk from Northern "Democrats," about Southern slaveholders and their demands, sounds novel to our ears; and deserves heeding as one of the "signs of the times." True, the position of the Northern section of the party is low enough, in all conscience; far enough from genuine Democratic principle, and, theoretically and practically, little better than that in which it refuses to be placed; but it is something—much, indeed, remembering the antecedents of the party—that it dares at length to say there *is* a lower depth to which it will not go; much, that on *any* ground, however low, it dares to face and to defy the arrogant, exacting despotism which has governed it so long. It is a hopeful sign, and seems to say that a new era is begun. Not that we suppose the party leaders have any conscientious scruples against yielding as of old whatever the slaveholding oligarchy requires; but they know that Northern feeling is not now what once it was, and that they *must* stop short, or lose the Northern votes on which success depends.

Shortly after the breaking up at Charleston, the leading Southern Democrats in Congress issued an address to the National Democracy, expressing admiration and approval of the course of the seceders; but intimating a belief that the Convention, on its reassembling at Baltimore, would "recede from its determination, and afford, either by an amendment of the Platform or in some other manner equally satisfactory, such recognition of principles as would effectually obviate misconstruction and secure the harmonious action of the party;" in which event, "the reason for the withdrawal of the delegations of the eight States will have ceased, and no motive will remain for refusing to unite with their sister States, nor for holding an adjourned meeting at Richmond. On the other hand," they continued, "if the Convention shall disappoint the just expectations of the remaining Democratic States, their delegations cannot fail to withdraw and unite with the eight States which have adjourned to Richmond. In either event, there would be unanimous action in support of our principles by all the States which can be relied on for casting Democratic electoral votes." For these reasons, they advised the seceding delegations "to defer assembling in Rich-

mond until the necessity for such meeting shall become imperative," and "to return to the Convention at Baltimore, and aid their sister States in the struggle for the recognition of sound Democratic principles." Though this advice was not followed to the letter, yet the spirit of it was substantially complied with. The Richmond Convention met at its appointed time, the 11th of June, and, without doing anything important, adjourned the following day to the 21st of the same month, three days later than the Baltimore Convention was to meet. When the Baltimore Convention came together, on the 18th, a new cause of controversy came with it. Most of the seceding delegates, except those of South Carolina and Florida, returned and claimed their seats, some of them upon a reappointment by the Conventions of their respective States, since they went out, at Charleston. But in three of those States, Georgia, Alabama and Louisiana, the friends of DOUGLAS had—with at least questionable regularity—chosen delegates to contest the seats, made vacant, they contended, by the secession. A heated contest, lasting until Friday evening, the fifth day of the session, ended in the admission of the original delegation from Georgia, and of the new or DOUGLAS delegates from Alabama and Louisiana, the vote for the last named being 153 to 90. Thereupon the main body of the Virginia delegates withdrew, followed by most of those of North Carolina, Tennessee and Kentucky, part of those of Maryland, Missouri and Massachusetts, and all of Oregon and California. With the seceders of Massachusetts went the President of the Convention, CALEB CUSHING. A portion of those remaining declined to vote on the nomination of candidates, which was the business of the next day. The rule requiring a two-thirds majority of the whole original Convention was virtually set aside,—less than that number being left,—and DOUGLAS having received, on the second ballot, 180 out of 194 votes, was, by a unanimously adopted resolution, declared to be nominated, "according to the usages of the Democratic party and the rules of the Convention, by a two-thirds vote." In the evening, BENJAMIN FITZPATRICK, of Alabama, was unanimously nominated for Vice President; but he having subsequently declined, the "Executive Committee of the National Democratic Party" put HERSCHELL V. JOHNSON, of Georgia, in his place. After nominating FITZPATRICK, the Convention, on motion of a delegate from Louisiana, virtually surrendered, as it seems to us, the favorite DOUGLAS doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty," by unanimously resolving, "that it is in

accordance with the Cincinnati Platform, that, during the existence of Territorial Governments, the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been or shall hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and ability by every branch of the General Government." It then adjourned without day.

The seceders met and organized on Saturday; all the Slave States but South Carolina being represented by entire or partial delegations, with scattering delegates from several Free States besides those whose secession we have already mentioned, making twenty-two States in all. They nominated JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, for President, giving him 81 of their 105 votes; and JOSEPH LANE, of Oregon, for Vice President, by a unanimous vote; and then adjourned without day. The Richmond Convention reassembled on the 21st, and after adjourning from day to day till the result at Baltimore was known, it closed its work by unanimously adopting the ticket of the Baltimore seceders, and reëffirming the Charleston Southern Platform.

Precisely where the several candidates of the divided "Democracy" stood upon the questions in debate, or precisely what and how much difference really separated them, is not so easy to determine as at a first glance might be supposed. From the circumstances of the nominations, it would be natural to infer that they were distinctly adverse to each other, at least concerning the relation of the Territories to slavery; and a large part of what themselves have said before and since would seem to justify the inference. But, in view of *all* the evidence bearing on that point, it is not quite so clear. The candidates of the seceders are, of course, presumed to hold with faith unwavering every doctrine of the Southern Platform, and especially that property in slaves is sacred everywhere within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislatures can legislate about it, unless to protect it; and that protection, to the full extent which its peculiar needs may call for, is the duty toward it of the Federal Government. Yet, in the canvass, passages were cited from Mr. BRECKINRIDGE'S speeches, which appear to favor the heresy imputed to his rival. For instance, from his speech in Congress on the 23d of March, 1854, the *New York Tribune* quoted these words:—"If Congress may inter-

vene on this subject, it may intervene on any other, and having thus surrendered the principle and broken away from the Constitutional limitations, you are driven into the very lap of arbitrary power. * * I have never acquiesced in this odious claim, and will not believe that it can abide the test of public scrutiny." From another speech, the time and place not given, the same journal copied thus:—"I gave it [the Nebraska Bill] my voice and vote, because it acknowledged the right of the people of the Territory to settle the question for themselves." And again:—"I am connected with no party that has for its object the extension of slavery; nor with any to prevent the people of a Territory from deciding the question of its existence or non-existence with them for themselves." But in his letter of acceptance, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE "approved, as just and necessary to the preservation of the National organization, the action of the [seceding] Convention"; gave his cordial assent to its Platform; went into an argument to prove that "the citizens of all the States may enter the Territories of the Union with their property, of whatever kind, and enjoy it during the territorial condition without let or hindrance, either by Congress or by the subordinate Territorial Governments"; declared "these principles essential to that equality, which is, and ever has been, the vital principle of our constitutional Union"; and, while claiming to hold "the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress or by a Territorial Legislature, either to establish or prohibit slavery," asserted "the plain duty of the Federal Government, in all its departments, to secure, when necessary, to the citizens of all the States, the enjoyment of their property in the common Territories, as everywhere else within its jurisdiction." That is, Congress may not "intervene" to put down slavery, or—gracious admission!—to set it up; but *must* intervene to *hold it up* wherever any single slaveholder chooses to place it. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, both in this letter and in a speech to some of the citizens of Washington who serenaded him soon after he was nominated, took especial care to disclaim for himself and his fellow-partisans all leaning to disunionism. "There was nothing in the character of the Convention, or the gentlemen who composed it, or of the nominee, to justify the belief that they intended to break up the Union. Instead of breaking it up," said he, "we intend to strengthen and *lengthen* it."

General LANE, in accepting the nomination offered to him, was equally emphatic in approving the Platform on which it was ten-

dered; and interpreted "non-intervention" in the same accommodating way as his principal. "If the Constitution," he said, "establishes the right of every citizen to enter the common territory with whatever property he legally possesses, it necessarily devolves on the Federal Government the duty to protect this right of the citizen whenever and wherever assailed or infringed. * * * The people of a Territory can only establish or prohibit slavery when they come to form a constitution, preparatory to their admission as a State into the Union." How it comes to pass that they have a right to "prohibit slavery" even then, if the right of property in slaves is as sacred as the right to any other property, these sagacious statesmen, it must be presumed, could readily explain, if they would but condescend so far; but we confess it passes altogether our simple understanding.

As for Mr. DOUGLAS, his wide renown as the especial champion of "Popular Sovereignty" would seem at first view to guaranty his diametrical opposition to the bold assumptions of the extremists in behalf of the sovereign rights of slavery. And this, too, he at times appeared to wish to have believed. In a letter to a member of the Baltimore Convention, while the struggle which rent it asunder was still going on, he deunced "the Northern and Southern partisans of Congressional intervention" as equally dangerous; declared that "intervention means disunion"; that "there is no difference in principle between Northern and Southern intervention"; that "the one intervenes for slavery and the other against slavery, but each appeals to the passions and prejudices of his own section, against the peace of the whole country and the right of self-government by the people of the Territories." And in a speech to the crowd in Washington, which gathered to congratulate him on his nomination, he spoke of the "imminent peril" in which the Union is placed, "by the effort in one section of the Union to use the Federal Government for the purpose of restricting and abolishing slavery, and a corresponding effort in the other section for the purpose of forcing slavery into those regions where the people do not want it"; and said that "to the cardinal principle of non-intervention, the Democratic party renewed the pledge of its faith at Charleston and Baltimore"; adding, "as the chosen representative of that great party, it is my fixed purpose to keep the faith and redeem that pledge, at all hazards and under all circumstances. Because the minority of interventionists could not intimidate the majority into an abandonment of

the doctrine of non-intervention, they have seceded from the organization, and are endeavoring to form a new party." So, while the canvass was going on, having been often urged to give explicitly his views as to the powers of the people of a Territory over slavery, and whether they can be exercised while the territorial condition lasts, or only in the forming of a State, after repeatedly evading the inquiry, or at least neglecting to respond, he at last became indignant at the iteration of it or at the doubt which it implied, and answered somewhat sharply, "I cannot believe there is a man in America of ordinary intelligence who does not know that I hold that the people of a Territory, while a Territory and during a territorial condition, may introduce, exclude, abolish, or regulate slavery just as they please. I have said that North and South, and held the same doctrine everywhere." From all this, it *seems* quite clear that Mr. DOUGLAS interprets the phrase "non-intervention" in a manner widely different from that of Messrs. BRECKINRIDGE and LANE. Yet he professes to stand upon the Cincinnati-Charleston-Baltimore Platform, which "recognizes the right of the people of the Territories, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of the majority of the actual residents, and *whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States*"; and which affirms that "the measure of restriction imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislatures, as the same *has been, or shall hereafter be*, determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens and enforced by every branch of the General Government." And he very well knows that what his party acknowledges as an authoritative decision of the Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, declares that "every citizen has a right to take with him into the Territory any article of property which the Constitution of the United States recognizes as property"; that "the Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and pledges the Federal Government to protect it"; that "the act of Congress, prohibiting a citizen of the United States taking with him his slaves when he removes to the Territory in question to reside, is an exercise of authority over private property which is not warranted by the Constitution"; and that, when Congress establishes a Territorial Government, it must be "with powers not exceeding those which Congress itself by the Constitution is author-

ized to exercise over citizens of the United States in respect to their rights of property." Moreover, in a speech at New Orleans, on the 6th of December, 1858, just after his last election to the Senate, he distinctly "defined his position" thus:—"I, in common with the Democracy of Illinois, accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Dred Scott case, as an authoritative exposition of the Constitution. Whatever limitations the Constitution, as expounded by the courts, imposes on the authority of a Territorial Legislature, we cheerfully recognize and respect in conformity with that decision. Slaves are recognized as property, and placed on an equal footing with all other property." And when the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was before the Senate, and, to the declaration in it that it meant to "leave the people [of the Territory] free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution," Mr. CHASE moved to add, "under which the people of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of slavery therein," Mr. DOUGLAS was one of the majority who rejected the amendment. We may add, also, testimonies of his prominent supporters, who ought to know his views. Mr. H. V. JOHNSON, his associate on the ticket, in a speech at Savannah on the 30th of July last, said that "Judge DOUGLAS had been misrepresented and misunderstood at the South. He was not in favor of Squatter Sovereignty." The Missouri *Republican*, one of the ablest and most influential of his advocates, affirmed that "DOUGLAS and BRECKINRIDGE stand upon the same platform in regard to the rights of slavery in the Territories."

Of Mr. JOHNSON, candidate for Vice-President, the New York *Tribune* tells us that "he was formerly Governor of Georgia, and one of the most thorough-paced ultra fire-eaters and secessionists in the State, beside being in favor of re-opening the slave-trade"; and that, "in a political speech in Philadelphia in 1856, he endeavored to enforce the doctrine that 'capital should own its laborers.'" In the Georgia State Democratic Convention, held on the 4th of last July, he introduced resolutions affirming that "slave property stands on the same footing as all other descriptions of property, and neither the General Government nor any Territorial Government can destroy or impair the right to slave property in the common Territories, any more than the right to any other description of property; that slave property stands on the same Constitutional basis as any other property, and is subject to like principles of recognition and protec-

tion in the Legislative, Judicial and Executive departments of the Government; and that we will not hold ourselves bound to support any man for the Presidency, who entertains principles inconsistent with these." In his speech accepting the nomination to the Vice-Presidency, he avowed his adhesion to the doctrine of "non-intervention," as "the best ground of compromise between the North and the South which human ingenuity can devise," as "it gives advantage to neither section, because it refers all questions of dispute between them, as to Congressional or Territorial power over slavery, to the final arbitrament of the Supreme Court. * * * Its abandonment will prove fatal to the Democratic party, and ultimately to the Union. * * * The doctrine of Congressional intervention, as advocated by this new-born sectional party, is fraught with peril to the country."

With all the facts and testimonies before us which are here recited, it will be seen that not without good reason we have pronounced it difficult to tell just how much difference there really was between the rival candidates of the two Democracies. But it is no way difficult to see that Slavery had nothing to fear, and Freedom nothing to hope from the success of either.

Nor was it only in these parties that the spirit of Pro-Slavery took organic shape. Under its inspiration, certain obsolete and obsolescent political celebrities held a meeting, early in the season, and agreed to take "immediate steps to form a party pledged to support the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws." A "Central Executive Committee" was appointed, and an address to the people of the United States—signed by such men as JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, of Kentucky, W. C. RIVES, of Virginia, WASHINGTON HUNT and FRANCIS GRANGER, of New York—announced these as among the objects of the party:—"To remove slavery from the arena of party politics; to remove all obstacles from the faithful execution of the provision for the rendition of fugitive slaves; [two objects admirably compatible with each other!] to respect the rights and reverence the Union of the States; and to teach reconciliation, fraternity and forbearance, as the great national charities by which the Union is to be preserved as a fountain of perennial blessings to the people." A Convention, held at Baltimore, on the 9th and 10th of May, in which all the States were represented, except South Carolina and Oregon, completed the organization of the party, and nominated, as its candidates, for President, JOHN BELL, of Ten-

nessee; for Vice-President, EDWARD EVERETT, of Massachusetts. It also "adopted by acclamation" a preamble and resolution, declaring that "experience has demonstrated that all platforms adopted by political parties have the effect to mislead and to cause political divisions, by encouraging geographical and sectional parties; therefore both patriotism and duty require us to recognize no policy or principles but those resting on the broad foundation of the Constitution of the country, the Union of the States, and the enforcement of the laws."

Considering how exactly people all agree as to what "policy and principles" *do* "rest on the broad foundation" spoken of, it will be seen that this is a beautifully definite political creed; not in the least adapted to mislead anybody, or leave a doubt of the precise position held by its adherents, all and singular, on all the important issues now before the country. Ask any member of the new party whether Congress can Constitutionally shut slavery from the Territories, and his answer is here ready, "I stand upon the broad foundation of the Constitution." Desire his judgment about the legal soundness of the Dred Scott decision, and with noble frankness he responds, "I am for the Union of the States." Inquire if he believes the Constitution recognizes slaves as property, precisely on the footing of all other property, he fearlessly replies, "I go for the enforcement of the laws." So through the whole wide range of controverted topics, his comprehensive platform meets all questions with responses equally explicit and direct. Mark, too, how deep is the philosophy, and how wondrous clear the logic, of the statement that "*all* platforms adopted by political parties mislead, and cause political divisions, by encouraging geographical and sectional parties"! Men of less ripe experience, and wisdom less profound, might have supposed it would depend upon *which way* they lead, and what doctrines they uphold; and might even have thought, in their simplicity, that "political divisions" precede and produce party "platforms"; and that where men differ widely and with earnest feeling on questions of great moment, their acts will show it, even if platforms should cease to be adopted; moreover, that when slavery has defied a nation to the death-struggle, and by a course of barbarous outrages and intolerable insolence has aroused a wide-spread and intense feeling against itself and its aggressions, and a determination to set at least some limit to its arrogant demands, this sentiment and purpose will and ought to speak out both in words and deeds;

and the fact that, in the "section" it inhabits, it permits no utterance or action hostile to its own usurped supremacy, makes slavery itself responsible for whatever "sectional and geographical" character the opposition to it necessarily takes:—in short, that the despotic and persistent claims of Slavery, on the one side, and the more or less distinct denial and resolute resistance which half-awakened Freedom offers on the other, are the stubborn facts before us, whereof the various platforms are but artificial signs; and that we might as wisely stop the clock to hinder sunrise, or break the thermometer to keep off a change of weather, as adopt "no-platform" for a party platform to prevent the forming of "geographical and sectional parties," while Slavery rules one section, and perforce crowds Freedom into another.

Though the Convention was shy of talking about slavery, and, as it seems, would have us think it had no mind in particular upon that subject, yet its Presidential candidate and his Southern supporters have shown less reserve. At a meeting held in Baltimore, May 14th, to ratify the nominations, and addressed by Tennesseans and Georgians as well as Marylanders, the *Patriot* of that city says, "Nearly all the speeches met the slavery issue squarely and boldly, by pointing to the fact, that the nominees stand where Mr. CLAY stood on this point, and that, they said, was sound enough for any Union man." A meeting on the 19th in Mobile, for the same purpose, resolved "that the South has now an opportunity to place in the Presidential chair a slaveholder, devoted to her interests, and sound on the great question which agitates this section." That Mr. BELL is a slaveholder, having, it is said, "a third interest in about 400 slaves," was not the only proof relied upon of his devotion to Southern interests. In his letter of acceptance, commending the wisdom of the Convention "in discarding the use of platforms," and "considering a man's past history, connected with the public service, as the surest guaranty" of his future good behavior, he said, "The pledge implied in my acceptance of the nomination is that, if elected, I will not depart from the spirit and tenor of my past course." When, shortly after, Mr. DAWSON, Chairman of the Union State Committee of Alabama, wrote to ask him whether or not he believed that Congress, or a Territorial Legislature, can "inhibit or establish slavery," and that slave property in the Territories "is entitled to the same protection by the Federal Government" as any other property, he sent, for answer, a collection of his speeches and his votes in

Congress, then just published by the Tennessee Committee, on purpose that "the tenor of" his "past course" might be seen. Mr. DAWSON published such extracts from these as met the points presented in his questions. As to the power of Territorial Legislatures, he quoted from a speech by Mr. BELL, made in the Senate in May, 1854, repudiating "the idea that any number of inhabitants in a Territory should have power granted them by Congress to deny to the citizen of one section of the Union the power to enjoy his right of property in slaves"; and contending that "the people of a Territory, when they came to form their State Constitution, and then only, were qualified to establish their domestic institutions." He further cited Mr. BELL's vote for an amendment, offered on the 5th of June, 1850, by Mr. BERRIEN, of Georgia, to the Compromise Measures, that "no law shall be passed * * * establishing or prohibiting African slavery." As to the power of Congress, he cited Mr. BELL's vote for a resolution, offered December 11th, 1838, by Mr. ATHERTON, of New Hampshire, "that all attempts of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, or to prohibit the removal of slaves from State to State, * * * are in violation of the Constitution." As to the right of slave property to be protected, he cited Mr. BELL's vote for a proviso, offered May 27th, 1850, to the Compromise Measures, that nothing contained in them should be construed to prevent the Territorial Legislature from passing laws to protect every kind of property in the Territory; Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi, having declared, in offering it, that his object was "to assert the duty of the Government to protect slavery." Upon slavery extension, Mr. DAWSON quoted from Mr. BELL, that "humanity to the slave, not less than justice to the master, recommends the policy of diffusion and extension into any new Territory adapted to his condition"; and contrasting this with Mr. BRECKINRIDGE's declaration, "I belong to no party which has for its object the extension of slavery," triumphantly exclaimed, "Southern slaveholders, choose ye between them!"

Mr. BELL approved the Compromises of 1850; and, in a speech upon them, defended slavery as in accordance with the laws of Nature and the will of God; as "the instrument of Hindoo, Egyptian, Assyrian, Jewish, Greek and Roman civilization"; as "recognized by the theocratic government of the chosen depositaries of the Word of Life"; as "contributing in a hundred various forms and modes, through a period of thousands of years, to the amelioration of the

condition of mankind generally"; as the "well-spring" of this country's "rich and varied commerce, navigation, and commercial marine," its "ample revenues, public credit, manufactures, and rich and populous and splendid cities." He doubted "whether the power and resources of the country would have attained more than half their present extraordinary proportions, but for this so-much-reviled institution"; and declared that the condition of the "millions of the African race" here "cannot be changed, though their masters should will it, without destruction alike to the interests and welfare of both master and slave." In the same speech, he maintained, as a doctrine which "cannot well be questioned or disproved," that "the Constitution *proprio vigore* protects the citizen in the enjoyment of his rights of property of every description, recognized as such, in any of the States, in every sea, and in every Territory of the Union; and, if the question related to a Territory situated as Oregon was when the United States came into possession of it, property in slaves would be entitled to the protection of the laws and Constitution of the United States." The *Mobile Advertiser* holds that Mr. BELL's opinions "are all that could be wished. He is opposed to the DOUGLAS doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty; he declares it the duty of Congress to protect slavery in the Territories when necessary, and he denies the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories. What more can any Southern man want?" But he voted against the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution; and, at an earlier day, favored the reception of anti-slavery petitions,—though not the granting of their prayer,—and voted against AHERTON's "gag-resolution," regarding it as a denial of a Constitutional right. Such is "the tenor of his past course" on the slave question.

Mr. EVERETT, after some hesitation and delay, and under the solicited advice of his friends, consented to stand as candidate for the Vice-Presidency. In making known, by letter, his decision, he pronounced the course of the Convention "wise and patriotic, in adopting as its Platform the Constitution, without note or comment"; condemned "electioneering platforms" as, "almost without exception, equivocal and delusive"; and declared that "the Constitution, in its fair and natural interpretation, is the only basis on which good citizens, in every part of the country, can now unite"; but was as shy of just the questions on which the nation is now thinking, feeling, talking, acting, as the Convention was which nomi-

nated him. He quite omitted even to explain how those "good citizens" who hold that on this "only basis" stands the right of Congress to protect the Territories from the touch of slavery, can unite with those—at least as good, we dare say Mr. EVERETT thinks—who claim to rest on the same basis their "sacred right" to hold slave property in every Territory belonging to the Union. Or is this but a difference on those "metaphysical subtleties" whereon he tells us platforms make "those differ, who agree upon great practical principles,"—so that merely stepping from an electioneering platform will suffice to reconcile it? Unlike Mr. BELL, he is himself opposed to slavery-extension, and, we believe, has spoken of it in terms of emphatic reprobation.

The history of Mr. EVERETT's public life supplied with weapons both his partisans and his opposers at the South. The latter urged against him, as a proof that, in the language of the Jackson *Mississippian*, he is "an Abolitionist of the most virulent and undisguised form," a letter written in 1839, in which he said that, while in Congress, he "voted in the negative on the motion to lay upon the table the petition of the American Anti-Slavery Society for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and on other motions of the like character, introduced to cast off the consideration of this class of petitions"; and stated further, that, while Governor of Massachusetts, he "cheerfully coöperated in the passage of the resolves" adopted by the Legislature of that State, affirming the Constitutional power and the duty of Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the slave trade between the States, and opposing the admission of any new Slave State to the Union. On the other hand, his Southern friends maintained his worthiness of their support, by publishing an extract from his well-known pro-slavery speech in Congress, in 1824, in which he said that "the great relation of servitude, in some form or other, with greater or less departures from the theoretic equality of man, is inseparable from our nature," and "I know of no way by which the form of this servitude shall be fixed, but by political institution"; that "domestic slavery, though not that form of servitude which seems to be the most beneficial to the master—certainly not that which is most beneficial to the slave—is not, in my judgment, to be set down as an immoral and irreligious relation"; that though "in the benignant operation of Christianity, this unfortunate institution disappeared in Europe, yet I cannot admit that while it subsists,

its duties are not presupposed and sanctioned by religion"; that "I know the condition of the working classes in other countries, and I believe the slaves in this country are better clothed and fed, and less badly worked, than the peasantry of some of the most prosperous States of the continent of Europe"; that "I am not of the class of politicians" who have "the disposition to disturb the compromise contained in the Constitution on this point," [the three-fifths representation]; that "the distribution of power among the States of the Union is a matter of agreement; if I make an agreement on this subject, I will adhere to it like a man"; that "neither am I one of those who would think it immoral and irreligious to join in putting down a servile insurrection at the South"; that "I am no soldier—my habits and education are unmilitary; but there is no cause in which I would sooner buckle a knapsack to my back and put a musket on my shoulder than that"; that "I would cede the whole continent to any one who would take it—to England, to France, to Spain; I would see it sunk in the bottom of the ocean, before I would see any part of this fine America converted into a continental Hayti, by that awful process of bloodshed and desolation by which alone such a catastrophe could be brought on." The Petersburg (Va.) *Intelligencer*, in copying the passage from which we make these extracts, pronounces it "a bold and manly vindication of the rights of the South."

Upon the whole, then, taking into view the sort of men who formed it, the circumstances of its organization, and the character and antecedents of its candidates, we see not much to choose for Freedom's sake between "the Union party" and either of the sham-Democracies. Indeed, in several States, the "Union party" joined in open league with the main body of the Douglas Democrats; and in one State, at least, all three united in support of one electoral ticket, made up in due proportions from the several parties; and strove, apparently with equal zeal, to gain the common end,—to overthrow that party whose success was thought to threaten detriment to slavery. The "Union Electoral Committee" of New York, in giving their constituents their reasons for consenting to a fusion with the Douglas party, said that "between the two there is, if not identity, yet a great similarity of principle, and many points of sympathy and attraction. There are no Abolitionists or disunionists, no Yanceys or Keitts or Summers or Lovejoys among the National Democrats and the Bell Unionists. There are doubtless differences

of opinion upon questions unconnected with slavery; but these are unimportant, when compared with the great issues upon which the Union hangs. * * * Upon the question of non-intervention, there is probably a very general concurrence between the National Democrats and the supporters of Mr. BELL. Hardly a single follower of Mr. BELL is in favor of present intervention, either for or against slavery, though doubtless many maintain the Constitutional power to intervene, and might be unwilling to abandon the claim, under circumstances that may possibly arise hereafter. * * * While, then, the Union men are separated from the National Democracy by the recollections of the past, they are drawn toward them by the sympathies of the present. And what serves to draw us yet closer together, we are hated and reviled by all the Abolitionists, nullifiers, disunionists, and sectional demagogues that afflict the land." It may, perhaps, be thought a little curious, after this fine outburst, that in this very same State of New York, these patriotic Unionists united to support a "fusion ticket," not only with the "National Democracy," toward which they are drawn by such a potent sympathy, but also with the party of "the Keitts and Yanceys," the slaveholding "nullifiers and disunionists and sectional demagogues";—showing that, all the while, their chief antipathy was for the "Abolitionists," the "Sumners" and the "Lovejoys."

The Republican Convention met in Chicago, on the 16th of May. Besides a full representation from all the Free States, and from the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, delegates were present from Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri and Texas, also from the District of Columbia. Two days were spent in preliminary arrangements and the discussion and adoption of a Platform, and a third in balloting for candidates. The Platform affirmed "that the causes which called the Republican party into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and Constitutional triumph"; reasserted the "self-evident truths" of the Declaration of Independence, declaring the maintenance of them "essential to the preservation of our republican institutions"; ascribed the rapid growth and great prosperity of the nation to the Union of the States; avowed abhorrence of all schemes for disunion, and denounced, "as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason," the threats of disunion by Democrats in Congress, "in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy"; asserted "the right of each State

to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively," and condemned "the lawless invasion by armed force of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes"; reprobated the Democratic Administration for "its measureless subserviency to a sectional interest," as shown in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Leecompton Constitution upon the people of Kansas, in construing the relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons," and attempting to enforce everywhere, "through Congress and the Federal Courts, the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest"; declared "the new dogma, that the Constitution of its own force carries slavery into the Territories, a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the provisions of the instrument, with contemporaneous exposition and with legislative and judicial precedent, and revolutionary and subversive of the peace of the country"; pronounced freedom to be "the normal condition of all the Territory of the United States," and, denying "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States," affirmed the duty of maintaining therein "by legislation, whenever necessary, the Constitutional provision that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law"; branded "the recent reöpening of the African slave trade, under cover of our national flag, as a crime against humanity and a shame to our country and age," and called on Congress for "prompt measures to suppress the execrable traffic"; referred to the vetoes, by the Federal Governors, of the legislative prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, as illustrating "the boasted Democratic principle of non-intervention and popular sovereignty, embodied in the Kansas and Nebraska bill," and as exhibiting "the deception and fraud involved therein"; and averred "that Kansas should of right be immediately admitted as a State, under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives."

In balloting for a candidate for the Presidency, the friends of WILLIAM H. SEWARD led off with 173 votes, followed by those of ABRAHAM LINCOLN with 102, while 190 were scattered among ten other competitors. The second ballot added eleven to SEWARD, and seventy-nine to LINCOLN, reducing the scattering vote to 97. This showed the way the current set, and on the third ballot, so many

went over to LINCOLN, that he was chosen by 364, to 101 for SEWARD. On motion of the leading member of the New York delegation, which had gone entire for SEWARD, the vote was then made unanimous for LINCOLN, amid an uproar of applause. HANNIBAL HAMLIN, of Maine, was, on the second ballot, chosen as candidate for the Vice-Presidency, and the Convention adjourned without day.

The result caused general surprise, and, we may well suppose, no little disappointment in many quarters. The nomination of SEWARD had been almost everywhere regarded as nearly a matter of course. That he was the foremost man of the party in ability, political experience and public services, was conceded even by those who were most averse to nominating him. That he was also generally regarded as the leader of the more anti-slavery portion of the party, and that his name was everywhere associated with the doctrine of an "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom, was doubtless the main reason why he was rejected for a rival who, though probably as anti-slavery as himself,—which is really not saying very much for Mr. LINCOLN,—had hitherto been less conspicuous, and so was less encumbered with an anti-slavery reputation. The nomination may be justly taken, therefore, as a bid for favor from self-styled conservatives, and as a hint, if not a pledge, that "Republicanism," in the party sense, means not to be so "black" as it has been represented; that its hostility to slavery is to be so moderate as not to repel the class of politicians who, four years before, supported as their candidate the signer of the Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850, or those who still regard pro-slavery compromises as the very salvation of the country.

And, so regarded, it was partially successful. The New York *Tribune* said, a few days after the Convention closed its session, "The wisdom of the choice of candidates is shown to be very manifest by the tone of the public press, as well as in other ways by which the popular sentiment makes itself felt. Especially cheering are the indications that the ticket will form a rallying point for all sections of the opposition to the party now in power. A most impressive indication of what is to be looked for in this respect is to be found in the following carefully-considered article from the *Buffalo Commercial Advertiser*, a journal of great ability and influence, which, in 1856, supported Mr. FILLMORE." The article here referred to declares that in 1856 the Republican party "was vehement, intemperate, fanatical"; but that now, at Chicago, it had enunciated a

political creed so definite in all matters of real importance, so free from sectional denunciations, so true to the old standard of the relations which should exist between the North and the South, that it appeals strongly to the confidence and support of those who have hitherto stood aloof from an organization which seemed—and under certain management was—dangerous to the perpetuity of our beloved Union of States. That danger no longer exists.” Hon. RICHARD W. THOMPSON, a leading Fillmore man in 1856, in a speech at Vigo, Indiana, affirmed that “if Mr. LINCOLN is elected, he will be entitled to the respect of every man in the United States. His strength consists in his *conservatism*. His own principles are conservative. I know him well. I served in Congress with him. This slavery question was then up. I was upon very intimate terms with him, and I know just how he felt about this question of slavery.” JAMES O. PUTNAM, of Buffalo, Republican elector at large, with W. C. BRYANT, for the State of New York, addressing a Republican ratification meeting at the Cooper Institute, in New York city, said: “I unite with you in this canvass, because I find at the threshold of your organization a sacred pledge of your moral and political power to maintain inviolate the rights of the States, leaving to them the amplest exercise of every right which, under the Federal Constitution, pertains to sovereignty; because you have pledged the power of the Government, if you shall ever be invested with it, to put down all unlawful invasions, from without, of the Slave States, and to punish, as ‘the gravest of crimes,’ such forays upon their peace; because, furthermore, I find in the man who is to give direction to the policy of your administration of the Government, a man whose every sentiment and act, in private and in public life, demonstrates his love of this Federal Union, and his fidelity to all the balances and compromises of the Constitution.” And what these “rights” are, for maintaining which “inviolate” he deems the party worthy of his support, he thus announced: “The three-fifths representation in Congress of those holding the servile relation; the keeping open the slave trade until 1808; the provision for the return of fugitives from labor, meaning escaped slaves, with such other rights as the common law, then in force throughout the country, could invest that interest—these were the chief rights guaranteed and secured by the Federal Constitution to the institution of slavery.” In other words, the party’s presumed fidelity to the duty of slave-catching, and of standing guard to protect slavery, is one of its chief recommendations to his

favor. Yet, after that avowal, the party was not ashamed to choose him as one of its standard-bearers.

The utterances and antecedents of the candidate himself are of that mixed character which the party leaders seemed to think best suited to the requirements of the somewhat heterogeneous multitude relied on to achieve success. As the *New York Tribune* puts the case: "While his position as a Republican renders him satisfactory to the most zealous member of the party, the moderation of his character, and the conservative tendencies of his mind, long approved and well known of all men in public life, commend him to every section of the opposition." In his brief letter accepting the nomination, he avowed his approval of "the declaration of principles and sentiments" adopted by the Convention, and promised "not to violate or disregard it in any part." In a speech made at Springfield, Ill., on the 16th of June, 1858, at the opening of the campaign against DOUGLAS for the United States Senatorship, he announced the "irrepressible conflict," even in advance of Mr. SEWARD; declaring that "a house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved,—I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South." In a speech at Cincinnati, in September, 1859, he said: "We want, and must have, a national policy in regard to the institution of slavery, that acknowledges and deals with that institution as being wrong." At Freeport, Ill., August 27th, 1858, to a question from DOUGLAS, whether he was "opposed to the acquisition of any new territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein," he replied: "I am not generally opposed to any honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate the slavery question among ourselves"—by which we are willing to understand, giving his words the best construction they will bear, that he *would* oppose any territorial acquisition which would enlarge the domain of slavery. In answer to another question, he declared himself "impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a

belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories."

On the other hand, he said, in the same speech: "I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more Slave States into the Union. * * * I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another Slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add that, if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union." To another question he replied: "I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law. I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Fugitive Slave Law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave Law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, *without lessening its efficiency*. And, inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I *would not* be the man to *introduce it as a new subject of agitation* upon the general question of slavery." And in other speeches of the same campaign, he affirmed the Constitutional right of "slave-owners" to reclaim fugitive slaves, adding that as it would be "a barren right, without legislation to enforce it, I would deem it my duty—although distasteful to me—to vote for and support a Fugitive Slave Law, because I do not understand that the Constitution, which guaranties that right, can be supported without it." To another question, at the Freeport meeting, his answer was: "I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished there. I believe that Congress possesses the Constitutional power to abolish it. Yet, as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: first, that the abolition should be gradual; second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners." Another

question called out the answer: "I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States. That question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the Constitutional power to do it. However, if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the Constitutional power, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power, unless upon some conservative principle, as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia."

At Ottawa, Ill., on the 21st of August, 1858, he "acknowledged that the Southern people are no more responsible for the origin of slavery than we"; and that "the institution exists, and it is very difficult to get rid of it in any satisfactory way"; adding, "I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves and send them to Liberia"; but of this scheme, though it may be hopeful in the long run, the "sudden execution is impossible." It is not "quite certain" that to "free them and keep them among us as underlings" would "better their condition"; and to "free them and make them politically and socially our equals, my own feelings will not admit of, and if mine would, those of the great mass of the white people will not. * * * It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted; but for their tardiness in this, I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the South." In that and other speeches of the same campaign, he emphatically disclaimed any purpose to "bring about the social and political equality of the white and black races, make voters or jurors of negroes, or qualify them to hold office or intermarry with white people"; and affirmed his belief that the "physical difference between the two races will forever forbid their living together on terms of social and political equality." So "while they do remain together," he was "in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race." He was "not in favor of negro citizenship," and though he thought "that the different States have the power to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States," yet, "if the State of Illinois had that power," he would "be opposed to the exercise of it." He held, however, that to the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the negro "is as much entitled as the white man."

On the 10th of January, 1849, Mr. LINCOLN proposed, in the United States House of Representatives, a bill, which, if passed, was to be valid only when ratified by a majority of the voters of the District of Columbia, providing in substance that no slave shall be taken from or brought into the District, except that officers of the U. S. Government from Slave States, coming in on public business, and making only what stay it requires, may bring, retain and take away the necessary servants of themselves and their families; that all children born of slave mothers on or after the first day of 1850 shall be free; and all slaves "now owned" by any resident in the District shall still be slaves at their "owners'" will; but any "owner" may, whenever he chooses, receive the full value of such slaves from the U. S. Treasury, and they shall then be free. It also "empowered and *required* the municipal authorities of Washington and Georgetown to provide active and efficient means to arrest and deliver up to their owners all fugitive slaves escaping into said District." As the Constitutional provision touching fugitives from "service or labor" authorizes the surrender of none but those escaping from one *State* into another, and as the Supreme Court has decided [*Hepburn vs. Ellzey*, 2 Cranch, 445] that the District of Columbia is not a State, within the meaning of the Constitution, it will be seen that Mr. LINCOLN's bill attempted a clearly unconstitutional extension of the power of slave-catching, and so did not come under his excuse, above recited, for supporting a Fugitive Slave Law. It hardly rose, indeed, even to the low moral level of a *compromise* with iniquity; for slavery being, according to the Republican theory, illegal anyhow in the District, without a statute to make it so, the stretching of the Fugitive Slave Law over it, also without legal obligation or warrant so to do, looks like a pure gratuity to the Slave Power. Be it that the offer came from ignorance of the Constitutional limit to slavery's so-called legal rights, rather than from any purpose to enlarge them; still, if a blunder only, would any earnest anti-slavery man have made it?—or would such a man, in framing what he meant to be a nation's statute, have called one man the "owner" of another?

Such is the "record" on which Mr. LINCOLN was put before the people. It proves him, perhaps, a good enough Republican for the party's purposes, but far from being the man for the country's need. It shows him as a sort of bland, respectable middle-man, between a very modest Right and the most arrogant and exacting Wrong; a

convenient hook whereon to hang appeals at once to a *moderate* anti-slavery feeling and to a timid conservatism practically pro-slavery, half-way assertions of human rights, and whole-way concessions to a wicked prejudice against dark-colored manhood, arguments against slavery-extension, and apologies for continued complicity in slave-holding. He thinks slavery wrong, but opposes the immediate abolition of it; believes it ought to be kept out of the Territories, but would admit it to the Union in new States; asserts the power of Congress to abolish it in the District of Columbia, but would have leave asked of the slaveholders for the exercise of that power; considers slave-catching a "distasteful" business, but would enforce it by Congressional enactments, not only under, but beyond the Constitution's warrant for it; dislikes the slave trade, but is not ready to forbid it between the States; affirms the equality of white men and black in natural rights, but is "not in favor of negro citizenship"; in short, if we rightly understand him, regards impartial justice as a most excellent thing, but as somewhat too fine and costly for everyday wear.

Alike discordant were the tones of the divers sorts of his supporters, if not, indeed, of the same sort and even the same persons, at divers times and places, or in different parts of the same discourse. Much pains were taken in some quarters to make it clearly understood that the Republican party is no champion of the black man's rights, but that its aim is to maintain the rights and to promote the interests of white men. At one of its mass meetings, held in Springfield, Ill., the home of Mr. LINCOLN, a banner borne in the procession was inscribed: "NO NEGRO EQUALITY IN THE NORTH." The New York *Tribune* thought it needful to deny—not as disclaiming credit undeserved—an adversary's charge that Mr. LINCOLN once said, in a public speech, [what, had he said it, would have done him honor,] that "true democracy asks not about the color of the skin; and the exclusion of the colored people, as a body, from the elective franchise is incompatible with true democratic principles; that all legal distinctions founded upon color, origin, and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions; and that slavery and oppression must cease, or American liberty must perish." The Republican Executive Committee of Maryland, addressing the people of that State, said: "This is essentially the white man's party. Its sympathies are enlisted in behalf of the white race, and its fundamental object is to protect and ennoble free [evidently meaning

white] labor." So, too, the Address of the Republican Convention of Virginia announced the party's "policy" to be, "to encourage the white labor of the country," and "give white labor its proper reward." And even HORACE GREELEY wrote, in the *New York Independent*, that the party "contemplates primarily the interest of free white labor, for which it struggles to secure the unoccupied territory of the Union." Mr. SEWARD, in his very able and elaborate speech at Detroit, September 4th, declared "the motive of those who have protested against the extension of slavery" to have "always really been concern for the welfare of the white man," and not, as some assumed, "unnatural sympathy with the negro." The *Independent* understands him to have argued, either in this speech or in some other, made not far from the same time, that "this great country is for *white* men," and justly says that "such a doctrine would brand Republicanism with infamy." Whether or not he did so argue, his language seems at best ambiguous, and not incapable of that construction. After denying "that this Government was made by and for white men only," and affirming its duty to "protect the extreme rights of every human being, foreign or native, bond or free, whom it compulsorily holds within its jurisdiction," he spoke of "the African race" as "a foreign and feeble element, incapable of assimilation, entitled," indeed, "to such care as the weak may require from the strong," but "a pitiful exotic, unwisely and unnecessarily transplanted into our fields, and which it is unprofitable to cultivate at the cost of the desolation of the native vineyard."

He admitted the departure of the nation "from the right and safe way," but held that it took place, not at "the establishment of the Constitution," with its disastrous concessions to slavery, but at the date of the Missouri Compromise, which, it seems plain to us, was but the natural and inevitable result of those earlier concessions. But even this, and all the wider "national divergence" which has followed, he thought "not altogether inexcusable." For "history says the compromise of 1820 was necessary to save the Union from disruption"; and he did "not dispute history, nor debate the settled moral questions of the past." And, since then, "alarms of disunion were sounded whenever we proposed to consider in good earnest the subject of Federal slavery. We love, and ought to love, the fellowship of our slaveholding brethren. How natural, therefore, has it been to make the concessions so necessary to silence their complaints, rather than * * * lose such genial companionship!" One

frank confession which he made suggests a moral not unsuited to his own case and that of his political associates of to-day. It is that the disasters, if not ruin, of all the older parties, Democratic, Whig, American, resulted from the fact that their "foundations had been laid in compromises of natural justice and human rights," and therefore were too narrow for the "expanding" of "the public conscience," caused by the "new, great moral question" which had now arisen. The foundations of his present party may be broader than of those he has so well described, because the "compromises" which narrow them are fewer; but the fatal fault is in *them* too; they do not cover all the ample breadth of "natural justice and human rights."

Still, it would be injustice to the party not to say, that all through the campaign its presses and its speakers uttered many noble sentiments; exposed, with many words of earnest reprobation, the folly and the wrong of slavery; and, with unanswerable arguments, from which they only drew the modest inference that it ought to be allowed to spread no further, proved really that it ought not to be tolerated anywhere. We think, too, that, however they might deem it prudent to invite "conservative" support, the party's clearest-sighted advocates were conscious that its most trustworthy strength lay in its anti-slavery element; and its best hope for victory in the enthusiasm and determination which appeals to that would best awaken. Hence, partly as the shrewdest policy, but partly, too, no doubt, from principle, much anti-slavery truth was spoken, and to multitudes of willing ears and open hearts; much feeling against slavery was created or aroused; and many, we may hope, were ripened wholly or in part for something better than the work required of them. So that, with all its serious defects, the canvass hardly can have failed to do good service to the cause of freedom.

On the 16th of August, Mr. SEWARD spoke in Boston, and, prophesying victory to the Republicans, declared that "with this victory comes the end of the power of slavery in the United States." At St. Joseph, Mo., on the 22d of September, he said: "The democratic principle that every man ought to be the owner of the soil that he cultivates, and the owner of the limbs and the head that he applies to that culture, has gone through eighteen States of the Union, and is bound to go through all the other fifteen, for the simple reason that it is going through the world." His Missourian audience answered this with "enthusiastic cheering." Nine days before, at

Madison, Wis., he told his hearers: "You are to make this whole continent, from North to South, from East to West, a land of freedom and a land of happiness." In the same speech he said: "The rule of interpretation by which I have studied the Constitution has been simply this: That by no word, no act, no combination into which I might enter, should any one human being of all the generations to which I belong, much less any class of human beings of any nation, race or kindred, be oppressed and kept down in the least degree in their efforts to rise to a higher state of liberty and happiness. Amid all the glosses of the times, this has been the simple, plain, broad light in which I have read every article and every section of that great instrument. Whenever it requires of me that this hand shall keep down the humblest of the human race, then I will lay down power, place, position, fame, everything, rather than adopt such a construction."

"What noble sentiments, and what fitting words!" exclaims the New York *Tribune*, copying them. "Here is condensed at once the loftiest political wisdom and the most generous utterance of the human heart." If only we could feel at liberty to forget that the same eloquent lips had, half a year before, asserted in the Senate Chamber the Constitutional obligation to send back fugitives from bondage, and to defend the Slave States, "no matter by what foe" assailed, or for "what cause or pretext,"—that is, no matter if by slaves, "in their efforts to rise to a higher state of liberty and happiness," or by John Browns, endeavoring to help their efforts,—we might perhaps be more disposed to put our trust in politicians uttering such "noble sentiments" in such "fitting words." Still, as it is, we hail the utterance of them, and the applause which greeted it; both as they show what key-note skilful politicians strike, to waken popular enthusiasm, and as they help the spread and final triumph of such sentiments.

CARL SCHURZ, the brilliant German orator, speaking at St. Louis on the 1st of August, contended that the party meant "to adopt a policy which will work the peaceful and gradual extinction of slavery; for if we do not, we shall have to submit to a policy which will work the gradual extinction of liberty." Quoting from MASON, of Virginia, that "our ancestry were not Abolitionists," because they only took such measures that, as they believed, "slavery would die out of itself," he added: "I am willing to accept this as it stands. The fathers, then, intended to bring about a state of things by which

slavery would die out of itself. What else do we want? If WASHINGTON, MADISON and JEFFERSON were Abolitionists, we are. Mr. MASON says they were not; well, then, we are not, for our policy has been theirs, and theirs has become ours."

In this election, the Republicans began, at least, to practically refute the charge of being "a sectional party"; for Republican Electoral tickets were formed and voted for in no less than five of the Slave States,—that is, in all which border on the Free States,—and in many places in these States, Republican meetings were held, some of which were large and spirited. One of these, held about the middle of October at Georgetown, Sussex county, the largest slaveholding county of Delaware, was the most numerous meeting ever seen there, "the people having come to it from a circuit of twenty miles around"; and, says the *Philadelphia News*, "to show the confidence of this ultra slaveholding community in the conservatism of Lincoln, the meeting was presided over by the largest slaveholder in the State." The Address of the Republican Executive Committee of Maryland stated that "organizations of the Republican party for the present canvass are going forward spiritedly in five other Southern States," and strongly recommended "similar organizations in Maryland." Of the Convention held in Wheeling, Va., on the 1st of May, the *Intelligencer* of that city says: "It was a most complete and overwhelming success. Its friends were most agreeably disappointed in the large and extended representation from all parts of the State. It surpassed what we at any time expected. Not that we did not know that there were thousands of men in Virginia who are attached to the doctrines of Republicanism, but that we did not dare to hope that so many could be found who would come up from a distance and take part in the Convention." In Missouri, the Republicans, or "Free Democracy," had "for six years maintained the ascendancy" in St. Louis, but now for the first time formed an organization for the State. The St. Louis *Democrat* of August 17th, in an article on the prospects of Republicanism in the State, says that "the immigration for the past four years has been large, and, politically speaking, almost exclusively of one quality; and that simultaneously with the development of industrial enterprise at any point arises at that point a local Republican organization." How many votes the Slave States gave for Lincoln we are unable to say, as probably but partial returns of them were ever made. In Delaware, he held the second place among the four

candidates voted for there, having nearly 4000 votes, or more than one fourth of all which were cast. In Missouri, he had a little over 17,000, or about one ninth of the whole number. From Virginia, Maryland and Kentucky, between five and six thousand were returned for him. One town in Eastern Virginia, Occoquan, gave him a higher vote than to either of the other candidates, and rather more than one third of the whole vote of the place. The *N. Y. Tribune* further states that Delaware elected as her Representative in Congress, a man "who sympathizes with the Republicans in all their leading ideas," including "the non-extension of slavery." Missouri chose, from the St. Louis District, in the person of F. P. BLAIR, an avowed Republican and advocate of emancipation in the State. In view of facts like these, the *New York Tribune* said, "As to the cant about a sectional party, let St. Louis answer it for the present, as three or four States will be ready to do before Mr. LINCOLN's first term will have nearly expired."

The friends of General HOUSTON tried to add his name to the list of Presidential candidates, and he at first consented to that use of it, but afterward changed his mind, and positively withdrew it; and at the same time raised his warning voice against the "reckless spirit of Disunion, North and South"; and hinted pretty plainly that some others ought to follow his example, inasmuch as having "four or three or two opponents to the Republican candidate" would ensure "the elevation of a sectional President, whose claim to success is based upon opposition to the institution whose existence should never have been brought into the national politics."

The little band of "Radical [Political] Abolitionists," who regard the Constitution, rightly construed, as an anti-slavery instrument, met on the 29th of August, in National Convention, at Syracuse, N. Y., and nominated GERRIT SMITH for President, and SAMUEL MCFARLAND, of Pennsylvania, for Vice President. A resolution, "extending earnest sympathy and hearty God-speed to" the authors of this nomination, was adopted by a Conyention which was held in Worcester, Mass., on the 19th and 20th of September, and there organized "a political association, to be known as the Union Democratic Party of the United States of America." The new association is based upon the principles—that all men, of whatever color, condition, sex or nation have a natural right to themselves, and no right of property in the person or labor of one can, without his consent, be given to another; it is the right and duty of all men to defend their

liberty by the most potent means in their power, at whatever cost to their oppressors; it is the duty of the National Government to protect all inhabitants of the country in the enjoyment of all their natural rights; the people of the United States, and not the Supreme Court, are the ultimate arbiter in all questions involving the interpretation of the Constitution, and the Court is bound to obey the clearly expressed will of a popular majority; the Constitution, fairly interpreted, prohibits the existence of slavery in the States, and invests the Federal Government with ample powers for its overthrow; all laws, to secure our respect and support, must be based upon general principles, operating equally upon all classes of society; slavery is organized piracy, and any Administration which tolerates it, in any State or Territory, is guilty of the crimes inherent in it, and of treason to the Constitution; any act which, done by a private individual, would be a crime against natural justice, when done by an officer of Government is equally criminal, and doubly dangerous; therefore the execution of the Fugitive Act of 1850, and of all other legislation to subvert the rights of black or white, should be resisted; and finally, woman having the same capacity for government as man, and the same need of its protecting care, her aid is invoked "in this effort to transform, by peaceful political means, a slaveholding despotism into a model of republican liberty, justice and equality."

We have spoken of the conduct of the canvass on the part of the Republicans. It may be well to glance a moment at the method of their adversaries. The country has been long familiar with the Southern policy of threatening disunion, to extort, from Northern fear, concessions to the Slave Power; as well as with that of its Northern allies to repeat the threat, in the subdued tone of a warning. But never were they used before with such abundant earnestness and frequency as now. Indeed, the chief reliance of the sham-Democracies and the Bell-Unionists appeared to be on the alarm-cry of impending peril, if not certain ruin, to the Union, if Lincoln should be chosen President.

As the New York *Tribune* said, two days after the election, " 'Dissolution of the Union is inevitable, if the Black Republicans triumph,' has been the cry of the *Herald*, the *Express*, the *Journal of Commerce*, any day for a few months past." Said the Electors Committee of the New York Union party, "The principle upon which Mr. Lincoln was nominated excludes the great mass of the citizens of the Southern States from office. * * * This principle is a viola-

tion of the spirit of the Constitution, and if persisted in, must, in the event of the permanent success of that party, inevitably cause a dissolution of the Union." The Executive Committee of the Union party in Kentucky declared that "an attempt to govern the country upon the distinctive and peculiar principles of the Republican party, would be fatal to the Union." And Mr. WADSWORTH, a leading champion of the party in that State, maintained, in an electioneering speech, as reported in the *Louisville Journal*, that "the election of a Black Republican President would be cause for a dissolution of the Union." A Richmond correspondent of the *New York Herald* wrote, in the early part of June, "From all that I can learn, there is a settled purpose in the South—not among Democrats alone, but men of all political opinions—to resist by force of arms the inauguration of LINCOLN, should he be elected"; and gave warning of "the danger which threatens to engulf the Democratic organization and the Union together." A letter to the *Herald* from Atlanta, Ga., September 23d, announced that, in "a brief, but searching visit to the interior plantations," the correspondent had "arrived at these conclusions: That the agricultural population is ripe for revolution and separation; that if LINCOLN be elected, men can be found ready to go to Washington, and, by force, prevent his inauguration; and that an armed league already exists, pledged to this and other purposes, hostile to LINCOLN's Government." The *Charleston Mercury*, two months earlier, said: "If beaten by the election of Messrs. BELL and EVERETT, we will cheerfully acquiesce. If beaten by the election of the Black Republican candidates, we will not acquiesce. We will counsel resistance. We will do all we can to arouse the South 'to the consideration of the question whether or not she will longer remain in the Union.'" The same journal, at a later date,—about the middle of October,—argued that if, in consequence of Southern secession, the North should "make war on the South, instead of loss, it may be great gain to Southern merchants; for they have the goods of Northern merchants, and the latter have their promises to pay, which will be abrogated by war"; whereas the North has nothing to set off against this forfeiture. "Our cotton, sugar and tobacco have been paid for before they left the producers' hands." Mr. ORR, of South Carolina, Ex-Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives, wrote, on the 23d of July, "LINCOLN and HAMLIN will be elected in November next, and the South will then decide the great question whether they will submit to the domination

of Black Republican rule. I believe that the honor and safety of the South, in that contingency, will require the prompt secession of the slaveholding States from the Union." He was opposed to "the separate secession of South Carolina"; but if Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi would go with her, he "would give" his "assent to the policy." The Montgomery (Ala.) *Mail* declared that if LINCOLN should be elected, "some, perhaps most, of the Southern communities will refuse to let a postmaster appointed by him take the office," and if the United States authorities attempt "to enforce the law, the people will rise against the United States Government, and civil war will envelop the land in blood and carnage." And again: "We regard it as a fixed fact, that if Mr. LINCOLN succeeds, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Texas will go out at once; and that the other cotton States—indeed, the greater part of the South—will promptly follow." In the same paper, on the 18th of September, was a call to "the young men of this city and vicinity, between the ages of sixteen and twenty, to meet at Concert Hall, on Friday night, October 16, at 7½ o'clock, for the purpose of forming a club, whose motto shall be, 'Resistance to LINCOLN is obedience to God.'"

The Atlanta (Ga.) *Southern Confederacy*, a DOUGLAS organ, said: "If LINCOLN is elected, let us with one heart and mind forget the past, and go out of the Union together. If we permit the blacks to come into power, and allow them to govern us, they will, in four short years, inflict a moral sting upon slavery from which it will never recover." And again, with some terrible talk about paving Pennsylvania Avenue "ten fathoms deep with mangled bodies," it declared, as "the determination of all parties at the South," that "the South will never submit to such humiliation and degradation as the inauguration of ABRAHAM LINCOLN." Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, in a speech at Columbia, on the 21st of August, urged dissolution without waiting for an overt act from the Republican Administration; if the whole South would not go, then with as many States as would; and if no other, "then he was for South Carolina, in the majesty of her own sovereignty, and in the exercise of her own right, marching out alone from beneath the yoke of a vulgar tyranny." The Sumter (Ga.) *Republican*, stated, on the authority of "a private letter, written by a distinguished gentleman in Oglethorpe county," that Senator TOOMBS, "in private conversation, said, that in the event of LINCOLN's election, he would resign before BUCHANAN's time was out, come home, raise an army of ten

thousand men, and when he crossed the Potomac again, it would be with his drawn sword. The Senator said there were thirty members of Congress pledged to that position, and would go with him, some from every Southern State." The *Washington Constitution*, the reputed organ of BUCHANAN, on September 21st, set forth a formidable array of consequences to be apprehended from the election of a Republican President, and then asked: "Is it likely that Southern communities will submit to the perilous experiment? Can they reasonably be expected to wait until abolition has entrenched itself behind the offices at the disposal of the General Government? We think not. Let LINCOLN be President, and how many months' purchase would the Union be worth?" The *New Haven (Ct.) Register* published a letter written in Alabama, October 24th, by "a Union-loving, conservative man," who said, "I fear, should LINCOLN be elected, there will be dissolution of the Government! South Carolina will secede as certain as LINCOLN is elected; and all the cotton States will follow. Our State has passed a resolution, that in the event of a Black Republican being elected, the Governor shall convene the Legislature; and our Governor, and a large number of our Representatives elect, are in favor of resistance! Most of the Governors in the cotton States are of the same mind. Now there are many conservative men here; but when the South becomes involved in a difficulty with the General Government, they will not only sympathize, but take an active part. Not one in a hundred will take sides with the General Government. * * * * The North is to blame for it all. Had she let the South alone, we would now have been as a band of brothers." The *Register* added: "Thousands of communications of the same purport are written by people at the South to their friends in the North." A letter from Alabama, dated October 31st, and published in the *Nashville (Tenn.) Banner*, said that "Gen. L. P. WALKER, JOHN T. MORGAN, and many other 'fire-eating' leaders have taken the ground, in the last few days, that any man who will hold or continue in office under LINCOLN shall be hung!" Another letter, from South Alabama, dated October 29th, and published in the *Banner*, stated that "the Breckinridgers have declared openly for dissolution in the last few days." Near the same time, the *New York Express* contained a letter from St. Louis, saying: "It is idle to talk about Missouri's going with the Free States, in case of a dissolution. She will go where her feelings and interest prompt; and these are all with the South." "Be assured," said the

St. Louis *Bulletin*, "that, in the event of Mr. LINCOLN's success, the Union cannot last." The New York *Courrier des Etas Unis* affirmed that "preparatory overtures have been made to the French Government, to know whether, the case occurring, it would consent to take under its ægis the commercial neutrality of any point on the Southern coast of the United States. Though no encouragement was given, yet the persons charged with the negotiation appear to have gained the impression that if a Government regularly organized at the South, after having given evidence of an independent existence, should proclaim one of its ports free, it would have the chance of obtaining the guaranty of the French flag for the neutrality of the point thus delivered to the commerce of the world. Hence the idea of inaugurating the disunionists' movement by the erection of Charleston as a free port."

Many pages might be filled with matter of this sort, and yet an ample residue be left. How signally it all failed to frighten the majority of the Northern people from supporting LINCOLN, the issue of the contest very plainly told. It was believed to be intended merely for political effect, or, at the worst, as seriously meant by only a few blustering "fire-eaters," whom the soberer people of their own region would restrain from doing mischief, if they should be mad enough to attempt the execution of their threat.

The New York *Tribune*, of July 11th, pronounced "the threat of a dissolution of the Union, in the event of the election of a Republican to the Presidency, as audacious a humbug as Mormonism, as preposterous a delusion as Millerism. Southern braggarts threatened it—Northern demagogues echoed it—a few simpletons feared it." The same journal quoted the Frankfort (Ky.) *Commonwealth*, an "old Clay-Whig organ," as saying of the threateners of secession: "We are tired of their gasconade, their terrific threats, and of their bloody prophecies. They were never calculated for any higher destiny than that of frightening old women and young children." On the 28th of July, the *Tribune* said that "this threat of dissolution would be ridiculous enough, if all the great Slave States should be harmoniously united in crime. But the South could no more unite upon a scheme of secession, than a company of lunatics could conspire to break out of Bedlam." Again, on the 13th of October: "It is now clear that the ridiculous gasconade of disunion exerts, and can exert, no influence over the Free States, except to confirm them in their fixed resolve not to be bullied out of their convictions by

menaces which strike at the root of Constitutional Government, and make a mockery of elections. If the chivalry persist in menaces of rebellion, in case the election shall go against them, they will speedily be divorced from all sympathy in the North, and utterly overwhelmed by the undemonstrative but resolute conservatism of the South. The Union will in no case be shattered. It will not even be seriously shaken." And on the 2d of November: "There will be no call for Mr. LINCOLN to put down rebellion and nullification in the Southwest; the people of the cotton States will do that whenever the opportunity is offered them. They are not going to have their mails stopped and their coast blockaded to gratify the mad ambition of a few self-seeking counterfeiterers of pro-slavery fanaticism." And again, November 3d: "We call upon all * * * whose minds have been muddled by the dreadful forebodings of the *Herald*, to notice, that the South is anything but a unit for disunion; the disunionists themselves have not agreed upon any contingency upon which the standard of war must be raised; and the howls are much heavier at the North than at the South." Yet further, on the same day: "After all the talk about secession and disunion, not a single State can be named which shows any disposition to lead off in that line. Secession, even in South Carolina, however a certain number of fanatics may have believed in it, has always been regarded, even by those who have threatened it most loudly, as nothing more than a scarecrow, not a thing to be put into actual execution."

A letter to the *Tribune*, from Memphis, Tenn., on the 7th of July, declared that "none but the veriest fire-eaters contemplate disunion; they are but an insignificant clique, utterly powerless against the people." And the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent wrote, October 21st: "I am satisfied, from information latterly received, that there is scarcely any disunion feeling in Virginia or North Carolina." Mr. DEFREES, of Indiana, in a speech before the Republican Association in Washington, August 2d, predicted that "so just will be the new Administration to all portions of the country, that all opposed to Democratic policy, everywhere, will be its supporters. It will be a revival of the era of good feeling which characterized the Administrations of the early Presidents, and the croakings of the disunionists will be heard no more in the land forever!" CARL SCHURZ, in his speech at St. Louis, on the 1st of August, arguing at length against the probability of a dissolution of

the Union, reached the conclusion that "the Southern States cannot desire it, for it would defeat the very objects for which it might be undertaken; they cannot attempt it, for slavery would lay them helpless at the feet of the North. Slavery, which makes it uncomfortable to stay in the Union, makes it impossible for them to go out of it. * * * Will there be a disturbance? The people of the South themselves will have to put it down. Will they submit? Not to Northern dictation, but to their own good sense." A few days before the election, a Washington correspondent wrote to the *New York Independent*: "The disunion cry is, I think, nearly ended. There is a fresh shriek, however, just now, for effect in the State of New York at the November election." He then related a conversation which he had lately heard, with "a fair specimen of the most rampant of the secessionists," who, after some furious talk about preventing by force of arms the inauguration of Mr. LINCOLN, "finally admitted," upon being boldly answered, "that even in his opinion—his sober second thought—there would be no practical treason in Washington or at the South." In full accordance with the tone of these quotations was that of the Republican press and speakers everywhere throughout the country.

The result of the election, giving Mr. LINCOLN a large electoral majority, consisting of the entire electoral ticket in every Free State but New Jersey, and four of the seven electors there, though but the carrying of an outpost, was yet, so far, a victory for Freedom. While the collective anti-slavery of the successful party was but moderate, and its action limited expressly to the keeping of the Territories free, the energy and zeal and persevering effort which achieved this triumph were mainly due, no doubt, to a more earnest anti-slavery spirit animating many of its members, and a belief on their part that this first success, by shutting slavery within impassable bounds, and depriving it of its long usurped political supremacy, would doom it to a sure, if not a speedy death. Besides, whatever the intrinsic value of the special point contested, the contest was against the Slave Power; and carrying that point was a defeat to Slavery, even if, in itself, it was no great gain to Freedom. It was a test of strength, and Slavery was for once borne to the wall. At all events, the slaveholders so understood it. Whatever others think or say of the deficiency or the sufficiency, anti-slavery-wise, of the Republican Platform, or the significance, slavery-ward, of the Republican triumph, the slaveholders have already, with an emphasis, interpreted the one to mean a virtual indictment of their system as

a capital offender, and the other, in effect, the signing of its death-warrant. For, with a truer logic than the platform-framers used, they say, if slavery is unfit to go into the Territories, it ought to be abolished in the States,—having no right to spread, it would have no right to live,—and casting on it such an imputation is to assail its life. And, further, they affirm that if a powerful party enters on a career of victory with the premises of the Republicans, it will in no long time be drawn, by virtue of the very laws of mind, to the legitimate conclusion of those premises; and even if honest now in its denial of such a purpose, must soon become an Abolition party. “If slavery in the Southern States be the evil they affirm it to be,” said the South Carolina Secession Convention, “the requisitions of an inexorable logic must lead them to emancipation.” Since such a party, therefore, has come into power, they see no safety for their institution but in prompt withdrawal from the Union they have ceased to govern. Their course confesses their despair, alike of winning back their lost political ascendancy, and of preserving slavery without it. “In spite of all disclaimers and professions,” said the Convention just referred to, “there can be but one end to the submission by the South to the rule of a sectional Anti-Slavery Government at Washington; and that end, directly or indirectly, must be the emancipation of the slaves of the South.” Quoting from WENDELL PHILLIPS, that, “for the first time in the history of the Republic, the slave has elected the President of the United States,” Mr. PORTER, Representative of Charleston in the Legislature of South Carolina, said to his constituents: “It is true; but alongside of that fact, in the history of the Republic, will be written another, that one, at least, of these slaveholding States refused, with utter scorn, unto the very disruption of the Confederacy, to submit to the inauguration of a President elected by a slave.” Moreover, in the light of subsequent events, the very moderation, not to say the meagreness, of the demands, and the amplitude of the concessions, of what was relatively the party of freedom, served one important purpose. They made plain, beyond the reach of doubt, almost of cavil, the boundless arrogance, insatiate greed, and overbearing temper of the slaveholding oligarchy, which nothing less than permanent and undisputed sway could satisfy; which, bent on ruling, and determined not to stay where it must submit to any other rule, however moderate, conservative, or Constitutional, would not allow the new Administration time to show itself all these; which, in a word, would rather wreck the Ship of State, than see the helm in other hands.

SLAVERY IN REBELLION.

Great was the excitement at the South, when it was certain that the Republicans had prevailed. Measures began immediately to be taken to execute the threats against the Union, though not by any means with unanimity at first, even in the cotton States; still less in those more northward. A large proportion of the press throughout the border States and North Carolina, and a less proportion further South, spoke more or less decidedly against hasty action, and counseled waiting to see what would be Mr. LINCOLN'S course as President. "He will probably," said the Norfolk (Va.) *Herald*, of November 9th, "administer the Government with strict impartiality: or, if anything, be more regardful of the interest of the South than Southern Presidents usually have been"; and though "the idea which he represents—deep-seated enmity to Southern institutions—justly awakens solicitude, yet it is proper to wait and give his Administration a fair trial." The Petersburg (Va.) *Intelligencer* was "for submitting to the Constitutional expression of the opinion of the majority." The Baltimore *Clipper*, of November 8th, said: "Mr. LINCOLN, although the candidate of an aggressive sectional party, will be unable to interfere with any Constitutional right of a Southern State, even if he so desired. The Senate and the House of Representatives will be both opposed to him and his party. * * * The masses of the people in all the Southern States, except South Carolina, will wait for the sober second thought, and not precipitate upon the country the worst disaster that can possibly befall us." The Raleigh (N. C.) *Register* declared that the "disunion threats" are "for a miserable abstraction"; that because of them, "negroes have already gone down thirty per cent.," and that "an attempt to execute them would reduce to poverty men now wealthy." The Nashville (Tenn.) *Banner* believed that "the friends of the Union are vastly in the majority all over the South—in the border Slave States there can be no question of this fact"; that "no evil exists or is threatened, even in the excited imaginations of these mad disunionists, for which the remedies secured by the Federal Union are not vastly to be preferred to any remedy of secession or revolution." The New Orleans *Bee* ridiculed the "talk about the ruin of the South" in the Union, and called disunion "the gaunt and hideous spectre, invoked as our guide to an imaginary Utopia of independence, opulence and

honor." The Savannah (Ga.) *Republican*, of November 8th, was "constrained to regard any popular movement at the present moment as ill-advised and unfortunate"; seeing that "in a crisis like this, it behooves us to act with circumspection, with deliberation, with calmness, with the greatest possible freedom from that excitement which stirs the blood and warps the judgment." The St. Louis (Mo.) *Republican*, on the same day, said that "Mr. LINCOLN has been elected President, according to the forms of the Constitution, and on his induction into office, should be recognized as President by all good citizens. There is no justification, in anything which has taken place, for threats of secession from the Union. Let there be peace between the North and South, until LINCOLN is guilty of some act of oppression justifying revolution." And these but represent the sentiment of a large class of Southern journals, and a large proportion, if not really a majority, of the Southern people.

But such counsels suited not the temper or the aims of the ruling spirits of the South. It was of no avail to tell them that LINCOLN would administer the Government Constitutionally, and with scrupulous regard for "Southern rights"; for that was probably just what they feared. As FOSTER MARSHALL, a State Senator in South Carolina, had already said, foretelling what would be the policy of the Republicans, if they should win the election: "They will first lull us into false security by an outward show of protection to our property and an adherence to the Constitution. Our fears being quieted, they will then commence instilling their insidious poison by distributing the \$80,000,000 of treasury liberally to our people, in the way of offices at home and abroad. * * * In a short time, men among us will begin to say it is not such a bad Government after all. After a few more years, parties will be formed in every district and county of the slaveholding States, sustaining this dominant party. These small parties will increase, under the auspices and patronage of the Black Republicans, until district after district, county after county, falls into their power. * * * They will not commit the *overt act* that some Union men are waiting for. Not they! But they will bring to bear the whole power of the Government upon the South, in such a way that abolition will be far preferable to the attempt to hold the negro in slavery." They had *made* their occasion, by breaking up the Democratic party in order to ensure a Republican victory; and now they meant to use it, and without delay. "It is a time for action, not for words," said the Charleston *Courier*,

of November 8th. "The action has commenced, and some of its significant beginnings are recorded in another place. If the index of the dial-plate of Providence points to South Carolina as the leader selected by the natural course and issue of events, she cannot and will not shirk that position." A dispatch from Richmond, Va., to the New York press, dated November 10th, stated that "efforts are making to induce South Carolina and Georgia to submit to the action of a conference of the Southern States; but they refused, their policy being to accomplish their purpose before LINCOLN gets into office." On the same day, the Legislature of South Carolina,—which had assembled on the 5th to choose electors, and, at the Governor's suggestion, had remained in session to prepare the State for any emergency,—unanimously passed a bill calling a State Convention, to meet on the 17th of December; and the Senate's Military Committee reported a bill for immediately enrolling and equipping 10,000 volunteers. On that day and the next, the Senators of that State, in Congress, resigned their seats. Judge MAGRATH, of the U. S. District Court, resigned two days before, and other Federal office-holders in Charleston soon after either did the same, or declared their intention to do so, as soon as the State should have seceded. The Convention met at the time appointed, and on the 20th of December unanimously "declared and ordained" that the Ordinance of May 23d, 1788, which ratified the Constitution of the United States, and all the legislation of the State, "ratifying amendments of the said Constitution, are hereby repealed, and that the Union now subsisting between South Carolina and other States, under the name of the United States of America, is hereby dissolved." The next day, three Commissioners were chosen, to go to Washington and negotiate for a division of the public property and debts, and "the delivery of the forts, magazines and light-houses, and also for all other real estate and appurtenances thereto within the geographical limits of South Carolina," to the State.

On the 24th, a Declaration of Independence was adopted, setting forth "the causes which have led to" the act of secession. It cited the Declaration of 1776 in proof of "the right of a State to govern itself, and the right of a people to abolish a government, when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted;" and it affirmed, as a fact established by that instrument, and the treaty in which Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the colonies, "that *each* colony became and was recognized by the mother country

as a free, sovereign, and independent State." It further affirmed, that when the Constitution of the United States was framed, "the parties to whom it was submitted were the several sovereign States;" that the Constitution recognized by implication, if not expressly, "their continued existence as sovereign States;" that "thus a government was established by compact between the States, subject to the two great principles asserted in the Declaration of Independence," and—by the mode of its formation—to a third, the law of compact; "that in every compact, the failure of one contracting party to perform a material part of the agreement releases the other, and where no arbiter is provided, each party is to determine the fact of failure, with all its consequences;" and that "in the present case, that fact is established with certainty," inasmuch as "fifteen of the States have deliberately refused for years past to fulfil their Constitutional obligations," in a particular "so material to the compact, that without it, that compact would not have been made." This refusal is proved by their own statutes. Every non-slaveholding State except California and Oregon has "enacted laws which either nullify the Acts of Congress, or render useless any attempt to execute them. In the State of New York, even the right of transit for a slave has been denied by her tribunals, and the States of Ohio and Iowa have refused to surrender to justice fugitives charged with murder and with inciting servile insurrection in the State of Virginia." Other alleged grievances are that "the non-slaveholding States have assumed the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions; have denied the rights of property recognized by the Constitution; have denounced slavery as sinful; permitted the establishment of societies whose avowed object is to disturb the peace and endanger the property of citizens of other States; have encouraged and assisted thousands of slaves to leave their homes; and by emissaries, books and pictures, incited to insurrection those who remain;" that "this agitation has steadily increased, until now it has secured the aid of the common Government," and, "observing the forms of the Constitution, a sectional party has found means to subvert the Constitution; all the States north of a geographical line have united in electing to the Presidency a man whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery;" some of the States have "elevated to citizenship persons who, by the supreme law of the land, are incapable of becoming citizens; next March, this sectional party will take possession of the government, and has announced that the South shall be excluded

from the common territory; that the judicial tribunals shall be made sectional, and that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States."

Such are South Carolina's reasons for withdrawing from the Union, and those of the other seceding States are of course substantially the same. It will be seen that they amount to a declaration that union can exist between Slave States and Free only on these conditions:—Disfranchisement within the latter of all who think that slavery is such an evil, moral, political, economical or social, or all together, as ought nowhere to be favored, but everywhere discountenanced, and utterly forbidden where the General Government has jurisdiction,—for else such men may choose a President and Congressmen after their own heart, and "exclude [the curse of] the South from the common territory"; suppression of free speech and a free press,—for else the question of the rightfulness and propriety of Southern institutions may be agitated, and slavery be "denounced as sinful"; denial of the rights of conscience,—for else they who believe that slavery *is* sinful, and that moral warfare against sin wherever they can reach it is their duty, may "wage war against slavery until it shall cease"; abolition of the freedom to associate for moral and benevolent purposes,—for else societies may be established "whose avowed object it is" to make so plainly and so generally understood the atrocious character and pernicious influence of the "peculiar system" as "to disturb the peace" of its iniquitous upholders, and "endanger the property" which they dare to claim in the common Father's children; renunciation of the right of reading and interpreting the Constitution, and unqualified acceptance of the construction put upon it by the Taney and Magraths,—for else may doubts arise whether it recognizes "the right of property" in man; and, finally, a full surrender of the "State right" to enact and expound their own laws, decide what peculiar usages of other States or countries shall be admitted within their limits, and determine the political condition of their own inhabitants,—for else may be denied the "right" of a slaveholder to carry with him the local law of his own State whenever he is "in transit," with his human chattels, across other States; else, too, a sort of persons may be "elevated to citizenship," whom "democratic" despots do not like to acknowledge as political equals, although the fathers of the Republic so regarded them in almost every State of the Union.

The Convention also adopted an address to the people of the slave-

holding States, disclaiming "any design or desire to lead" their "councils"; telling them that "circumstances beyond our control have placed us in the van of the great controversy between the Northern and Southern States"; and that "South Carolina desires no destiny separated from yours"; that "we ask you to join us in forming a confederacy of slaveholding States, with a territory larger than that of any Power in Europe, four times the population of the whole United States when they achieved their independence, and productions which make our existence more important to the world than that of any other people"; that "united together, we must be the most independent, as we are the most important, among the nations of the world, requiring no other instrument to conquer peace than our beneficent productions"; and, in conclusion, that "we must be a great, free and prosperous people, whose renown must spread throughout the civilized world, and pass down, we trust, to the remotest ages." The other—less important—"nations of the world" will doubtless properly appreciate the modesty of this self-estimation of a people that expects to win such greatness and renown by means so fit and eminently hopeful as the use of stolen labor, and the perpetual monopoly of a production to which the soil and climate of many other broad and fertile regions—some even more so than its own domain—are quite as well adapted as the best of that. But then we know that merit *is* proverbially modest; so, what else could have been expected?

With the address of the Convention, Commissioners were sent to the other slaveholding States, to urge the formation of a Southern Confederacy. Also an oath of allegiance to South Carolina, and of abjuration of all other allegiance, was adopted, to be administered to citizens of other States wishing to become citizens of South Carolina. The Representatives of the State in Congress, immediately, on being officially informed that the Secession Ordinance was passed, addressed a note to the Speaker, saying that "the people of the State of South Carolina, in their sovereign capacity, have resumed the powers heretofore delegated by them to the Federal Government of the United States, and have thereby dissolved our connection with the House of Representatives." On the 27th of December, the Palmetto flag was raised over the Charleston Custom-House and Post-Office, and the State military occupied Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie, whence the United States garrison of seventy or eighty men, under Major ANDERSON, had retired, the day before, to

Fort Sumter. About the same time, the rebels seized the arsenal in Charleston, and the Revenue Cutter in the harbor. On the 28th, and the next two or three days, the Convention passed ordinances to transfer to the Governor the powers belonging to the President of the United States, in relation to negotiating treaties and maintaining intercourse between South Carolina and foreign nations; to "vest in the General Assembly, except during the existence of this Convention, all powers which the State has heretofore delegated to Congress"; to confer upon "such courts as the General Assembly shall direct, the judicial power heretofore delegated to form a part of the judicial power of the United States"; and to define and punish treason against the State. On the 5th of January, the Convention adjourned, subject to a call by the Governor. And now Rebellion was fully inaugurated, and—except Fort Sumter—was master of everything within the bounds of South Carolina.

In several of the other slaveholding States, the Governors, on hearing the result of the Presidential election, convened their respective Legislatures in special session, and sent them messages, ardent, if not luminous, advising prompt and energetic action to preserve the fearfully imperiled rights and lives and liberties of the Southern people; and the Legislatures, not behind the Governors in zeal, made all convenient haste to call Conventions to consider and adopt the measures needful to that important end. In Florida, the Convention met on January 3d, and passed an Ordinance of Secession on the 10th, by 62 to 7; but we have not yet heard of any vote to repay the forty or fifty millions paid by the United States, to buy from Spain, and clear of Seminoles, the territory now so summarily taken out of the Union. That, probably, is left to be attended to by the "great, free and prosperous" slaveholding Confederacy, to which the precious purchase has been since transferred. On the 7th, Conventions met in Mississippi and Alabama, and the former State was voted out of the Union on the 9th, by 84 to 15; the latter, on the 11th, by 61 to 39. On the 18th of November, the Legislature of Georgia had passed a bill declaring that "the present crisis in our national affairs demands resistance, and it is the privilege of the sovereign people to determine upon the mode, measure and time of such resistance"; and ordering the call of a Convention to "consider all grievances impairing or affecting the equality and rights of the State of Georgia as a member of the United States, and determine the measure and mode and time of redress." The

Convention met on the 16th of January, and on the 19th, by 208 to 89, ordained "that the union between Georgia and the other States is hereby dissolved, and that the State of Georgia is in full possession and exercise of all those rights of sovereignty which belong to a free and independent State." A motion to postpone the operation of the Ordinance until the 3d of March, in order, doubtless, not to wound the tender heart of President BUCHANAN by needless haste to get from under his paternal rule, was defeated by about thirty majority: so Georgia decided to secede at once.

Although a little slower than her sister Carolina in declaring for secession, we judge, from the language of her Governor, in his special message on Federal relations, sent to the Legislature early in November, that she was no less sanguine in her estimate of the magnificent results that measure would achieve for Slavedom. "Should the fifteen States secede," said Governor BROWN, "there would be no war. So many of the Northern people are dependent upon Southern cotton and Southern trade for employment, and upon the South for the necessaries and luxuries of life, that they could not afford to fight her themselves, or permit others to do it." Besides, Great Britain "could not afford to witness an invasion of the Southern States. The loss of one cotton crop would shake the pillars of the English throne." Nor was this all. The Governor, like a prudent archer, had two strings to his bow. Trusting not alone to the dependence of the North upon the cotton crop, he even condescended so far as to court the aid of those who, in the polished phrase of chivalry, are styled "the mudsills"; but whom, to suit his language better to his purpose, he called "those honest, sturdy laborers," who "belong to no inferior race"; who "have inalienable political rights"; who "have the right to bear arms, and thousands of" whom "know how to use them." "Should a separation take place," said the sagacious Governor, "and the North take up arms against the South, and attempt to incite our slaves to insurrection, these Northern white laborers * * * should not only be informed of their rights, but they should be encouraged to rise in their might and divide among them the surplus of such Northern capitalists as have received their labor for many years without just compensation." Southern slaveholders informing Northern laborers of their rights! Who would have looked for such a comedy in the middle of a Governor's message? And there is yet more of it. After these laborers have, under such well-qualified instructors, become sufficiently

acquainted with their rights, and, thereupon, "declared their independence of those who assume to be their masters, and who will not associate with them, nor permit their families to associate with them as equals, they should be invited to join our standard, and to associate with us upon equal terms." Most facetious of Governors! When the oligarchs of the slave land begin to "associate upon equal terms" with Northern laborers, may we be there to see! But to proceed. "They should be liberally rewarded for their services, [besides "dividing among them" all that "surplus"!] should no longer be required to perform the menial service of the negro, and should be taught that the true aristocracy in the South is an aristocracy not of wealth, but of *color* and of—conduct"! Evidently, Governor BROWN is not quite perfect yet, in the true social philosophy. He needs a lesson or two from the Richmond *Examiner*, to teach him that "the defence of slavery labored under great difficulties," while "its apologists confined the defence of slavery to mere negro slavery, thereby giving up the slavery principle, admitting other forms of slavery to be wrong"; that "the line of defence is now changed," and "the South now maintains that slavery is right, natural and necessary, and does not depend upon difference of complexion"; that "the laws of the Slave States justify the holding of white men in bondage"; in short, that the Southern aristocracy is not "an aristocracy of color," but rather is of that ancient and honorable order, whose fundamental organic law is, in the poet's words,—

"The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they may take who have the power,
And they may keep who can."

How far that makes it "an aristocracy of conduct," we will not assume the prerogative of deciding. The Governor seemed really bent, however, upon getting up his tragi-comic spectacle, regardless of expense, as the play-bills say. For thus he went on: "We should not hesitate to spend whatever sums of money may be necessary to give proper information upon this subject to the down-trodden and oppressed laborers of the North, and to encourage them, in case of difficulty with the Northern States, to take into their own hands that justice which has been so long denied them by their haughty oppressors." Secession would also make it easier than now to recover fugitive slaves. As "we should then have the power to

regulate our own revenue laws and tariffs," and to "discriminate against" such States as harbor fugitives, the Northern States, to obtain "a favorable commercial treaty with us," would stipulate "to bring back our fugitive slaves, and deliver them to us at the line"; and "for a like reason, the English Government" would do the same with those escaping into Canada. After some talk about the formidable "ultimate design of the Black Republicans," intended for effect among the white laborers of the South as well as of the North, the Governor thus grandiloquently concluded: "If the madness and folly of the people of the Northern States shall drive us to a separation from them, we have within ourselves all the elements of wealth, power, and national greatness, to an extent possessed probably by no other people on the face of the earth. With a vast and fertile territory, possessed of every natural advantage, bestowed by a kind Providence upon the most favored land, with almost a complete monopoly of the cotton culture of the world, if we were true to ourselves, our power would be invincible and our prosperity unbounded."

The Louisiana Convention met on the 23d of January. On the 24th, an Ordinance was reported by a Committee, declaring that "Louisiana hereby resumes the rights and powers heretofore delegated to the Government of the United States, and its citizens are absolved from allegiance to said Government." On the 25th, a motion to wait for coöperation with other States was defeated by a large majority; and on the 26th, the Ordinance was adopted by 113 to 17, and an addition was made to it, unanimously recognizing "the right of free navigation of the Mississippi river and tributaries by all friendly States bordering thereon, and the rights of the ingress and egress of the mouths of the Mississippi by all friendly States and powers." On the question of submitting the Ordinance to the people, the vote was 45 yeas, 84 nays. But the secessionists claimed that a popular majority had already declared for their movement, in choosing delegates to the Convention: the vote, according to their statement, having been, for the secession candidates, 20,448; against them, 17,296. It was asserted, on the other side, however, that this majority was in considerable part made up by counting in it the vote for men who had been chosen as Unionists or "coöperationists," and had afterward gone over to secession. It was, moreover, a suspicious fact, that, for months after the election, the Convention positively refused to let the returns be published; and they were not permitted to appear till after it had not only declared Louisiana out

of the Union, but had adopted—refusing to submit it to the people—the Constitution of the Southern Confederacy. And by the secessionists' own showing, the vote in their favor was but about two-fifths as large as the whole vote cast two months before, at the Presidential election; so that the Convention was chosen, and its acts—so far as appears from any vote—were sanctioned, by a minority of the people. When the question of uniting with the Southern Confederacy was before the Convention, on the 21st of March, one member of the minority tested the sincerity of the secessionist majority by moving that, in adopting the Confederate Constitution, “the sovereign State of Louisiana does expressly reserve to herself the right peaceably to withdraw from the Union created by that Constitution whenever, in the judgment of her citizens, her paramount interest may require it.” The Convention shrunk from the test; laying the motion on the table, by 92 to 11. The Constitution was adopted by 101 to 7.

In Texas, the Legislature ordered a Convention “over the Governor’s head”; but it is said the popular vote for delegates was very meagre. The majority for the secession candidates, however, was “overwhelming.” The Convention assembled on the 28th of January, and on the 1st of February passed an Ordinance of Secession, by 166 to 7, submitting it to the people, to be ratified or rejected on the 23d of February, and, if approved, to go into effect on the 2d of March. Little more than half the legal vote of the State was cast upon the question, but of this, more than three-fourths were cast for the Ordinance: the vote, as reported by the secessionists, standing 41,600 for, and 12,172 against secession. So the Ordinance was ratified—as the Convention had been chosen—by a minority of the legal voters of the State, though by so large a majority of all who voted. And this majority, as well as that which chose the delegates to the Convention, eye-witnesses affirm, was largely due to fraud and to coercion. A writer from San Antonio to the *New York Times* stated that “handbills were posted everywhere, daring the Union men to show themselves; but they did so, carrying the day in spite of imported Mexican votes and all kinds of irregularities and frauds practised by the officers at the polls, all of whom were ‘K. G. C.s.’” The same writer said: “The members of the Convention were elected by a minority of the people, as is well known, the Union men abstaining from voting. It was an election which put to shame the celebrated elections in Kansas. In San

Antonio, for instance, caretaros from Chihuahua each voted three times." A Mr. DUNCAN, of Massachusetts, who was in Texas when the vote upon the Ordinance was taken, informed the *New York Tribune* that "he saw, at Harrisburg, two men from Boston who were led up to the polls, and forced to vote for secession. They had resided in Texas but three months; and the law requires a residence of a year. In Richmond, a Southern man narrowly escaped hanging, because he put in a vote for Union. At New Braunfels, a German village of Unionists, a committee from Austin told them if they attempted to vote for Union, they would be driven out of the State for Abolitionists, and very few of them voted for Union." And such, we have reason to believe, was the freedom of election throughout the State. On the 4th of March, the Convention, having received the result of the election, declared Texas out of the Union; and, shortly after, deposed Governor HOUSTON from his office, because he would not take the oath of allegiance to the State.

The Governor of Virginia convoked the Legislature a week before its usual time of assembling; but, in his message, condemned the hasty action of South Carolina, and affirmed "the imperative duty to adopt all Constitutional measures before resorting to the ultimate remedy of secession." He would, however, "regard the attempt of the Federal troops to pass across Virginia, for the purpose of coercing a Southern State, as an act of invasion, which must be repelled"; and his list of grievances to be redressed and guaranties to be given, in order to keep Virginia in the Union, was somewhat formidable. The Legislature called a State Convention, leaving the people to decide, while choosing its members, whether its work, when done, should be referred to them for approval or rejection. A large majority voted for such referenee. The Convention met on the 13th of February, a majority of its members claiming to be "Unionists, but not submissionists"; that is, they were graciously willing to continue ruling the Union, as long as the North would be wise enough to let them. For more than two months, the Convention hesitated, or seemed to hesitate, between a semblance of loyalty and undisguised rebellion; keeping alive in many "conservative" minds a trembling hope that it would leave Virginia in the Union, and be content with merely requiring the Republicans to expiate the offence of being victors in the late election, by yielding more to slavery than slavery had ever asked before, and turning their victory into a worse disaster than defeat would have been. And possibly this hope would have

been realized, had the Republicans but shown themselves disposed — as some of their leaders certainly appeared to be — to take the proffered grace upon the terms proposed.

The terms were set forth in a Report of the Convention's Committee on Federal Relations, proposing that the Federal Constitution should be so amended as to protect slavery against Congressional and Territorial legislation and the operation of "any preëxisting law of Mexico," in all the present territory of the United States, south of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min., but to leave it "subject to judicial cognizance in the Federal Courts," and to forbid it north of that line; to guarantee admission into the Union to any State on either side of that line, with or without slavery, as its Constitution may provide; to prohibit future acquisitions of territory, except with the concurrence of a majority of the Senators of each class of States, slaveholding and non-slaveholding; to deny expressly the power of Congress to legislate concerning slavery in any State or Territory where it exists by law, or to abolish it in the District of Columbia without the consent of Maryland and Virginia, and either the consent of the slaveholders of the District or compensation to the unconsenting, or to abolish it in places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, within slaveholding States or Territories, or to forbid the transportation of slaves, by land or water, from one Slave State or Territory to another, with the right of touching at ports, shores and landings in any State or Territory, and landing, in case of need, or to authorize a higher rate of taxation on slaves than on land; — to prohibit the slave trade in the District of Columbia; to recognize the right of the States to enforce, by their legislation and the action of their judicial and ministerial officers, the return of runaway slaves to their masters; to forbid the importation of slaves and coolies from foreign places; to require Congress to provide by law that the United States shall pay for fugitive slaves protected from arrest or rescued by riotous assemblages; to forbid voting and holding office, Federal or Territorial, by persons of African descent; and to provide that none of these amendments, nor the original fugitive slave section of the Constitution, nor that relating to the three-fifths representation, shall ever be amended or abolished, without consent of all the States.

On the 27th of March, a proposition to substitute, for this Report, the Constitution of the Confederate States, was unanimously rejected. On the 4th of April, a resolution that the Convention

should adopt an Ordinance of Secession, and submit it to the people at the May election, was voted down by 89 to 45. On the 6th, a resolution declaring that the separate independence of the seceded States ought to be acknowledged without further delay, was rejected by 71 to 68. But on the 17th, in secret session, the Secession Ordinance was passed, by 60 to 53, and submitted to be voted on by the people on the 23d of May; and, without waiting for the popular decision, the Governor recognized the Southern Confederacy, by proclamation, and thenceforward, in his official acts, proceeded as if the State had already become—as practically it had—a member of that rebellious league.

In Arkansas, on the 16th of January, the Legislature unanimously submitted to the people the question of calling a Convention, and the people, by a large majority, voted for the calling of one. It met on the 4th of March, and chose Union officers by six majority; on the 18th, rejected a Secession Ordinance, by 39 to 35; but, on the 20th, consented—as a compromise—to let the people vote, on the first Monday in August, whether they would secede or not. The Little Rock *True Democrat*, announcing this decision, said: “As certain as the first Monday in August rolls around, the people will vote Arkansas out of the Union and into the Southern Confederacy by an overwhelming majority.” About the middle of January, the Legislature of Tennessee passed a bill for a Convention, to be chosen February 9th, but to meet or not as the people should, on the same day, decide. Most of the delegates elected were “Unionists,” and the popular majority for “no Convention” was not far from 50,000. But the value of this “victory for the Union” may be judged from the statement of a correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, that “both parties demanded nearly similar concessions from the North.” Still the secessionists bewailed it as a sad event. The Huntsville (Ala.) *Independent* announced, “with deep sorrow,” what Tennessee had done, and added,—showing how much seceding oligarchy cares about the people’s will,—“Her Legislature must now see the folly of submitting the question of Convention or no Convention to the popular vote.” The Governor of North Carolina, in his Message to the Legislature, recommended consultation with the other Southern States, and the calling of a State Convention, “to assemble immediately after that consultation shall have terminated.” In giving his urgent reasons for these measures, he unconsciously disclosed what sort of freedom is permitted in his region. Aiming to show the

“sectional” character of the President and Vice-President elect, he said that “neither of them could have uttered, in many of the Southern States, the political sentiments upon which they are elevated to power, without subjecting himself to the penalties of the local criminal laws.” The Legislature, on the 30th of January, passed a Convention bill like that of Tennessee; and on the 28th of February, the people chose the delegates,—about two-thirds of whom were Unionists, elected by an aggregate majority of about 14,000,—and voted, by about 700 majority, for “no Convention.”

The New York *Tribune*, of March 15th, cites the opinion of the Staunton (Va.) *Spectator*, “in which,” it adds, “many of our Southern exchanges concur, that if the people of the seceding States had been allowed fairly to vote upon the question of ratifying or rejecting the Ordinances of Secession, they would have been rejected in every State except South Carolina.” Corroborative testimony is before us, from newspapers and newspaper correspondents in nearly every one of the slaveholding States. While, very likely, this opinion is correct, and consequently the seceders are usurpers in their own States, as well as rebels against the General Government, it is evidently no less true, that this usurping minority includes the motive-men,—the ardent, active, energetic and decided,—in a much larger proportion than the opposing party, and so is the majority in effective force. Just this, too, was to have been expected;—that, as a general rule, the quietists, the indolent, the timid, the slow in thought and action, disliking the trouble and the peril of a change so radical, would oppose their *vis inertiae* to the rising flood of revolution, and be counted among the Unionists; more because Union is, than from any earnest conviction that it ought to be. It is easy enough to see that such men will be overborne by even inferior numbers of the other sort, since the very qualities which make them Unionists make them comparatively feeble ones. The same traits, also, tend to make them acquiescent in the new order, when set up, and opposed to changing back. The drift-wood which checks the current for a time, when lifted and borne on it, adds to its momentum.

The secessionists have made, and are still making, desperate efforts to drag the other Slave States out of the Union, excepting, perhaps, Delaware, of whose secession they have probably no hope. Thus far, these efforts have been unsuccessful, as to their main design, though plentifully fruitful of mischief in many ways. But of the various moves and counter-moves, and all the shifts and turns of the

exciting struggle in Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri, we have no room to speak. Missouri only, of these States, has held a Convention under a legislative call. It met on February 28th. Among its rules, it adopted one requiring of its members an oath to support the Constitutions of the State and the United States; and, by a large majority, refused to pass an Ordinance of Secession; but recommended "the withdrawal of the Federal troops from forts within the seceding States where there is danger of a hostile collision," and the adoption of the amendments to the Federal Constitution proposed by Mr. CRITTENDEN in Congress. It gave a hearing to a Georgian Commissioner, who strongly urged Missouri to follow Georgia's example. The Georgian also tried his eloquence and logic, in the same behalf, upon the people of Jefferson City,—a few of whom had called him out for a speech,—and, among other equally cogent reasons why Missouri should secede, assured them, with a fine felicity of scriptural illustration, that "the South and the North were now as widely separated as Abraham from Lazarus!" The secessionists in Maryland were urgent for a special session of the Legislature, believing they had a majority in that body; but the Governor—a Unionist, though "ready to go as far as any man for the rights of the South in the Union"—has, till within a few days, refused to call one. But for this refusal, it is thought highly probable, at least, that before now, a formal act of secession would have been passed; although the popular majority seems not to favor it, as the greater portion of the people, there is reason to believe, are Unionists of much the same sort as their Governor.

In Kentucky, while the Governor but thinly, if at all, disguises his strong sympathy with secession, a large majority of the Legislature and the people stand fast for the Union; that is, for a Union wherein slavery shall have abundant guaranties and undiminished strength. Of what kind is their Unionism, was shown in the almost unanimous adoption of resolutions by the Legislature, on the 26th of January, requiring the Federal Government "to protect slavery in all the Territories now held or hereafter to be acquired south of 36 deg. 30 min., and to guarantee the right of transit of slaves through Free States"; and in the State's claim to be considered neutral in the contest between the Government to which it still professes to be loyal, on the one hand, and, on the other, open and defiant rebellion against that Government.

The Governor of Delaware, in his Message to the Legislature,

spoke of it as a cause of "pride and gratitude, that Delaware has ever remained firmly determined for the Union"; and ascribed all the present trouble to "the persistent war of the Abolitionists upon more than two billions of property," whereby it has been brought to pass that "it has become the opinion of a large portion of one section of the country, that slavery is a crime and a sin." On the 3d of January, the Legislature gave a patient hearing to a Commissioner from Mississippi, urging secession, and then unanimously voted an "unqualified disapproval of the remedy for the existing difficulties suggested by the Legislature of Mississippi."

On the 4th of February, a Congress of delegates from the six States which had then seceded,—South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana,—assembled at Montgomery, Ala., to organize a Southern Confederacy. HOWELL COBB, of Georgia, was chosen President of the Congress, and, in a brief speech made on taking the chair, declared that the dissolution of the Union "is now a fixed, irrevocable fact. The separation is perfect, complete and perpetual. The great duty now imposed is to provide a government for our future security and protection." On the 8th, a Provisional Constitution was adopted, being the Constitution of the United States, with a few changes to fit it to its new use. The title it gives to the new league is "The Confederate States of America." For "we, the people of the United States," the preamble opens with "we, the deputies of sovereign and independent States." The section touching "the migration or importation" of a certain class of "persons," gives place to one which, in plain words, forbids "the importation of African negroes from any foreign country other than the slaveholding States of the United States," and requires Congress to "pass such laws as shall prevent the same." Congress is also empowered "to prohibit the introduction of slaves from any State not a member of this Confederacy";—a broad hint to Virginia and Maryland. Instead of the clause about fugitives from "service or labor," is a provision that "a slave in one State, escaping to another, shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom said slave may belong, by the Executive authority of the State in which such slave may be found; and in case of any abduction or forcible rescue," the State in which it takes place must pay the claimant for the slave, "and all costs and expenses." The next day, JEFFERSON DAVIS and ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS were elected Provisional President and Vice-President of the Confederacy.

About the middle of March, the Permanent Constitution was adopted, differing but little more than the Provisional one from that of the United States. Its preamble begins with "we, the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character." Instead of "a more perfect Union," it proposes "to form a permanent federal government." As the work it was to help do is of a kind sufficiently suggestive, to scripturally-instructed minds, of the convenience of a broad phylactery, it has a clause "invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God," with a pious fervor, scarce inferior to that of the plundering Scottish moss-trooper, who was wont

"To patter an Ave Mary,
When he rode on a border foray."

In the article on apportioning Representatives and direct taxes, for "all other persons," it speaks right out and says "slaves"; as it does whenever, in the old instrument, that word is shunned by a roundabout phrase. The section relating to the foreign slave trade is the same as in the Provisional Constitution; but that relating to fugitives omits the provision that States shall pay for runaway slaves rescued within their bounds, and differs from the parallel provision of the old Constitution only in putting the words "slave or" before "person held to service or labor"; the words "in any State or Territory of the Confederate States," instead of "in one State"; the words "or lawfully carried" between "escaping" and "into another"; and the words "to whom such slave belongs, or" before "to whom such service or labor may be due." To the guaranty, to "citizens of each State," of "all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States," is added, "and shall have the right of transit and sojourn in any State of this Confederacy, with their slaves and other property; and the right of property in said slaves shall not be thereby impaired." In the clause concerning fugitives from justice, after "charged in any State with treason, felony or other crime," is added, "against the laws of such State";—an addition evidently meant to meet the case of fugitives from the injustice of the local law of States which make humanity and justice crimes. A wholly new section provides that "the Confederate States may acquire new territory," for the inhabitants of which "Congress shall have power to legislate and provide government"; and "in all such territory, the institution of negro slavery, as it now exists in the

Confederate States, shall be recognized and protected by Congress, and by the territorial government; and the inhabitants of the several Confederate States and Territories shall have the right to take to such territory any slaves, lawfully held by them in any of the States or Territories of the Confederate States."

These, we believe, are all the changes, affecting slavery, made to adapt the old Constitution to the wants of the new Confederacy; unless, indeed, we may consider as of that character the provision that "other States may be admitted" only "by a vote of two-thirds of the whole House of Representatives, and two-thirds of the Senate, the Senate voting by States"; which may have been intended as a safeguard against the admission of States not duly sensible of the transcendent excellence of the peculiar institution. An express provision, that none but slaveholding States should be let in, would have barred the execution of a project said to be meditated by some of the most prominent and active secessionists, among them DAVIS and STEPHENS, unless rumor errs. That project is, to "reconstruct" the Union, on substantially the basis of the Montgomery Constitution, making "slavery national" beyond all question, and hardly leaving room for freedom to be even "sectional." Said Mr. HANDY, Mississippian Commissioner to Maryland, speaking in Baltimore, last December, "Secession is not intended to break up the present Union, but to perpetuate it. We go out for the purpose of getting further guaranties in security for our rights. * * * Our plan is for the Southern States to withdraw from the Union for the present, to allow amendments to the Constitution to be made, guaranteeing our just rights; and if the Northern States will not make these amendments, then we must secure them the best way we can." On the 24th of December, a correspondent of the *New York Tribune* wrote from Washington, that "day by day it grows more and more clear that the object of the revolutionists is to break up the Union, not for the purpose of separating the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States, but to form a new Union and Constitution, constructed for the nationalization and perpetuation of slavery." From Philadelphia, the correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard* wrote, on December 31st, "We hear from authentic sources that the secessionists will withdraw the Gulf States, and perhaps some others, from the Union; that their purpose then is to 'reconstruct' on a slave basis, and invite all other States to join them; and that they confidently expect that Pennsylvania and New York, and in fact all

the Northern States, except those of New England, will be glad to accept their invitation." The Washington correspondent of the same journal said, on the same day, "Their great object is to form a new Confederacy at once, and invite the border and middle Free States to join it. Northern men from those States assure Southern men that those Free States would gladly join such a Confederacy, and that the people would, by a majority-vote, any day, agree to it." On the 15th of March, GEORGE N. SAUNDERS, a Northern renegade and rank secessionist, wrote from Montgomery to the New York *Tribune*, "Messrs. DAVIS and STEPHENS both favor admitting Northern States, and count upon New York as seeking to become one of the Confederate States within a year." And again, alluding to the defeat of the Republicans in Rhode Island, by the election of Governor SPRAGUE, "Rhode Island has given the first gun for the Grand Republic. The New York Democrats and Union men will soon reject all programmes not embracing the entire continent. * * * There can be but one Government embracing the old Territories of the Union, and that Government cannot be that of the United States, as at present organized. Neither can the latter form the basis of adjustment." A dispatch from New Orleans, on the 26th of March, said, "The adoption of the Constitution of the Confederate States by the Northern States is looked upon as the only medium of a basis for a treaty of reconciliation." Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, speaking in the Senate, March 18th, said that if the Republicans reject such propositions as the Border States may offer, "then the disruption of the Union will be inevitable to the extent of fifteen States, and at no distant day, the new Confederacy will be the largest on this continent." The New Orleans *Picayune*, of a recent date, declared the future to be free from all doubt, and that there will be permanent separation on such terms as may be demanded by the seceded States, or "honorable reconstruction." And Mr. DAVIS, in speeches made while on his way to Montgomery to be inaugurated, although insisting that "our separation from the old Union is complete; no reconstruction now can be entertained,"—still showed an open door to virtual reconstruction, by saying that "if other States"—not specifying whether slave or free—"join our Confederacy, they may freely come, on our terms."

The politicians of the South Carolina school regard the project with no favor, but evidently see, or think they see, so strong an influence working for it, as to justify a serious apprehension that it

may succeed. The Charleston *Mercury*, perceiving that in the Montgomery Constitution "there is nothing to prevent the admission of Northern States into the new Confederation," at once saw "specks upon the Southern horizon that, ere long, may become dark and muttering clouds. We fear," it said, "reconstruction on the basis of the new Constitution." The North, too, has unquestionably a class of politicians base enough to favor such a scheme, and plot with Southern traitors to promote it; but not enough of them, we trust, to make the execution of it probable, even if aided by the ruling influence at the South. Still, we confess, our hope that the nation will be spared the calamity of such a reconstruction, or something little better, draws no small portion of its strength from the evidently desperate earnestness of the authors of this rebellion, and their arrogant determination to reject all terms but such as even the basest and boldest of their Northern sympathizers would hesitate to offer openly; or as, at all events, none but the basest would consent to, if any should be bold enough to offer them.

The new Constitution has been ratified by the Conventions of all the States participant in framing it, and by that of Texas, making seven in all; none of them permitting the people to pass judgment upon it at the polls. As it provided that when ratified by the Conventions of five States, it should be in force over those States, the "great slaveholding Confederacy" is now constructed and consummated—on paper—and is ready to address itself to its sublime task of practically demonstrating to an admiring world that chattel slavery is incomparably the best, if not the only sure and safe foundation for the fabric of political freedom. That the world, while it admires, may clearly understand the nature and the aim of this grand experiment, the foremost men of this model league of model commonwealths have condescended publicly to expound the principles whereon it sets out and is to proceed. "With the formation of the Confederate States," said T. S. GOURDIN, of Florida, "a new era in civilization has commenced; an era in which, if we hope to gain the respect of the civilized world, we must abandon the old idea of our forefathers, that 'all men are born free and equal,' and teach the doctrine of the diversity of the races, and of the supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon race over all others. We must take the ground never dreamed of by the men of '76, that African slavery is right in itself, and, therefore, should be preserved." L. W. SPRATT, of South Carolina, notorious for years past as a strenuous advocate of the revival

of the foreign slave trade, writing on April 6th to the Charleston *Mercury*, argued the excellence of the Southern "form of society," in that it "embodies the principle that equality is not the right of man," and "has taken to itself the rounded form of a social aristocracy"; and, in it, "labor is involuntary," and has not the elective franchise; so that "there is no pauper labor with the power of rising," and, as "the ship of state has the ballast of a disfranchised class, it is reasonably certain that, so steadied, it will sail erect and onward to an indefinitely distant period."

Provisional Vice-President STEPHENS, in a speech at Savannah, on the 21st of March, showing the "numerous changes for the better" which make the difference between the old Constitution and the new, dwelt with especial emphasis upon this;—that the new "has put at rest forever all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution—African slavery as it exists among us. This," he said, "was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution." The framers of the old Constitution held the "fundamentally wrong idea" of "the equality of the races"; regarding "the enslavement of the African" as "in violation of the laws of nature, wrong in principle, socially, morally and politically"; and so their government being "built upon a sandy foundation, when the storm came and the wind blew, it fell. Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea—upon the great truth, that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery is his natural and normal condition. This government is the first in the history of the world based upon this great physical and moral truth; the first government ever instituted upon principles of strict conformity to nature, and the ordination of Providence, in furnishing the materials of human society. Many governments have been founded upon the principle of certain classes; but the classes thus enslaved were of the same race, and in violation of the laws of nature. Our system commits no such violation of nature's laws. The negro, by nature, or by the curse against Canaan, is fitted for that condition which he occupies in our system. * * * This stone, which was rejected by the first builders, 'is become the chief stone of the corner' in our new edifice." Though this newly-discovered principle in social science "has been slow in the process of its development, like all other truths in the various departments of science," yet Mr. STEPHENS seemed to think it in a very hopeful way at last, not in the South alone, but everywhere. "May we not look with confidence," he asked, "to the ultimate universal acknowledgment of the truths upon which our system rests?"

Glorious prospect! And yet,—alas for the weakness of poor human nature, even in its, hitherto, best estate!—the builders of the “new edifice” had not sufficient faith and courage to keep it altogether plumb upon “the chief stone of the corner.” For, as we have seen in the Montgomery Constitution, they actually forbid, by their organic law, that holy traffic whereby the negro is transferred from the unnatural, abnormal state of freedom, or, at the best, of slavery to men of his own race and color, “in violation of the laws of nature,” to the “natural and normal condition” for which he is divinely fitted. No doubt, they meant the deviation to be only temporary; a neat device to *take in* the slave-selling border States, and at the same time circumvent the lingering prejudices of the still benighted old-world nations, and lure them into recognizing the new group of nations in the new world; which ends attained, the leaning wall will speedily be straightened to the perpendicular, we may trust. But is it not a perilous expedient—so blunt a practical denial of the “great truth” whereon their government is built, (the first upon that basis,) and but for which they would have had no right to build one? It looks so, we perceive, to some among the builders. Said Mr. GOURDIN, from whom we quoted on a former page, “if we believe slavery to be morally right, and find it to our interest to keep up the institution, let us be manly enough to maintain our principles in opposition to the rest of the world. But, for God’s sake, and the sake of consistency, do not let us form a Union for the express purpose of maintaining and propagating African slavery, and then, as the Southern Congress has done, confess our error by enacting a Constitutional provision abolishing the African slave trade.” And Mr. SPRATT maintained that if, as some say, “at the outset of our career, it were wise to exhibit deference to the moral sentiment of the world, the obligation is as perfect to respect the moral sentiment of the world against the institution. The world is just as instant to assert that slavery itself is wrong; and if we forego the slave trade in consideration of the moral feeling of the world, then why not slavery also? We cannot dodge the issue; we cannot safely change our front in the face of a vigilant adversary. Every intellectual or political evasion is a point against us. We may postpone the crisis by disguises, but the slave republic must forego its nature and its destiny, or it must meet the issue, and our assertion of ourselves will not be easier for admissions made against us. And is it not, in fact, from a sense of weakness that there is such admission?” In like

manner also reasoned others, with arguments not easy to refute, from the premises they hold in common with those whose policy they condemn. But we leave both parties to decide between themselves the comparative merits of expediency and consistency, in the prosecution of an enterprise whose vital principles lead inevitably to conclusions shocking to the moral sense of the whole civilized and Christian world. If it is piracy, as that world believes, to carry a single ship-load of Africans to some western slave-mart, what name will suit the attempt to found an empire on the horrible assumption, unblushingly avowed, that the whole race of Africa was created to be enslaved to white men, and of course—since else its destiny would be defeated—to be dragged from its own to the white man's country, in fulfilment of the "ordination of Providence"?

ATTEMPTS TO COMPROMISE.

Of course, the movements at the South, of which we have been speaking, could not but stir the North in its whole extent, and call out a diversity of opinions and suggestions from all sorts of people here, as to the requirements of an emergency so serious and so little looked for. A few declared themselves in favor of a peaceable separation, if a fairly ascertained majority of the people of the Southern States, or a considerable part of them, should, after due deliberation, persist in wishing it. The *New York Tribune*, of November 9th, referring to the telegraphic information just received, "that most of the Cotton States are meditating a withdrawal from the Union because of Lincoln's election," avowed "a chronic, invincible disbelief in Disunion as a remedy for either Northern or Southern grievances"; but added, "if the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. * * * Whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberately resolve to go out, we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep it in. But we must insist that the step be taken, if it ever shall be, with the deliberation and gravity befitting so momentous an issue. Let ample time be given for reflection; let the people have both sides of the question fully presented; let them reflect, deliberate, then vote; and let the act of secession be the echo of an unmistakable popular fiat." And again, a few days later: "We fully comprehend that secession is not a Constitu-

tional, but a revolutionary remedy; but whenever the Slave States, or the Cotton States only, shall unitedly, coolly say to the rest, 'We want to get out of the Union,' we shall urge that their request be acceded to." A petition to the General Court of Massachusetts, from a large number of the citizens of Boston and its vicinity, was published in the *Boston Journal* of March 11th, with the remark that it "undoubtedly reflects the matured convictions of a very large number of thinking men, who realize the obstacles which stand in the way of any attempt to bring back the Cotton States to their allegiance." It represents that, in the opinion of the petitioners, a return of the Cotton States to the Union is impossible, without such a sacrifice of principle on the part of the North as would make the Union worthless; and—"in view of this aspect, and of the great evils of civil war which would follow measures of coercion," also, because the people of those States, if conquered, "would be clothed with the same privileges as before, and would reënaet the same scenes,"—prayed for the passage of a resolution, to be submitted to the different States for action thereon, declaring the consent of Massachusetts (three-quarters of the States agreeing) to the secession of the seven States of the new Confederacy, and the surrender to them of all property of the United States within their boundaries; provided they declare freedom of navigation in the Mississippi river, cede to the United States, for a port of entry, a district six miles square, opposite New Orleans, and resign all claim to any part of the Territories. A correspondent of the *New York Tribune* wrote from Washington, on the 16th of March, that "Republicans here, of high political standing, assert the firm belief of radical members of the Cabinet in the inevitability of the ultimate division of the country into two confederacies—one distinctly free labor, the other slaveholding—and their desire to bring about the separation without bloodshed."

But the general voice was for the preservation of the Union; though, as to how it was to be preserved, opinions widely differed. That the sham-Democrats and Bell-Everett Unionists should generally, as they did, propose new compromises with the Slave Power, or rather, new concessions to its arrogance, was all in keeping with their antecedents. But they were not alone. Some prominent Republicans were weak and blind enough to countenance the same folly; as if that were not the very way to embolden the spirit of disunion, and give strength to the belief that the Union is for the

advantage mainly, if not solely, of the North, and consequently, that the North ought to pay roundly for its continuance, and will do so, if crowded hard enough.

One clamorous demand was for the repeal of the Personal Liberty Laws of several Northern States. The repeal of that of Massachusetts was urged in a long and argumentative address to her citizens, issued early in the winter, by Chief Justice SHAW and more than forty other men of note in different parts of the State. Appealing eloquently to the people's patriotism, humanity, good faith, and love of right, it would have been an admirable document, if men had really a sacred right of property in God's human children, and personal freedom were of no more worth than coined metal or merchants' wares; if no regard for human rights, no reverence for human nature made in the Creator's image, no solemn sense of moral obligation outraged by the claims of "legal" or illegal kidnappers, and no abhorrence of complicity in man-stealing, man-imbruting, and all the crimes and foul abominations condensed into the slave system, were involved in the repugnance felt and shown toward slave-catching. But looked at in connection with a just view of the character of that system and that act, it is a document to make one sad in reading it and thinking whence it came. It leaves entirely out of sight the moral wrongfulness of slavery, and the duty of the State to guard the freedom of its own inhabitants, and proceeds throughout upon the implied assumption, that giving up a slave to the bondage he has fled from is just as much a duty as restoring a stray horse to its owner, and that to hinder the performance of this duty is the purpose of the statute. So it profanes such words as wisdom, justice, honor, manliness and magnanimity, by using them to characterize the base and wicked deed. "A Committee chosen to distribute the address," also sent out a circular to all the clergymen of the State, together with a form of petition for the repeal of the law complained of, requesting them to use their influence for obtaining signatures to that or some one of like purport, and have it sent to the Legislature "at the earliest day possible."

GEORGE ASHMUN, also, who presided over the National Republican Convention at Chicago, in a letter published about the 1st of January, through the congenial medium of the *Springfield (Mass.) Republican*, denounced the law as "an act of indefensible wrong," which "ought not to remain upon our statute-book." Governor BANKS, in a farewell address to the Legislature, at the close of his

official term, on January 3d, condemned the statute as "unnecessary, and detrimental to the public peace," and hoped it might, "by common consent, be removed from the statute-book." His successor, Governor ANDREW, took the other side, with emphasis and much ability, in his Inaugural Address. Many petitions, with numerous signatures, both for and against repeal, went up to the Legislature; and able advocates of their respective prayers had hearings before the Committee to which they were referred. The result of all was, that the Legislature left the statute unrepealed, but somewhat modified. Governor SPRAGUE, of Rhode Island, went "heart and hand," to use his own expression, for the repeal of the law in that State, and it was effected. In Maine, repeal prevailed in the Senate, but was defeated in the House. Vermont retained the law by a vote of more than two to one. In Pennsylvania, Governor CURTIN, in his Inaugural Address, in January, advised exhibiting "to the States which have enacted laws interfering with the rights of all American citizens, an example of magnanimity (!) * * * by a prompt repeal of every statute that may, even by implication, be liable to reasonable objection." The Philadelphia *Bulletin*, (Republican,) seconding the demand of the sham-Democratic and notoriously pro-slavery *Pennsylvanian*, uttered its servility in still stronger language. "Even if the laws were inoperative," it said, "yet, if their titles or phraseology are offensive to our Southern fellow-citizens, if by any *forced construction* they could be made to *appear* hostile to them, let them be blotted out." But the law was not repealed. In several States, the Governors recommended a repeal, *if* the act conflicted with the Constitution, some intimating the belief that it did not; but so far as we have learned, no State, except Rhode Island, has taken the disgraceful backward step. The retiring Governor of Michigan said, in his Message to the Legislature, that "these laws are right and Constitutional, and speak the sentiment of the people, and ought not to be repealed. This is no time for vacillating counsel, while the cry of treason is ringing in our ears." And the incoming Governor, in his Inaugural Address, declared his willingness to abide by the result of a judicial scrutiny of the laws, but not to see the State humiliated by repealing them at a demand accompanied by threats of violence and war.

Another proposition of the compromisers was to amend the Fugitive Slave Act, or pass a new one, so as, if possible, to make it at once more effective, and less odious to the North. The Albany

Evening Journal, a leading organ of the Republicans in New York, in its issue of November 19th, pronounced the Act of 1850 "aggressive and vindictive—so vindictive that it defeats its execution"; and added, that "the South, in the language of Mr. LINCOLN, is 'entitled to an efficient Fugitive Slave Law.'" And, a month later, "We are prepared to say that an *efficient*, but not *revolting*, Fugitive Slave Law should be passed, and that its passage should be followed by a repeal of Personal Liberty Laws." In another issue it suggested—showing what it thought "efficient, but not revolting"—"that in the place of a vindictive Fugitive Slave Law, one should be enacted which arms the Federal authorities with all needful power for its execution, together with a provision making counties where fugitives are rescued by violence, from officers who have them in charge, liable for the value of the slaves so rescued." The *New York Times*, another of the "Conservative" Republican organs, commenting on a notice, given by Senator DOUGLAS, of his intention to propose a bill amending the Act of 1850, and anticipating that, if rightly framed, it would lead to Northern action which might better the basis for efforts by Southern Union men to preserve the Union, said, "Two objects are to be accomplished: the *more effective* working of the law in securing the return of fugitives, and the removal of the features which put freemen at the North in jeopardy. Whatever secures the latter, secures the former. * * * It seems to us, therefore, that certain concessions can be made to Northern feeling on this point, not only without the slightest risk of impairing the efficiency of the law, but with the certainty of increasing it, besides securing the prompt repeal of the Personal Liberty Bills." That is, if you will be careful not to rob us, Northern freemen, you may resume, with little or no difficulty, the robbing of the victims of your past robbery, who have sought a refuge here among us.

Besides favoring a Fugitive Slave Law of "increased efficiency," and a repeal of the Personal Liberty Bills, the *Times* thought the Republican party could now "afford to give new guarantees against the invasion of Southern rights," and to "place a larger trust in the influence of climate and of soil, and in the will of the inhabitants, for excluding slavery from new territories"; that is, if we rightly understand it, to leave them without a legal prohibition of slavery. A correspondent of the *Times*, writing from Washington, November 27th, spoke of consultations which had been held there by "leading Republicans" with Southern men, and of the plans proposed to save

the country from impending dangers. One "which seemed to meet with favor among Republicans, was that Mr. LINCOLN should announce his Cabinet so soon as the electoral vote should have been cast," and should include "three men from the South, who command the confidence of the whole country." This, though unusual, it was thought he would do, "if it would pour oil on the troubled waters." Another was, that "an influential Republican would offer resolutions in Congress, declaring the rights of the several States, in terms satisfactory to every Union-loving Southern man, with a declaration that this Bill of Rights the Republicans are willing to embody in the Constitution." This done, all excitement was expected to "subside in forty-eight hours." Another project, mentioned by the Washington correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, as talked of at the capital, was that the Constitution should be so amended as to provide for the election of two "sub-Presidents," one by the Slave States and one by the Free, both of whom must sign all Acts of Congress, before they can become laws; another, that fugitive slaves should be paid for from the National treasury; and yet others equally sagacious, and likely to be equally effective. The Albany *Evening Journal*, of December 19th, was "almost prepared" to adopt the Douglas doctrine, in regard to the Territories; "or, if this is inadmissible," to let them be divided by a new Missouri Compromise, which perhaps the South would violate, as it did the former, "but not in our generation, or the next, nor, indeed, until the lessons of the last six years have been forgotten." It strikes us, that "the lessons of the last six years," if closed with such a "compromise," are just what would embolden, rather than discourage Southern perfidy; by showing that, however loudly the North may clamor for its rights, and even though it may appear to have almost won them, a menace of disunion will, at any time, suffice to bring it back to tame submission. But of all the methods in which friends or foes exhorted the Republicans to do fit penance for having dared to choose a President, the New York *Herald*, with characteristic modesty, proposed the most ingenious and yet simplest. It was that Mr. LINCOLN should "resign as President elect, and leave some room for accommodation"; to be brought about, no doubt, by the election of a thorough devotee of slavery. For it is only when the Slave Power loses an election, that trouble follows. Its enemies can bear defeat with patience, and loyally submit to the will of the majority, even when the basest tools of the worst of tyrannies are the elect expo-

nents of that will;—plain proof, of course, that Providence ordained them to perpetual submission, and the Slave Power to perpetual rule.

Having quoted from such conservative Republican men and presses as ASHmun, BANKS and CURTIN, and the *New York Times*, *Springfield Republican*, and *Albany Evening Journal*, we gladly add, it is but just to say, that they by no means represent the general sentiment of the party. That, we believe, although consenting, more or less reluctantly, to abide by all the “compromises of the Constitution,” fairly construed, is firmly set against descending any lower. It has so declared itself abundantly in legislative action, by speeches and resolutions in public meetings, and through the periodical press. The *New York Tribune*, which, on this subject, speaks the sense of the majority of its party, “insists that there shall be no bribing, no coaxing, no wheedling those to stay in the Union who want to get out;” declaring that to make concessions now to slavery is “to proffer, for all time, a bounty on rebellion and treason.” And its chief editor, replying, on the 21st of January, to a renegade Free Soiler’s arguments for compromise, said, “To me, any concession of free soil to slavery is crime—flagrant, cowardly, inexcusable, atrocious crime—such as I dare not commit to save a dozen Unions. * * * We Republicans will never assent to a policy condemned alike by our own consciences and the unanimous judgment of the wise and good throughout the world. You may cajole a few leading politicians to their own ruin, but the masses will not be frightened, and cannot be bought.” In a like tone spoke the *New York Evening Post*, the *Boston Atlas*, *Boston Traveller*, *Concord (N. H.) Independent Democrat*, and, in fact, the larger portion of the Republican journals. A correspondent, writing to the *New York Tribune*, from Northern Ohio, on the 14th of February, expressed surprise that “Northern States had agreed to send delegates to Washington, to treat with rebels and enter into compromise with the Slave Oligarchy”; adding, that “if the Republican party backs down from the Chicago Platform, we on the Reserve will, almost in a mass, step upon WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON’S Platform, or some other, in which we can trust.”

The remark just quoted, about sending delegates to Washington, refers to a Convention which the Legislature of Virginia invited to assemble in that city, on the 4th of February, “to consider, and if possible agree on, some adjustment of the present unhappy contro-

versies, so as to afford the people of the slaveholding States adequate guaranties for the security of their rights." Ex-President TYLER was sent as a Commissioner to President BUCHANAN, to bear a copy of the resolutions accompanying the invitation, and to request him to agree to abstain, during the proposed deliberations, from all acts calculated to produce a collision of arms between the Government and the seceding States. To those States, also, a Commissioner was sent with a like request, as well as with an invitation to the Convention. The President transmitted the resolutions to Congress, on the 28th of January, with a message, "hailing this movement with great satisfaction," and declaring that the Convention, "when assembled, will constitute a body entitled, in an eminent degree, to the confidence of the country"; intimating a strong desire to enter into the agreement asked for, which, however, he could not do, because the power belongs to Congress; cordially commending it to Congress to enact no law conflicting with the request, and trusting that Virginia's mediation might be the means of perpetuating the Union on terms honorable for all sections.

Fourteen Northern and seven Southern States were represented in the Convention, by 133 Commissioners; but none came from any of the seceding States. It closed its work on the 27th of February, by sending up to Congress a plan adopted as a basis for final settlement of the slave question, and requesting Congress to submit the same to Conventions in the States, as an amendment to the Constitution. The plan was substantially the same as that proposed by the Virginia Convention, of which we have given an abstract on a former page, except that it omitted the prohibition of negro citizenship, and proposed to make only a part of the suggested amendments incapable of change or abolition. The several propositions composing it were adopted by varying votes, of from nine to sixteen affirmative States, against from five to eight in the negative, the remainder being divided or not voting. Only nine States, five Northern and four Southern, voted for leaving the Territory south of 36 deg. 30 min. open to slavery, while eight opposed it, two were divided, and two did not vote; so that it was carried by a plurality only. It would have been defeated, but for the absence of the New York delegate whom the delegation of that State had instructed to cast its vote in the negative. Twelve States voted to prohibit the abolition of slavery by Congress, in places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, within slaveholding States. The prohibition of the

foreign slave trade received the largest vote—sixteen States against five. Thus it will be seen that the weight of the Convention's advice was nearly neutralized by the want of unanimity, since on the most important propositions it was almost equally divided. The plan found little favor in Congress—being rejected in the Senate, by four to one, and not even called up for action in the House.

But Congress was by no means inattentive to the business of adjusting compromises. Indeed, it was the principal business of the session, and, if little was accomplished, it was not for want of strenuous and pertinacious efforts on the part of the conservatives. The President devoted to the subject nearly half his annual Message, which was very long, and as thoroughly pro-slavery as all his previous policy. He talked about "the sacred right of property" in slaves, which he denied that either Congress, or any Territorial, or even any State Legislature, or any other body but the people of a State, when framing or amending their State Constitution, can legally annul. The fault, of course, was in the Northern people, for the present troubles; which were "the natural effects" of their "long-continued and intemperate interference with the question of slavery in the South." The Personal Liberty Laws were "most palpable violations of Constitutional duty," and unless repealed, without unnecessary delay, no human power can save the Union; and "the injured States, after having first used all peaceful and Constitutional means to obtain redress, would be justified in revolutionary resistance to the Government of the Union." But there is no Constitutional right of secession. "Secession is revolution. It may, or may not be justifiable; but still it is revolution. The Executive is bound 'to take care that the laws be faithfully executed,' and no human power can absolve him from the obligation. He has no power to acknowledge the independence of a seceding State, or recognize the dissolution of the Confederacy. But the enforcement of the laws in the regular way, through the Federal Judiciary, being now impracticable in South Carolina, the whole question is submitted to Congress, with the expression of a decided opinion that neither Congress, nor any other department of the Federal Government, has "the power to coerce" a seceding State "into submission"; and that, "if we possessed the power," it would not "be wise to exercise it, under existing circumstances."

Having fully shown that the States have no Constitutional right to leave the Union, and the Government has none to keep them in it;

that "this is a great and powerful Government," and quite imbecile and helpless; that "its framers were not, at its creation, guilty of the absurdity of providing for its dissolution," and withheld from it all power to save itself from being dissolved whenever any State may choose to leave it; and having thus made evident the necessity "of preserving it by conciliation," if at all,—that is, by buying off rebellion with concessions which will be a bounty on fresh outbreaks and increased demands,—the Message goes on, in fit sequence, to suggest the terms which should be offered for a bargain. It "earnestly recommends an explanatory amendment of the Constitution," to "be confined" within such modest limits as to only "drink the cup and all"; that is, to settle "the construction of the Constitution on three special points": first, to recognize expressly the right of property in slaves in the States where it now exists, or may exist hereafter; second, to protect this right in all the Territories, till they shall be admitted as States into the Union, with or without slavery, as their Constitutions may prescribe; and, third, to recognize the master's right to have his fugitive slave delivered up to him, and the validity of the Fugitive Slave Law, and to declare unconstitutional, null and void, all State laws which impair this right. As the Paris *Constitutionnel* says, commenting on the Message, "Under the pretext of conciliation, it calls on the conqueror to place himself under the feet of the conquered."

"So much of the Message as relates to the present perilous condition of the country," was referred, in the Senate, on the 20th of December, to a Special Committee of thirteen; and, in the House, on the 6th, to a Committee of one from each State. On the 18th, Mr. LANE, of Oregon, offered resolutions in the Senate, proposing a conference of delegates from all the States, the Southern to meet first and decide on conditions necessary to their peace and safety, and submit them to the Northern; declaring it "contrary to religion and the spirit of the age for the Government to interfere in any way with any steps the States may agree to adopt"; that "the Federal Government will employ no force aggressive toward any State; and, if there is danger of collision, the Federal and State forces should be promptly withdrawn." On the same day, Mr. CRITTENDEN, of Kentucky, offered resolutions in the Senate, that the Constitution be so amended, as to prohibit slavery north, and protect it south of 36 deg. 30 min., in all present and hereafter-acquired Territories; to guarantee to States, on either side, admission to the

Union with or without slavery, as their Constitutions shall prescribe; to deny to Congress power to abolish slavery in the States, or in the District of Columbia, while it exists in Virginia or Maryland, or to forbid the officers of Government or members of Congress, while on duty in the District, to bring in slaves and hold them there, or to hinder the transportation of slaves from State to State, by land or water; to empower Congress to pay for fugitive slaves rescued by force after arrest, and "the owner" to sue the county in which, and the county to sue the persons by whom, the violence is done; and that these articles shall never be amended. Then followed resolutions that the Southern States have a right to the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, which ought not to be repealed, or so modified as to lessen its efficiency, but ought to be so altered as to make the Commissioner's fee the same, whichever way he decides, and to restrict to cases of forcible resistance the power of the holder of the warrant to call a *posse comitatus*; and that the laws against the African slave trade ought to be effectually executed. Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently moved additional amendments, to deny the power of Congress to abolish slavery in places under its exclusive jurisdiction within Slave States; to include among "fugitives from justice," those charged with acts criminal in the State they fled from, though not in that where they are found; to take the elective franchise and the right to hold office, Federal, State, Territorial, or Municipal, from persons wholly or in part of the African race; to empower the United States to acquire territory in Africa or South America, for colonizing, at the expense of the Federal Government, such negroes and mulattoes as the States may wish to have removed from them, and from places under the jurisdiction of Congress; to require (instead of merely empowering) Congress to pay for rescued fugitive slaves, and empower the United States to recover the sum paid, with interests and damages, from the county where the rescue was made, and the county from the rescuers; to extend the term of President and Vice-President to six years; give the choice of two electors for each State to the Legislature in joint Convention, and have the others chosen, one by each Congressional District.

Other propositions, more than we have room to enumerate, but adding no important particular to these which we have given, were offered, some in one House and some in the other, and were referred to their respective Special Committees. After full consideration, the House Committee, through Mr. CORWIN, of Ohio, on the 14th of

January, made a long Report, proposing amendments to the Constitution and to the Acts for the rendition of fugitives from service, and from justice; the immediate admission of New Mexico to the Union, slavery and all; and a series of declaratory resolutions. Mr. ADAMS, of Massachusetts, made a Minority Report, saying that he had at first concurred in several of the measures reported, for although not approving them in the abstract, he hoped they might restore kindly relations between the opposite sections of the country, without a sacrifice of principle. But finding that this spirit was not reciprocated by a majority of the Representatives of the aggrieved States, that three of them refused to be represented at all, and seven more, making ten of the fifteen, decided to reject the conclusions of the Committee, while a number of the Representatives of Free States were equally disinclined to accept them; and having come to the conclusion that no form of adjustment will be satisfactory to the recusant States which does not incorporate into the Constitution of the United States a recognition of the obligation to protect and extend slavery, to which he never could give his consent, he changed his course, declined to recommend the measures he had offered in good faith, and now dissented from the introduction of any measures whatever for the consideration of the House.

On the 11th of February, the House resolved, by 161 yeas, no nays, that Congress, and the people and Government of the non-slaveholding States, have no right to interfere with slavery in a slaveholding State. The debate on the Report of the Committee of thirty-three continued through six weeks and more, and on the 27th and 28th of February, the several propositions were voted on, with results not eminently encouraging to the compromisers; and if not altogether such as they ought to have been, still, quite as good as could have been expected, considering the urgent efforts used to make them worse. First, a motion to substitute for the Committee's plan a resolution recommending to the States to request Congress to call a Convention, for the purpose of amending the Constitution, was rejected by 109 to 74. Two other substitutes, the Crittenden proposition, and one much like it, but a little less pro-slavery, were voted down by 111 to 80, and 153 to 33. The declaratory resolutions were adopted, by 136 to 53. They say that, whether the Southern people's discontents have a just cause or not, any reasonable additional guaranties of their peculiar rights and interests needed to preserve peace and union ought to be cheerfully granted; condemn all

State laws which obstruct the recovery of fugitives from service, and request the several States to revise their statutes and forthwith repeal all having such a tendency; recognize no authority outside of any State to interfere legally or otherwise with slavery within it; affirm the justice and propriety of a faithful execution of the Constitution and laws, as to fugitive slaves, discountenance mobs to hinder it, and assert the right of citizens of each State to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States; recognize no conflicting element in, or cause for dissolution of, the Government, but rather the duty to perpetuate it on terms of equality and justice to all the States; declare that the faithful observance, by all the States, of their Constitutional obligations to each other, is essential to the peace of the country; request each State to revise and so amend its statutes as to secure to citizens of other States travelling therein the same protection its own citizens enjoy, and to protect travellers and sojourners from other States against popular violence and illegal summary punishment; request each State to enact laws to prevent and punish lawless invasion of any other State or Territory; and ask the President to send copies of the resolutions to the Governors of the States, to be laid before their Legislatures. A proposal to amend the Constitution by providing that it never shall be so amended as to enable Congress to abolish slavery in any State, failed on the 27th, for want of the requisite two-thirds, having but 120 to 71; but, being reconsidered the next day, prevailed by 133 to 65. The Act to admit New Mexico, with its atrocious slave code, was defeated by 114 to 71. The Fugitive Slave Act was amended, by 92 to 82, so as to provide that if an alleged fugitive, after being given up by a judge or commissioner, shall aver that he is free, he shall have a jury trial before the United States Circuit Court, in the State "from which he is ascertained to have fled"; also, that no citizen of any State shall be compelled to aid in taking a fugitive, unless when the capture is forcibly resisted; also, that the Commissioner's fee shall be ten dollars, however the case is decided. The bill relating to fugitives from justice, proposing to transfer from the State Governors to the Judges of the United States District Courts the duty of acting on requisitions for such fugitives, was voted down by 126 to 47.

On the 16th of January, the Senate adopted, by 25 to 23, a substitute offered by Mr. CLARK, of New Hampshire, for the Crittenden propositions. It declared, in substance, that the Constitution is

well enough as it is, and needs to be obeyed, rather than amended; that the way out of our dangers should be sought in efforts to enforce the laws, rather than in new guaranties for particular interests; that a reconstruction of the Union, should it be dissolved, is impracticable, and therefore that the Government and all good citizens should direct their energies to the maintenance of the existing Union and Constitution. On the 18th, it was reconsidered, by 27 to 25, and was finally rejected, on the 3d of March, by 22 to 15. On the 28th of February, the Select Committee reported in favor of adopting the propositions of the Peace Convention; while Messrs. SEWARD and TRUMBULL, dissenting from the majority, concurred in recommending that as Kentucky, Illinois and New Jersey had asked for the calling of a Convention to amend the Constitution, the other States be invited to express their will upon the subject. On the 2d of March, the Report of the majority was virtually set aside by a vote to take up the Corwin propositions, sent up from the House. On the 3d, all the various propositions were disposed of: that of Messrs. SEWARD and TRUMBULL being rejected by 25 to 14; those of the Peace Convention, by 28 to 7; Mr. CRITTENDEN'S, by 20 to 19; the Corwin proposal to amend the Constitution was adopted by 24 to 12,—an affirmative vote of less than half the Senate, even not counting the Senators of seceding States, but, being two-thirds of the votes given, the presiding officer declared it sufficient. The Corwin declaratory resolutions were also adopted. The House amendment to the Fugitive Slave Law was not acted on.

So the winter's labor of the compromisers came to very little. A few declarations of opinion, calling for no corresponding action, and which might be changed the next day, and a decision to give the people an opportunity to put into the Constitution, if they choose, a perpetual prohibition of Congressional interference with slavery in the States, but no assurance that the requisite number will so choose,—these are the sum of the results of that winter's work. Says the Washington correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, "Those who have seen what a mighty pressure has been brought to bear upon the Republican members of Congress in favor of compromise, will be deeply thankful that the cause of freedom has suffered so little as it has, thus far, in this bitter struggle."

Of the earnest and protracted debate which, in both Houses, preceded final action, we have little room to speak. The representatives of the oligarchy were, if possible, even more domineering and

defiant than their wont; and mingled largely with their customary insolence and bluster what the government of almost any country but this would have dealt with promptly, as incipient treason. It was plain enough, long before the close of the debate, that the controlling spirits among them did not wish the South to be "conciliated"; and that all concessions which left anything else to be conceded would be thrown away upon them, or rather, being interpreted as signs of fear and conscious weakness in the North, would make them more audacious and determined in their revolutionary purpose. Even those Southern members who, like Mr. CRITTENDEN, were eager for an adjustment of some sort, insisted on such terms as no Republican could have accepted without abandoning his principles, nor the North generally, without disgrace to itself, and disaster to the whole country. As the *New York Tribune* truly said, the passage of the Crittenden Compromise would have made the Republican triumph "the worst blow that Freedom has ever received on this continent." And if some of the proposed compromises were not quite so bad as that, they every one required a surrender of the main article in the Republican creed, the non-extension of slavery. Yet some of the leading members of the party were disposed to yield even that, in one or other form, as well as other points deemed less important.

Mr. ADAMS would have consented to give up New Mexico to slavery, till he found that the extreme South would have all or nothing. Mr. SEWARD, in a speech made on the 12th of January, the tone of which contrasted strikingly with that of his speeches in the Presidential canvas, quoted from on a preceding page, lamented the occasion, but hailed with cheerfulness the duty, of lifting up his voice for the Union; held that a truce on the question of the power of Congress over slavery in the Territories is essential to reconciliation; and, while admitting that "Congressional compromises are not likely to save the Union," and declaring that he would never give his vote, directly or indirectly, to sanction slavery in the Territories, or anywhere else, said that if Kansas were admitted as a State, under the Wyandot Constitution, he could vote for organizing all the remaining Territories into two States, and admitting them, with the right of future subdivision reserved, if such reservation could be Constitutionally made. This would of course come little, if at all, short of ensuring the admission of slavery in that one, at least, of the two States, which should include New Mexico, since it is already

recognized as an established system there, by one of the worst slave codes the world can show. He also favored modifying the Fugitive Slave Act, "so as not to oblige private persons to assist in its execution, and to protect freemen from being carried into slavery"; and the repeal of all laws of Free or Slave States, relating to fugitive slaves or other persons recently from other States, which contravene the Constitution or any Constitutional law of Congress. This is doubtless meant to hit at once the Northern Personal Liberty Laws, and the Southern Acts against the rights of colored seamen going into Southern ports. He was, moreover, willing to vote for so amending the Constitution that it can never be amended to confer on Congress power to interfere with slavery in any State. Besides assenting to these specific measures of "conciliation," he was ready for a general surrender of the distinctive principles of his party,—of course including so much anti-slavery as is in them,—in order to preserve the Union. For only so can we interpret him when he says that "Republicanism, Democracy, every other political name and thing,—all are subordinate, and they ought to disappear in the presence of the great question of Union. So far as I am concerned, it shall be so." Unless he meant that he will cease resisting slavery-extension, and all the aggressions of the Slave Power which "Republicanism" condemns, if else the Union will be dissolved, his language seems to us ill-chosen. And if such is his meaning, it is hard to see what Freedom has to hope for in a Union "saved" by this weak and cowardly policy; or from professed defenders who, if they win a victory for her, make haste to pacify her conquered foes by an unconditional surrender. But if the Union is dissolved, said Mr. SEWARD, "our own peculiar liberty must languish," and soon die. "And such a liberty! free movement everywhere through our own land and throughout the world; free speech, free press, free suffrage, the freedom of every subject to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expounds, administers, or executes."

The freedom of movement, of speech, of press and of suffrage known in the Southern half of "our land," is truly a somewhat "peculiar liberty"; and one which we suspect the eloquent Senator himself would not be eager to enjoy. For well he knows he could more safely claim a freeman's rights, in any of these particulars, within the Russian or the Austrian capital, than in those despot-ridden States, our perpetual union with which he represents as so essential to the life and vigor of our liberty. And well he ought to

know, who once announced the "irrepressible conflict," that the only hope for freedom in the Union, or for a Union worth preserving, is in the extermination of slavery, not in bribing it by fresh concessions to a brief and treacherous truce. Happily, his counsels, and such as his, were overruled by those of wiser men and by the resistless "logic of events"; and the nation, for the present, has escaped the disaster and disgrace of being deluded, under a false pretense of compromise, into a new submission to the Slave Power.

CIVIL WAR BEGUN.

While Congress and the country were debating how to save or to restore the Union, what policy would keep the Border States, and what, if any, might bring back the States which had gone out, the secessionists were pushing on their measures with unslackening vigor, and openly and secretly preparing to maintain their cause, should need be, by the sword. Money was voted; troops were raised, organized, equipped and drilled; artillery, arms and ammunition were procured, both in this country and in Europe; and steps were taken to fortify the coast and provide a naval force. Each of the rebellious States, immediately after, or in most instances before, seceding, seized arsenals and forts and all other property of the United States within its limits; while officers of the army and navy who sympathized with the rebellion, treacherously surrendered the soldiers, vessels and war materiel of their respective commands, to the rebel authorities, till the Federal Government held but three of its own fortresses within the States which had seceded,—Fortress Monroe, in Virginia, Fort Sumter, in South Carolina, and Fort Pickens, in Florida; and of these, the last two were besieged by strong bodies of rebel soldiery.

This work of plunder and military preparation was greatly aided by the imbecility of some members of the Federal Government, and the rank treason of the rest. The Secretaries of War, the Treasury, and the Interior, were traitors, almost undisguised at first, and quite so when the thin mask ceased to serve their purpose. One traitor, HOWELL COBB, having resigned the Treasury Department, on the 10th of December, and openly joined the rebellion, after he had designedly, or through incompetence, involved the national finances in embarrassment, another, PHILIP F. THOMAS, was put into his place,

but held it only a month, when he resigned, and then, at length, a loyal man, JOHN A. DIX, was appointed to the post. On the 8th of January, Secretary THOMPSON, of the Interior, resigned; but first had visited North Carolina to persuade the Legislature to vote for secession, and had also used opportunities given by his official station, to betray to the rebel leaders the plans of the Government for sending supplies to the garrison of Fort Sumter. FLOYD, Secretary of War, who had diligently perverted his office to the doing of a traitor's work, from even long before the actual outbreak of rebellion, still persevered in that abuse of it, until the 29th of December, and then resigned because he could not bully the President into giving up Fort Sumter to South Carolina. But, by that time, he had transferred large quantities of arms, artillery and military stores from Northern arsenals to Southern forts, or points in easy reach of seizure by the State officials meditating secession; and this process he continued, almost to the moment of his resignation. Five days before that fortunate event, he was prevented from sending to the Southern forts the heavy ordnance in the arsenal at Pittsburg, Pa., only by an uprising of the people there, threatening to resist by force the removal of the guns. He had also scattered the army in detachments at remote stations and comparatively unimportant posts, so that no considerable force could be promptly brought together just where the exigencies growing out of the rebellion called for such; and had placed some of these detachments where the treachery of their officers, or the convenience of surrounding them with an overwhelming rebel force, would most effectively ensure their being lost entirely to the service of the country in the coming struggle. Moreover, it is easy to believe—so characteristic is the act imputed to him—that popular opinion has done him no wrong in charging him with having connived at, if he did not participate in, the plunder of nearly a million of dollars from the Indian Trust Fund, in order, by the robbery, to aid the cause of treason. The Secretary of the Navy, TOUCHEY, was, and continues, nominally loyal; but, whether as the dupe of traitorous associates, or from a secret sympathy with the rebellion, he served it as effectually as if that had been his deliberate intention. The navy was nearly all dispersed beyond the reach of any sudden call; and no measures were adopted to prevent such of its officers as chose to do so from passing into the rebel service; but their resignations, offered, as he could not but have known, on purpose to effect that transfer, were accepted without

question, as if tendered with no unlawful or dishonorable intent; and they were left at liberty to consummate their meditated treason, without so much hindrance as a feeble reprimand.

The President, if not at heart a traitor, as many, judging from his conduct, were at times inclined to think him, displayed an utter imbecility and moral cowardice hardly less disastrous in their effects than actual treason would have been. As long ago as October 29th, General SCOTT, anticipating the possibility of a Southern secession, sent to the President his views, in writing, as to the precautions suited to that prospect. Apprehending, as "preliminary to secession," attempts to seize the Southern forts, he advised that "all these works should be immediately so garrisoned as to make any attempt to take any one of them by surprise or *coup de main* ridiculous." As to follow this advice required a slight degree of moral courage, the President neglected it, not only then, when probably prompt action might have prevented such attempts, by making it evident that they must fail, but also after the work of seizure had actually begun, and only energy and decision could hinder its success. After South Carolina had so plainly shown her purpose to take possession of the forts within her bounds, that Major ANDERSON, commanding in Charleston harbor, felt constrained by his sense of military duty to remove with his loyal little band from the untenable Fort Moultrie to the more defensible Fort Sumter,—which he did, December 26th,—the President still wavered between the demands of traitors and the remonstrances of loyal men,—at first inclining to send back ANDERSON to Moultrie, or withdraw him wholly from the harbor,—but finally yielding to the Northern pressure so far as to let him stay in Sumter, but without supplies or reinforcements. It is said, indeed, and seems not intrinsically improbable, that his unexpected movement brought to light a promise from the President to the rebellious State authorities not to reinforce him. A feeble attempt to do it was, however, made, a few days later, provoked by an insolent letter to the President, from the Commissioners of South Carolina, received at a Cabinet meeting, on January 2d. After it was read, the President, according to his own account, exclaimed to his indignant Cabinet, "It is now all over, and reinforcements must be sent." It was meant to send them secretly, and an unarmed steamboat, the *Star of the West*, was accordingly dispatched with men and a much-needed supply of provisions; but while entering the harbor, January 9th, was fired upon and driven back by the rebels,

who had learned its errand, through Secretary THOMPSON'S treachery. The President submitted tamely to the outrage, and neither tried again to send supplies, nor took any measures to prevent the vigorous prosecution of the siege, and the preparation of ample means to reduce the beleaguered fortress. The same timidity and weakness, if nothing worse, marked all his policy toward the rebellion. As early as December 4th, he sent a Mr. TRESMOTT to South Carolina to *ask* her to wait for Congress to redress her grievances; and, on the 20th, another messenger from him, CALEB CUSHING, arrived in Charleston, bearing, it is said, his promise above mentioned, that ANDERSON should not be reinforced, and his *request* that the Convention, plotting treason there, would respect the Federal laws. This it of course refused to promise, the Charleston *Mercury* scornfully declaring that "we do not mean to be balked by clap-trap expedients, for Mr. BUCHANAN'S convenience." He incurred the contempt of open rebels, and lost whatever confidence of loyal men he ever had. Even his Secretary of State, conservative and cautious Mr. CASS, felt forced by self-respect to quit his Cabinet, when he would not reinforce Fort Sumter. He had not the courage or strength of will to dismiss the notoriously traitorous members of his Cabinet, or even to restrain them from plainly showing favor to rebellion, both in word and act. His most energetic measure of defence against the perils threatening the nation was the proclaiming of a National Fast, to be observed on the 4th of January; but, to proclaim the fast which God has chosen, he neither dared nor was disposed. No loosing of the bands of wickedness, no letting the oppressed go free, no breaking of servile yokes, was proposed or probably once thought of. On the contrary, the language of his proclamation was evidently meant to imply rebuke of those whose very moderate anti-slavery views and action had been made by the Slave Power an occasion for revolt. In short, to put upon his acts, and his neglect to act, the best construction they will bear, the President, by his cowardice and feebleness and indecision, gave treason all the aid and comfort which, perhaps, so weak a man could give; insomuch that, under his administration, it was not only free to ripen its designs and prepare its means of execution, almost without a show of hindrance, but had eminent facilities therefor provided at the public charge. Thus favored, it had gone so far, before the incoming of the new Administration, that it could not be prevented from going further, and achieving at least a partial and temporary success.

It was much emboldened, also, to the taking of decisive steps, by the representations of pro-slavery politicians at the North, and by the falsehoods told by correspondents of the Southern press, writing from Northern cities, as to the opinions and condition of the people there; as well as by an overweening estimate of the importance of the South to the well-being, not to say the very being, of the North. Relying upon these, the rebels fully expected from the Northern sham-Democracy a strong diversion in their favor, should the Government attempt "coercion"; and believed that the secession of the Cotton States would fill the North with such pecuniary distress, that, in the manufacturing and commercial towns, the mass of laborers would break out in furious riots, clamoring for "bread or blood"; and thus effectually disable the Government for putting down rebellion at the South.

The New York correspondent of the Petersburg (Va.) *Express* wrote of a "Southern Organization" in New York, numbering "much over 20,000 men, pledged under oath to thin the ranks of the Yankee scoundrels before they reach any of the seceded States"; and of "similar organizations in active operation in many parts of New Jersey and Pennsylvania"; adding, "I heard one of the most active members of this organization say to-day that its plans, if effectual, would stiffen the joints of 250,000 Yankees at the very lowest calculation." A Southerner, spending some days in New York, wrote thence, December 6th, to the Charleston *Mercury*, "I hear many expressions of sympathy for us in this city, and in case of an attempt to coerce us, I believe we can safely rely upon much material aid from here, and especially from the Irish. They hate the nigger, and will fight to sustain our rights, if it finally comes to that. I am inclined, however, to the opinion that we shall be allowed to go quietly out of the Union, if the business is properly managed with the Federal Government. * * * The *Tribune* portion of the Abolition party think there will be no peace so long as we remain in the Union. * * * Bennett, of the *Herald*, is with us. He hates the Union as bad as any of us, and would rejoice to see it broken up. He has much influence with a certain class, and will, if it comes to a rupture, encourage enlistments in New York to fight the North. We can depend upon that. * * * It is my honest conviction that there is no need of preparation for war. * * * I believe, if we demand secession, that the North will force the Government to accede to our request." He had, however, the sense to

see, and the frankness to say, that "if it comes to a fight with the General Government, we shall find it much easier to get in than to get out of it."

Three months later, a correspondent of the same journal wrote from New York that "any troops raised to invade the South would have to march over the dead bodies of at least their own number, before they ever set foot on Southern soil, and GREELEY, BEECHER and other truculent Abolition leaders would be swinging by the neck, from the lamp-posts of Broadway. * * * The whole city of New York is on the verge of bankruptcy. Not five dry goods houses will be able to stand. No business is doing. The number of hands discharged is immense. The Morrill tariff will bring the crisis to an explosion next month, and in a short time the general distress will be so great that risings and riots will take place, and the white slaves of commerce and capital, both in New York and in New England, will administer to the lips of their task-masters the poisoned chalice which they have prepared for the planters of the South. * * * If the South wants recruits to fight its battles against invading hosts of Abolitionists, and spare the lives of its own citizens, let the Confederacy employ a few agents in New York and other cities of the North, and it will soon have as many troops as it requires. There is not an unemployed Irishman who would not gladly enlist in the cause, and there are thousands of native Democrats eager for the same service. And, should the Lincoln Administration proceed to make war upon your commerce, you can find at the North any number of ships and men ready for letters of marque from the Southern Confederacy."

As early as November 9th, the Atlanta (Ga.) *Confederacy* headed an article, "THE WAR ALREADY BEGUN," and said in it, "We learn that a mob has already set fire to the *Tribune* office, New York, and likewise to the Astor House, which has been for many years the headquarters of the leading fanatics of the North. It is nothing but *justice* that an indignant and outraged people should have laid these dens in ruins." A Philadelphia correspondent of the New York *Tribune* stated that ROBERT TYLER, son of the ex-President, and a resident in Bristol, Pa., "has been acting as a spy of Governor WISE," and that a letter from him was intercepted, "pledging WISE that he had 1,000 Philadelphians enrolled to march with him to Virginia and fight for the rebellion." A multitude of similar quotations might be made, but these will suffice to show the kind of

hopes and expectations which gave the rebels courage for their enterprise.

There is reason to believe that a part of their design was to prevent, by open or secret violence, the inauguration of the President elect, and either seize the capital, and openly usurp the government of the whole country, or at least create a temporary anarchy, with such consequent confusion and helplessness as would make impossible any effectual resistance to their revolutionary schemes, till the time for effectual resistance should have passed. As early as December 17th, a Southern man, or one so representing himself, wrote to Mr. LINCOLN, under cover to the editor of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, "not daring to risk" the letter directly "through the Southern mail," warning him of a conspiracy to kill him at the inauguration; detailing the plot, with circumstances of time and place, and naming the man—"a very courageous man, wealthy and influential, and considered very upright"—who had sworn to shoot him. "To escape detection," said the writer, "it was agreed for him to be in the centre of three or four hundred friends, they to concentrate to one point, and at such a distance that a sight could be brought to bear upon you while speaking." A correspondent of the New York *Times* wrote from Washington, January 2d, "It is now well known that military companies have been organized and drilled for months past in Maryland and Virginia,—some of them under the eye of an officer of the regular army,—and that the distinct object of their organization is to aid in the seizure of Washington city in the interest of the disunionists, or the prevention by force of LINCOLN'S inauguration." A letter from Baltimore, January 11th, to the New York *Tribune*, said, "A public man of some standing, and belonging to the revolutionary party, openly declared to-day that Mr. LINCOLN would not be permitted to pass through Maryland, on his way to Washington to be inaugurated, and that he never would be inaugurated in Washington! If the Legislature should ever get together, they design to prevent the transportation of any passengers at all over Maryland territory until after the 4th of March; and it is their declared purpose to seize upon the Capitol, in conjunction with Virginia. They will assemble a Convention that will vote us out of the Union; and, if the Capitol can be seized, the revolutionists intend to declare themselves the United States, and proceed to invite the Free States into a new Confederacy, with such changes in the present Constitution as Mr. BRECKINRIDGE asks for!"

The Lafayette (La.) *Journal*, of February 18th, states that on the 11th "an attempt was made to wreck the train on the Toledo and Western Railroad, bearing the President elect and suite," on their way to Washington. Shortly before the train was due at the State line, an obstruction was found about a mile from the station, "fastened upon the rails in such a manner that if a train at full speed had struck it, engine and cars must have been thrown off, and many persons killed." Several other attempts were made upon Mr. LINCOLN'S life, during his journey through Indiana and Ohio. The Syracuse *Journal* said, on the authority of some of his travelling companions, that, "as the Presidential train was leaving Cincinnati, a grenade of the most destructive character was discovered in a small carpet-bag, which some unknown person had placed on a seat of the car occupied by Mr. LINCOLN and his family and personal friends. It was found ignited, and so arranged that within fifteen minutes it would have exploded with force sufficient to demolish the car and destroy the lives of all in it." The New York *Evening Post* "learned from a gentleman who accompanied Mr. LINCOLN during the greater part of the journey, that, before he entered the cars at the various points on the route, the conductors were accustomed to examine the seats and cushions, to see that no dangerous machine or person was secreted in the carriage."

On Thursday night, February 21st, information reached Mr. LINCOLN at Harrisburg, Pa., by a special messenger from General SCOTT, and so authenticated as to compel belief, that a secret organization, just discovered in Baltimore, had formed a plot to assassinate him in that city, or on his way thither. A correspondent of the New York *Times*, attached to the travelling party, said that among the conspirators were "persons high in Southern confidence, and some whose fame is not confined to this country. Statesmen laid the plan, bankers endorsed it, and adventurers were to carry it into effect." Knowing, from public announcements, that the President intended to leave Harrisburg on Saturday morning, they purposed "to throw the train down some steep embankment, and destroy the lives of all on board, or, this project failing, to surround the carriage on the way from depot to depot in Baltimore, and assassinate him with dagger or pistol shot." After consultation with his friends upon this intelligence, he reluctantly yielded to their urgent representations, and took a train on Friday evening, passed through Baltimore in the night, and reached Washington early Saturday morn-

ing, before his change of plan was generally known, even in Harrisburg. The reception given in Baltimore, on Saturday afternoon, to the train he was to have taken, and which his family and suite did take, tended to corroborate the charge of a murderous conspiracy. When the train reached the station, a crowd of several thousands pressed around it, "and in an instant, as it were," says the Baltimore *Republican*, "the platforms of the cars were filled with an excited mass. The most terrific shouts and yells were sent up, excelling anything in the way of excitement we have ever witnessed. When Mrs. LINCOLN, with several gentlemen of her company, stepped upon the platform, one of them "was taken for the President, and, a rush being made, so violent was the pressure, that many were pushed headlong from the platform. But the gentleman taken for Mr. LINCOLN managed to escape by rushing quickly through the freight department of the depot, and taking a carriage. Mrs. LINCOLN and family were then escorted to carriages in waiting, and moved off," and after some time, the noisy crowd dispersed, baffled and disappointed.

Three days later, the New York journals stated that information had been laid before the proper authorities, that an organized band of five hundred men had sworn to prevent the inauguration of Mr. LINCOLN; that they would take a position near him, on inauguration day, and one of them would shoot him with an air-gun, while the crowd around would save the murderer from detection. If there was such an organization, which is by no means unlikely, the defensive preparations of General SCOTT, and the public warnings which had been given, deterred it from attempting to carry out its purpose, and the inauguration was undisturbed.

Meanwhile, the rebels were steadily pressing the siege of Fort Sumter, and had, by this time, surrounded it with such formidable batteries, and made the approach of a relieving force so difficult and dangerous, that the new President and Cabinet hesitated, for several weeks, whether to try to reinforce or to withdraw the little garrison. But, on the 8th of April, the President gave formal notice to the Governor of South Carolina that provisions would be sent into the fort, peaceably or by force; whereupon the rebel General, BEAUREGARD, by order of the Secretary of War of the Confederate States, demanded the evacuation of the fort; which being refused, he opened fire upon it from his batteries and Fort Moultrie, on the morning of April 12th. Major ANDERSON replied with spirit, from

the guns of Sumter, and, notwithstanding the vast disparity of force, kept up the fight till after noon of the 13th; when, almost everything combustible within the walls being on fire from the hot shot of the besiegers, his ammunition nearly gone, and his men exhausted by fatigue and heat, he surrendered, and was permitted, with his scanty band, to retire with the well-earned honors of war.

The fall of Sumter filled the country with intense excitement. The South exulted wildly over her success in the first encounter of arms,—as if the vanquishing of seventy men by seven thousand, with large advantages of means and preparation, had been indeed a glorious victory,—and hailed it as a happy omen of the final issue of the war. One hundred guns were fired in Richmond, one hundred in Augusta, Ga., in honor of the great event; and with like and other tokens of rejoicing it was welcomed throughout the rebellious States. President DAVIS and his Secretary of War were serenaded, and the latter answered with a speech, and prophesied that the Confederate flag would soon be waving over Washington and Faneuil Hall, if hostilities should continue. On the other hand, the North was startled from dreams of compromise and peace, and began to understand that the rebels were in bitter earnest, and meant blows and blood. All differences seemed to be forgotten on the instant; and Republicans and Democrats and Bell-Everett Unionists, Radicals and Conservatives, or whatever else men called themselves, declared with one emphatic voice for the effectual assertion of the Government's authority, and called for retribution on the authors of the flagrant outrage. A few exceptions, it is true, there were, among the basest vassals of the Slave Power, who had stolen the name of Democrat to cover their servility to the worst of despotisms. But, for the most part, even those whose hearts were with the traitors, seeing how general and earnest was the adverse sentiment, prudently affected a loyalty they did not feel, and joined the prevailing cry for upholding the Union. Indeed, the efforts which pro-slavery politicians have so long been making to inculcate blind, idolatrous reverence for the Union, that they might use the feeling in the interest of slavery, began at length to recoil against themselves. Multitudes who had been taught to give up Northern rights, and tamely bear the insolence of slave-drivers, because the Union must be saved, whatever else is lost, had learned their lesson too well for their teachers' purpose, and could not sit still and see the object of their idolatry shattered by armed rebellion. Possibly the zeal of some

may have been all the warmer, for the remembrance of past humiliations inflicted by Southern arrogance, and, at the time, received with outward semblance of complacency, but with a secret chafing of the spirit, which, therefore, seizes eagerly the opportunity to break from its long constraint. Be this as it may, the South was grievously disappointed by the response of almost the whole North to the attack on Sumter, and was not a little indignant at those who had deceived her into the belief that her revolutionary movement would have nearly as much Northern help as hindrance.

On the 15th of April, the President issued a proclamation, announcing that in seven States the execution of the laws of the United States is obstructed "by a combination too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings"; and calling out "the militia of the several States, to the number of 75,000, in order to suppress said combination, and cause the laws to be duly executed." He deemed it "proper to say, that the first service assigned to the forces hereby called forth will probably be to repossess the forts, places and property which have been seized from the Union," promised "the utmost care, consistent with the objects aforesaid, to avoid any destruction of or interference with property, or any disturbance of peaceful citizens"; and commanded "the persons composing the combinations aforesaid to disperse and retire to their respective abodes within twenty days." He also summoned Congress to a special session, to begin on the 4th of next July. The troops called for by the proclamation were duly apportioned among all the States which had not yet seceded, and requisition was made upon the Governor of each for its respective quota. The Governors of the Slave States, thus called on, except those of Delaware and Maryland, answered with insulting refusals; but all the Free States eagerly vied with each other in enthusiastic zeal to obey the requisition. From States and cities and towns all over the North came also liberal offers of money to meet the cost of war; and everywhere was the stir of busy preparation. In a few days, regiments from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New York were in Washington; but not a day too soon, it was believed, to save the city from falling into rebel hands.

The advance to the capital was seriously impeded by the secessionists of Baltimore, who, on the anniversary of the first shedding of Massachusetts blood in the war which won the nation's independence, murdered several members of a Massachusetts regiment,

marching through the city from one railroad station to another; and then broke the direct communication between the North and Washington, by destroying railroad bridges and cutting telegraph wires north and east of Baltimore. When, after that, the Northern troops continued to pour into Washington, going around by Annapolis, an attempt was made, but without success, to have them forbidden to cross any part of the soil of Maryland. The arch-conspirators had no doubt hoped, and almost confidently expected, that Maryland, as a slaveholding State, would join in the execution of their plot, and, by closing all approaches to the capital, would render it their sure and easy prey. Believing, from the Baltimore outbreak and other tokens, that she had resolved to do so, the Richmond *Examiner* joyfully exclaimed: "To have gained Maryland is to have gained a host. It insures Washington city, and the ignominious expulsion of Lincoln and his body-guard of Kansas cut-throats from the White House. It gives us the entire waters of the Chesapeake. * * The South could not have spared Maryland. Her territory, her waters, her slaves, her people, her soldiers, her sailors, her ship-builders, her machinists, her wealth, enterprise and bravery were all essential to it" And very likely she would have been carried into the Southern Confederacy, by a restless, desperate minority of her people, though against the will of the less energetic and active majority, but for the prompt arrival of the Northern troops.

Indeed, it was manifest, from the first rebellious movement, that sympathy with it was strong and active wherever slavery was strong; and that loyalty in any region was just about in inverse ratio to the strength of attachment there to the slave system. In Western Virginia, Eastern Kentucky and Eastern Tennessee, and other portions of the South in which the slaves are few and labor is mostly in the hands of freemen, secession is unpopular, and is even to some extent actively resisted. Already, loyal regiments are forming in all the border Slave States, notwithstanding the disloyal answers of the Governors of most of them to the President's requisition. And Western Virginia is beginning to move for organizing a new government, adverse to that of the State,—the latter being held to have abdicated its Constitutional authority by going over to the Southern Confederacy.

Whether such a step is strictly regular; whether one-fourth or less of the people of a State, occupying also hardly one-third of its territory, can legally create a government for the whole, in case

there is no legal government, admits, to say the least, of serious doubt. But that the legal consequence of secession, as determined from the standpoint of the Federal Constitution, is what it is here assumed to be, we think too plain for reasonable question. No State which has seceded has now a government which any citizen, still loyal to the General Government, can recognize as legal. This follows from the obvious truism, that no man can at the same time owe allegiance to two hostile governments. Either the "Confederate States" are legally and Constitutionally outside of the Union, or they have no State governments, and legally are subject only to that of the Union.

It will be seen at once that this proposition bears decisively upon the question of the present standing of slavery before the law. For slavery, being essentially immoral, can have no warrant in natural law, and never can acquire legality by prescription. In Lord Mansfield's often quoted words, "It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law." Hence, where no positive law is, it must be illegal. But positive law cannot be, where no legal government is, to enact or uphold it. Rights existing under natural law live on, although the human governments which have recognized them die. But rights, or what are called such, created by a government, die in the death of their creator. Since, then, the alleged right of slaveholding is of this latter class, it has, if ever strictly legal, ceased to be so in the seceding States; and every slave there has been emancipated by necessary legal consequence of the fact of secession. For, as we have seen, the only government now having legal power to enact or uphold "positive law" within those States is the General Government; which, as matter of fact, has never given or attempted to give legality to slaveholding; and, as matter of law, could not have given it, had the attempt been made. Whether *any* government could, we will not here debate; but the Federal Government, all agree, has such powers only as have been expressly granted in the Constitution, or as are necessary to the exercise of those expressly granted; and neither class includes a power to legalize slaveholding. This outbreak of rebellion, therefore, has devolved upon the General Government not only a Constitutional right, but a Constitutional obligation to regard slavery as illegal in all the States which have seceded, and to treat their heretofore enslaved inhabitants as free. Of course, the Constitutional right involves a moral obligation, also, to do this; for it is simply

self-evident that the Government is morally bound to exert upon the side of right whatever Constitutional power it has. So, if the act of slavery, in beginning this civil war, should not be suicide in fact, as it certainly is in law, the fault will be in the Government's unwise, unlawful, and most culpable forbearance toward the evil-doer.

The question concerns not alone the freedom of the millions of unlawfully held slaves, but the rights and interests, also, of the Government, and of all the loyal people of the country. The rightful Government of any country has a right to use, in upholding its authority, the services of every subject of its rule; every man who wishes to be loyal in act, as well as feeling, has a right to be so; and every loyal man has a right to be exempt from so much of the burden of supporting the Government as, in a fair distribution of it, would fall to the share of any other loyal man. These, it seems to us, are truisms; consequently, no man can be rightfully left under such control of the disloyal as will defraud the Government of its right to his services, him of his right to render them, and his fellows in loyalty of their right to be exempt from his share of the common burden. Not only, therefore, are the slaves of rebels legally set free by the mere fact of rebellion, but the Government is bound, alike by law and justice and sound policy, to regard them so, and shape its action toward them accordingly. It cannot else assert completely either its own rights, or, as its duty is, those of its loyal subjects, either white or black. If it treats as slaves those who were held as such before the treason of their masters annulled the authority by which they were so held, it robs itself of the services of a large class of loyal men, to give them to armed traitors; burdens unwisely, illegally and unjustly all other loyal men; cripples its own strength, to increase its adversary's; and takes the fearful responsibility of lawlessly enslaving—not merely keeping in, but thrusting into slavery—millions now free by law as well as right.

From this conclusion, we see no escape but by admitting secession to be right—for else the slave-code is annulled;—or by affirming that property in slaves stands on the same basis, in law and morals, as any other property,—for else it ceases with the local law. But both these doctrines have already been emphatically repudiated by large majorities in the loyal States; and to maintain the opposite, they are now mustering their hosts for battle against the perfidious authors of this civil war. Hence no consistent course is left them, but to treat slavery as abolished by secession, and adjust their future

policy to that fact. If wise enough to do this, they will secure the only adequate compensation within their reach for the present and coming calamities; while lessening also their duration and their weight, by cutting at the first blow the sinews of the strength of the rebellion, thus making easier and shorter the task of crushing it. We strongly doubt, indeed, whether it can else be crushed at all.

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S INAUGURAL.

Unless the actual outbreak of hostilities shall have opened the eyes of the new President, or their progress shall give him speedily a clearer vision than he had at first, we see no ground for hope that he will lead the way, as becomes his station and opportunities, in this plain course of justice and sound policy. For, when he took his office, he had evidently yet to learn the character of the implacable and desperate foe with whom he has to deal, and how alone he can be effectually dealt with. He was manifestly under the delusion, so widely prevalent at the North, that soft words will salve the nation's sore; that protestations of respect for the "rights" and "institutions" of the South will soothe the maddened Slave Power, and lure it from the execution of its long-meditated and slowly-ripened schemes of treason. Or, it may be, he was still controlled by that habit of deference to the interests of slavery, which has become a "second nature" to so many Northern politicians. Perhaps it is not to be wondered at, that one who is not so deeply sensible of the atrocious wickedness involved in the slave system as to be a thorough Abolitionist, should be slow to appreciate the depravity that system generates, and, hence, the terrible earnestness with which its votaries have plunged into the bloody strife to uphold its supremacy. Be all this, however, as it may, for these or other reasons, Mr. LINCOLN made unseemly and even unprecedented haste, in his Inaugural Address, to pledge himself particularly to the baser portion of the work to which he regarded himself as bound by his official oath; making especially conspicuous just that obligation which, as it is a shame that he or any man should be required to take it, one would think he might have had the grace at least to be ashamed thus to parade, and would have chosen rather to leave as much as possible in the background. That he did not, shows how very far he was from having any adequate conception of the greatness of the

wrong he undertook to do, and, consequently, how unfit to comprehend and deal with the pressing exigency of this fateful hour.

The first topic touched upon in his Address is the "apprehension" which "seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that, by the accession of a Republican administration, their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered." For this, he assured them, "there never has been any reasonable cause"; which they, at least so many of them as have any effective voice in Southern affairs, knew probably as well as he. To confirm his assurance, he quoted from one of his own published speeches, disclaiming any "purpose, lawful right, or inclination, directly or indirectly to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists"; also, from the Chicago Platform, the resolution affirming "the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively," and denouncing "the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as the gravest of crimes"; then said, "I now reiterate these sentiments, * * * and add that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States, when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause, as cheerfully to one section as to another." And lest this somewhat general statement should still leave room for doubt as to whether the work to be "cheerfully" done, "consistently with the Constitution and the laws," includes the particular business of slave-catching,—helping men-stealers again to their stolen "chattles" which may have slipped from their grasp,—he cited at large the provision of the Constitution touching "persons held to service or labor in one State escaping into another"; adding, "it is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves, and the intention of the law-giver is the law"; reminded "members of Congress" that they all "swear their support to this provision," and consequently "their oaths are unanimous, that slaves whose cases come within its terms shall be delivered up"; and asked, "if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?" And he rather insisted that they should do this, notwithstanding "some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by State authority"; since "that difference is not very material," for, "if the slave is to be sur-

rendered, it can be of little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done; and should any one be content that this oath shall go unkept, on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?"

The President's eagerness to have the promised wrong committed seems to have so disturbed his mind as to make his reasoning slightly turbid here. His leaving out of view the obvious truth, that

"It is a sin to swear unto a sin,
But greater sin to keep the-sinful oath,"

is only what might be expected of one who, with his understanding of the Constitution, is willing to "swear support" to it. But it is not so clear how he can think it immaterial to the Congressmen whose action he invokes, whether they think the Constitution, which creates the alleged obligation to do what otherwise would be alike illegal and immoral, lays it on them or elsewhere. It may, indeed, "be of little consequence" to the slave who has regained possession of his stolen body, whether the nation or the State re-steals and re-enslaves him; but "to others" it should seem that the "difference of opinion" is "a very material one," whether *they* are or are not required to do the mean and wicked act, which, done without the Constitutional warrant, would be criminal as well as sinful. The Congressman who holds that the Constitution lays this obligation on the States, would break, not keep, his oath, if he should vote for such a law as the President suggested.

Having made his bow to Slavery, the President next ventured mildly to hint an interrogative recognition of the possibility that Freedom also has some rights, to which a measure of respect may properly be shown. "In any law," he asked, "upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a freeman be not, in any case, surrendered as a slave?" Remembering, also, that the South has shown in general much less respect for the Constitutional rights of others than she asks for what she calls her own, he risked another modest question, doubtless prompted by that fact, although it is not alluded to in terms. "Might it not be well," he said, "at the same time to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States'?"

He then went into an argument against secession, maintaining that, "in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union is perpetual"; that "the destruction of it by one or a part only of the States is not lawfully possible"; that "no State can, upon its own mere motion, lawfully get out of the Union"; that "therefore, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken"; and that his "simple duty" is, "as the Constitution expressly enjoins upon" him, "to take care that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States." Promising to do this duty, "so far as is practicable, unless the people shall in some authoritative manner direct the contrary," he trusted "this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will Constitutionally defend and maintain itself. In doing this, there shall be no bloodshed or violence, unless it is forced upon the national authority. Beyond what may be necessary for occupying and possessing the property and places belonging to the Government, and collecting the duties and imposts, there will be no invasion. Where hostility to the United States shall be so great and so universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people that object. * * * The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection." This course is to be followed, "unless the current of events and experience shall show a change to be proper"; and he will use his "best discretion, in every exigency, with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections."

Then followed some paragraphs of expostulation, with "those who really love the Union," against their "entering on so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric. All profess," he said, "to be content in the Union, if all Constitutional rights can be maintained"; and he thought no right plainly written in the Constitution had been denied. "The only substantial dispute" is about slavery, which "one section of our country believes is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. The fugitive-slave clause of the Constitution; and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave-trade, [classed together as if there were no appreciable moral difference between

them,] are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry, legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This cannot be perfectly cured," but separation would make it "worse in both cases. The foreign slave-trade would be revived, and fugitive slaves would not be surrendered at all."

Referring to the desire of "many worthy and patriotic citizens" that the Constitution should be amended, he made "no recommendation of amendment," but would, "under existing circumstances, favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon the subject"; and, of the different "modes prescribed in the instrument" for amending it, "the Convention mode" seemed preferable to him, "in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves." The proposed amendment which had passed Congress, "to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of States, including that of persons held to service," he held "to be now implied Constitutional law"; and had "no objection to its being made express and irrevocable." As to "the position assumed by some, that Constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court," he did "not deny that such decisions must be binding upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect in parallel cases by all other departments of the Government"; but he distinctly implied his opinion that "the policy of the Government upon the vital questions affecting the whole people is not to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court."

He concluded by telling his "dissatisfied fellow-countrymen" that in their hands, not his, "is the momentous issue of civil war"; that they "can have no conflict without being the aggressors"; that they "have no oath registered in heaven [but how many in the other place?] to destroy the Government," while he has "the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect and defend' it"; that "we are not enemies, but friends," and "must not be enemies"; and that "the chorus of the Union" will be swelled from "every heart and hearthstone all over this broad land." For all which, how much his "dissatisfied fellow-countrymen" cared, may be inferred from the events which we have already related.

Regarded as an attempt to conciliate the plotters and abettors of treason, the Address was certainly a failure. They were as prompt,

emphatic and unanimous in condemning it, as if it had resembled their own policy in boldness and decision. In the Senate, on the 6th of March, Mr. CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, denounced it as "a war document, intended to provoke a collision with the South." Dispatches of the 5th of March to the New York *Tribune* and other Northern journals, from Montgomery, Ala., Richmond, Petersburg, Alexandria and Staunton, Va., Louisville, Ky., Nashville, Tenn., Raleigh, Wilmington and Goldsborough, N. C., Charleston, S. C., Jackson, Columbus and Vicksburg, Miss., and New Orleans, La., pronounced it "a virtual declaration of war against the seceded States"; declared that, "if its positions are sustained by the people of the United States, collision and civil war are inevitable"; that it "was received with indignation," and "creates intense excitement"; that "it is considered a very silly production"; that "its doctrines would reduce the South to the unquestioned dominion of the North"; that "the policy indicated toward the seceding States will meet the stern and unyielding resistance of the united South"; that "Tennessee will fight it to the bitter end"; that South Carolina is "content to leave Mr. LINCOLN and the Inaugural in the hands of JEFFERSON DAVIS and the Congress of the Confederate States"; and so on, to the end of a chapter too long to be recited here. Even those who claimed to be Unionists, at the South, were by no means united in approval of the Address. The (Union) Alexandria (Va.) *Gazette* said it "was not such as we wished"; a dispatch from Staunton said, "the Union men say little, but evidently are disappointed"; from Petersburg, that "hundreds hitherto for the Union avowed boldly for revolution if the Convention does not immediately pass the secession ordinance"; from Raleigh, N. C., that "the Inaugural was favorably received by the Unionists, though they do not approve of all of it"; and from Louisville, Ky., that "the Union men are rather favorably impressed."

At the North, it was warmly commended by the Republican press generally, and to some extent found favor among the "Democrats," those, at least, of the Douglas wing. DOUGLAS himself defended it in the Senate, against the attacks made upon it there; contending that it was "far more conciliatory than he had expected, and evinced a friendly purpose which would lead to pacification if properly met." The New York *Tribune* spoke of "the almost universal satisfaction with which it is received," and bestowed unqualified praise upon its "sagacity" and "courage" and "firmness," and other admirable

qualities. The *Albany Evening Journal* pronounced it "sound, conservative and patriotic," and declared that "it is universally conceded to be alike clear, compact and impressive; equally firm and conciliatory." The *Buffalo Courier* (Democratic) was, "on the whole, gratified with the tone and temper of the Address. It is moderate, decided, and not without positive merit. Mr. LINCOLN has wisely not attempted to satisfy either the radicals of his own party or the secessionists." The *Chicago Democrat* could "give the document its unqualified admiration." A dispatch from Rochester, N. Y., said "the Democratic organ gives it a qualified approval." In Hartford, Ct., "many leading Democrats" did "not hesitate to speak well of it." And of the same sort was the testimony from other places. But it must not be supposed that Northern "Democracy" was by any means unanimous in even a "qualified approval of the Address." The *Pennsylvanian*, of Philadelphia, called it "discreditable, unworthy of the President, a weak declaration of war against the seceded States, a tiger's claw concealed under the fur of Sewardism." The *Albany Atlas and Argus* condemned it as "weak and rambling," and as "inviting civil war"; also accused the President of "usurpation," and of "placing himself on the platform of the higher law, instead of the Constitution," in his denial that the decisions of the Supreme Court bind Congress and the Executive. The *Chicago Times* came to "the conclusion that Mr. LINCOLN has resolved to force his doctrine upon the country at the point of the bayonet"; that "the Union is lost beyond hope"; and that, "if the message is carried out in good faith, there must be civil war within thirty days." And such seems to have been the prevailing tone of the organs of sham Democracy, still hoping, doubtless, to profit by the still hoped-for ascendancy of the Slave Power. Of course, we are not obliged to believe, from their talking in this way, that they were such utter simpletons as not to see what was so plain to every intelligent observer—the absurdity of supposing that Mr. LINCOLN's tame and guarded words provoked to civil war; or that anything he could have said or done, short of complete and unconditional surrender to the slave-drivers, would have averted that calamity, now that BUCHANAN's imbecility, or worse, and the treachery of his Cabinet, had so fully prepared the way and provided the means for it. But the responsibility must be fixed somewhere, and, as putting it where it belonged would bring it nearer to themselves than they desired, they charged it upon Mr. LINCOLN all the same as if his tone had been fully up to the demand of the occasion.

CONGRESS.

At the date of our last Report, Congress was still in session, chiefly employed in "agitating" the subject of slavery. In that employment it persisted till the session closed. For about three weeks of the remaining time, the Senate continued the debate on Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS's resolutions; which, it will be remembered, as given in substance in our last Report, page 240, set forth the creed of the Pro-Slavery Extremists, claiming for slavery, in effect, the right to rule hereafter more despotically, if possible, than it has done heretofore. In a speech upon his resolutions, Mr. DAVIS held that they "were little more than a mere announcement of the principles of the Constitution." He would not argue about natural and inherent rights, but would plant himself on the Constitution, which all have sworn to support. * * * This was not a government of one people, but a compact between separate sovereignties. The States could at any time resume the powers which they had delegated to the Government. No power was given to the General Government to coerce the States. Congress had no power to forbid slavery in the Territories, and therefore could not give such a power to its mere agent, the Territorial Legislature. This could not now be considered a judicial question, for it had already been decided by the chosen umpire, that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature has the power to impair the right of property. But non-intervention, as formerly understood, did not deny the right of Congress to legislate in regard to slavery. If the Territories should interfere with the right of property, Congress was bound to protect it. Congress could not abdicate its powers. He only asked that the Constitutional rights of the Southern States should be respected. The determination of the South to maintain her equal rights is tortured into a menace. It was not a threat, but a warning to prevent what was dreaded, not desired.

Mr. BROWN wished to add a resolution, affirming that experience has already shown the need of legislation by Congress to protect slave property in the Territories, and it is therefore now the duty of Congress to interpose for that purpose.

Mr. CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, on the other hand, moved a resolution that "the existing condition of the Territories does not require the intervention of Congress for the protection of property

in slaves." He approved most of Mr. DAVIS's speech, but favored the doctrine of non-intervention, and read from the Kansas-Nebraska Act, to show that Congress meant to abrogate all power to establish, protect or prohibit slavery in a Territory. Even if the Dred Scott decision had asserted the power of Congress to protect slavery in the Territories, there was no occasion to exercise the power. He commended the magnanimity of Northern Democrats in repealing the Missouri Compromise, so as to put all parties in the Territories on an equal footing, and regarded it as a compromise which should be respected. He thought the adherence of the Democratic party to the Cincinnati Platform was no cause of dissolution, and regretted the withdrawal of the Southern delegates at Charleston. It was time for the Democracy to close up their ranks, and unite their energies to overcome the common enemy.

Mr. BENJAMIN, of Mississippi, could not acquiesce in the views of Mr. CLINGMAN. As to the Cincinnati Platform, two opposite interpretations were known to be put upon it. It was avowed repeatedly at Charleston, that if it were so construed that it should be clearly understood that slave property should be protected in the Territories, and that the party denied the right of the Territorial Legislature to interfere with slavery, no Northern State could be carried on that ground. Hence opposite interpretations in relation to Southern rights under the Constitution were avowed by men professing to be Democrats. He thought it dishonorable to go before the people with the avowed purpose of presenting opposite interpretations of the platform in the two sections of the Confederacy, as the principles of a common party. Expediency is the worst of all possible policies, when principle is to be sacrificed to it. He concurred in the praise bestowed upon Northern Democrats, but would confine it to the true men, and them alone, not give it to those who, by indirection, would break down the principles he upheld. He had no choice between a man who would deny his rights, openly and fairly, and one who admits them, but intends to deprive him of them. The people of his State would come back to the Democratic fold, if they could get a platform acknowledging their rights and a man pledged to uphold those rights; but if not, they would not be the only ones out.

Mr. DOUGLAS argued, at great length, in favor of his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, citing copiously from the resolutions of Conventions and the acts of Congress, to prove that it had long been the established doctrine of the Democratic party. He was for

“non-intervention by Congress, and no restriction upon the Territorial Legislature, then leaving it to the Court to decide whether the Territorial enactments were Constitutional or not.” Messrs. MASON, HAMMOND, WIGFALL and others asserted the right of slavery to Federal protection in the Territories. Mr. IVERSON, of Georgia, wished to go still further, and assert the duty of Congress to provide for such protection, in organizing the Territories, but would vote for Mr. DAVIS’s resolutions, “as the best that could be got.” Mr. TOOMBS went into the history of the Government of the Territories from the beginning, to show that Popular Sovereignty in them had never been recognized, not even in the Kansas-Nebraska Act. That Act, he contended, “was intended to prevent intervention against slavery.” The Dred Scott decision “sustained to the fullest extent the right of slavery to protection in the Territories.” Mr. CRITTENDEN, of Kentucky, dissented from the resolutions, and advocated “peace and quiet. All parties had been wrong, and contributed to the mutual irritation. He had, all his life, held that Congress had power to exclude slavery from the Territories. If the Supreme Court had decided otherwise, he could not yet concur with them, but, on the ground of that decision, would vote for such of the resolutions as touch that point.”

At length, on the 25th of May, the vote was taken. Mr. BROWN’s amendment was rejected by 43 to 5. Mr. CLINGMAN’s was adopted by 26 to 23, through the aid of Republican votes; but on motion of Mr. WILSON, of Massachusetts, it was reconsidered with the same aid, and was then rejected; the Republicans, though approving it as an independent proposition, not wishing to be responsible for any of the resolutions, as taken in connection with the series, since they had failed to procure the adoption of amendments affecting any principle announced in them. A motion of Mr. HARLAN, of Iowa, to so amend the resolution denying the right of citizens of the Free States to attack slavery, that it should concede the right of free speech and press, and of free discussion on the morality of slavery, had already been voted down by 36 to 20; as had also, by 31 to 17, a motion by Mr. TRUMBULL, of Illinois, to so amend the resolution touching “the Constitutional right of any citizen of the United States to take his slave property into the common Territories,” as to make it say “there is no Constitutional right to take and hold slaves in the Territories”; and, by 33 to 9, a motion of Mr. WILSON, of Massachusetts, to substitute, for the resolution affirming the right of a

Territory, when about becoming a State, to maintain or prohibit slavery within its bounds, one declaring that "slavery is against natural right, and can exist only by local law, that the Constitution does not create nor establish it, nor authorize Congress to do so, nor guarantee the right to take slaves into and hold them in a Territory; but, slavery being wrong and prejudicial to the rights and interests of freemen, it is the duty of Congress to prevent its extension into the Territories." Finally, the resolutions were adopted in the shape in which Mr. DAVIS originally offered them, some by 35, some by 36 yeas, against from 2 to 20 nays.

Our last Report left the JOHN BROWN affair and the cases of MESSRS. HYATT and SANBORN still pending before the Senate. On the 7th of June, that of Mr. SANBORN was virtually dropped, by the Senate's discharging the Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of Mr. SANBORN's petition against being required to appear before the Harper's Ferry Committee. On the 28th of May, Mr. DIXON, of Connecticut, attempted ineffectually to procure for Mr. HYATT permission to go anywhere within the city of Washington. Remonstrances against keeping him imprisoned were from time to time presented to the Senate. The offering of one of these, from a number of highly respectable citizens of Connecticut, by Mr. SUMNER, of Massachusetts, was made the occasion for a characteristic exhibition of rudeness and insolence, by one of those Northern sycophants of the Slave Power, whose officious zeal in its behalf is so well fitted to excite the abhorrence of freemen and the contempt of tyrants. Mr. FITCH, of Indiana, fraudulently holding one of the senatorial seats belonging to that State, objected to the reception and reference of the petition, because Mr. SUMNER had a few days before presented one from colored citizens of Massachusetts. When Mr. WILSON, with just and dignified severity, rebuked the insult to his colleague and his fellow-citizens, FITCH answered that he "did not class the Senator from Massachusetts in the category of gentlemen," and, having thus relieved his mind, consented, at the suggestion of a slaveholding associate, MASON, of Virginia, to withdraw his objection, and let the petition be referred to the appropriate Committee. On the 15th of June, Mr. MASON made a long Report from the majority of the Harper's Ferry Committee, laboriously but fruitlessly endeavoring to fasten upon the Republicans and Abolitionists the responsibility for JOHN BROWN's enterprise. Not that he ventured to charge that, as was at first pretended, others beside the open

participants were actually engaged in it, for the hoped-for facts to sustain that charge could not be found; but then, it had come of the doctrines taught by these anti-slavery fanatics, and so was really their doing. In a "clear and conclusive" minority "Report," said the New York *Tribune's* Washington correspondent, "Mr. COLLAMER answered and exploded this reasoning very effectively." The Committee also made a Report discharging Mr. HYATT from custody, on which Mr. SUMNER spoke briefly and forcibly, welcoming with pleasure "this act of justice to a much-injured citizen," and ably "exposing the injustice which he had received" from the Senate. The Report was unanimously agreed to, and Mr. HYATT went free without the slightest concession on his part,—substantially victor in the contest he had so nobly maintained. Mr. MASON, for the majority of the Committee, sought to salve its wounded dignity by recommending that the petitions of colored men of Massachusetts for the release of Mr. HYATT be returned to the mémorialists. Mr. DOOLITTLE, for the minority, reported, affirming the right of petition as undeniable to any. Finally, the Committee was, at its own request, discharged from further consideration of the matters referred to it, having accomplished nothing of all it had appeared to aim at. Said a Washington correspondent of the Northern press, commenting on this inglorious ending of its half-year's work, "a more flagrant failure, after so sounding a manifesto, never before occurred." But subsequent events have shown, we think, that there was a purpose, not avowed, and which did not wholly fail,—i. e., the purpose to inflame still more the hostile feeling of the South toward the North, and thus help on the ripening of the meditated treason.

Our last Report mentioned the passage, by the House of Representatives, of a bill for the admission of Kansas. On the 30th of May, it was taken up in the Senate, and an earnest effort was made by the Republicans to pass it; but the Democratic majority succeeded in postponing it from time to time, by almost strictly party votes, only three or four Democratic votes being given against delay, and thus the session ended without final action on it. It came up, however, at the next session, and, on January 21st, 1861, was passed, with an unimportant amendment, by 36 to 16. On the 28th, the House concurred in the amendment, and the bill, soon after, receiving the President's assent, Kansas became a member of the Union. Thus was completed, after a long and at times terribly severe conflict, another victory over the Slave Power. It was in the debate on

this bill that Mr. SUMNER made, on the 4th of June, his masterly speech on the "five-fold barbarism" of slavery; one of the most scathing exposures of its abominations ever heard in Congress, and which had the immediate effect to draw from a prominent representative of that barbarism, Mr. CHESNUT, of South Carolina, such a coarsely abusive rejoinder as aptly illustrates the unanswerable argument. On the 25th of June, Mr. SUMNER presented petitions from citizens of Massachusetts for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and the prohibition of the inter-State slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia. They were laid on the table, and we do not learn that any action was taken upon them.

On the 10th of May, 1860, Mr. BINGHAM, of Ohio, reported, from the Judiciary Committee of the House, a bill to annul the infamous slave-code of New Mexico; and, in spite of the opposition of the Southern members and the Democrats from the North, aided by ELI THAYER, a renegade Republican from Massachusetts, the bill was passed by 97 to 90. In the Senate, an amendment was moved, to abolish the laws of Kansas prohibiting slavery, which, however, was not carried; but the bill, for want of final action on it in the Senate, failed to become a law. May 11th, the House Committee on Territories reported bills to organize five new Territories, with a proviso excluding slavery from them. They were defeated by majorities varying from 13 to 29, a dozen Republicans, including THAYER, going with the pro-slavery majority, probably against the will of most of their own constituents. THAYER maintained, as the ground of his opposition, that the people of the Territories ought to be allowed to govern themselves. A few weeks later, he proposed to bring in a bill in accordance with that doctrine; but his motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of introducing it, though sustained by a majority of the members from the Free States, was rejected by 91 to 59; nearly every Democrat from the Slave States voting against it, contrary to what the mover had been given to expect. It was plain that, however willing they were to encourage and take advantage of divisions among their adversaries, they meant to favor no policy which would leave the Territories the least chance to protect themselves from slavery.

Of the second session of Congress, from December 3d, 1860, to March 4th, 1861, we have already given briefly, in our sketch of "Attempts to Compromise," the substance of the proceedings, so far as they bear upon the slave question.

IN THE STATES AND TERRITORIES.

In the several States, also, during the past year, the "irrepressible conflict" went on with varying results, the Right now making with strenuous effort a forward step toward its predestined triumph, and now the Wrong with obstinate resistance checking its advance, or even seeming to turn the tide of battle backward for the moment. Our space permits us to recite but a few incidents of the ubiquitous and unceasing struggle. Of the attempts, in nearly every instance happily unsuccessful, to repeal the Personal Liberty Bills, we have already spoken. In the State elections in most of the Northern States, the Republicans prevailed by large majorities; though the union of opposing parties in several of them carried so many Congressional districts against them that, but for the Southern secession, they could have carried no measure by their own strength in Congress.

In New Hampshire, at the last election for Governor, they did themselves the credit of nominating a man long known as an Abolitionist, and electing him by nearly four thousand majority, against the combined and desperate efforts of the sham-Democrats and Bell-Everett "conservatives," who hoped to make large gains out of the fears which they expected the Southern movement to excite.

In Massachusetts, last fall, the "Radical" wing of the Republican party prevailed in the selection of a candidate for Governor, in choosing whom, by an overwhelming majority, the old Commonwealth put in her chair of State a man of more decided anti-slavery sentiments than has occupied it before, since the agitation of the slave question began. The equal right of colored men, before the law, was upheld by the Superior Court, in a case tried in Middlesex County last September, in which a colored citizen of Lowell recovered \$200 damages, on account of having been forcibly taken from a public concert to which he had bought a ticket. The Legislature, happening to be in special session at the time of Mr. SUMNER's great speech in the Senate, availed itself of the opportunity to pass resolutions demanding, in the name of the people of the Commonwealth, freedom of speech for her representatives in the National Legislature, and promising to uphold them in the proper exercise of that right; thanking Mr. SUMNER "for his recent manly and earnest assertion of the right of free discussion on the floor of the United

States Senate"; approving "the thorough, truthful and comprehensive examination of slavery, embraced in his recent speech," and declaring that "the stern morality of that speech, its logic and its power, command our entire admiration, and that it expresses with fidelity the sentiments of Massachusetts upon the questions therein discussed." A resolution of thanks was also passed to Senator WILSON, "for his able, fearless, and always prompt defence of the great principles of Human Freedom, while acting as a Senator and a citizen of the Old Bay State." At the regular session, last winter, when it was determined to send commissioners to the "Peace Congress," invited by Virginia, the colored citizens of Boston sent in a memorial asking the Legislature "to instruct the commissioners to vote against every proposition having in view the disfranchisement of the colored citizens of the Commonwealth." The Committee on Federal Relations, to whom it was referred, in the House, reported a resolve substantially in accordance with its prayer; an amendment was offered, favoring the compromise measures proposed by CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS; but when, February 12th, the resolves came up by special assignment, the whole subject, on motion of the proposer of the amendment, was laid on the table. Some movement was made in the House, looking to the adoption of measures for the protection of citizens of Massachusetts travelling in the South; but nothing seems to have come of it. In the Senate, the Committee on Federal Relations reported "leave to withdraw," on the petitions for a law against slave-hunting. On the 5th of April, the House unanimously passed a resolution, on the petition of fifty-four mercantile houses trading with Hayti, instructing the Massachusetts Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence to obtain the recognition of Haytien independence. In consequence of the failure of the Mayor of Boston to use his police force effectively in suppressing a mob which disturbed the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and, with the Mayor's help, cut short its public sessions before the completion of its business, an attempt was made, but without success, to procure the passage of a bill giving the appointment of the police of that city to the State. A majority of the Joint Committee of the two Houses to which the subject was referred, in reporting against the proposed legislation, said that "a fleeting public impulse, finding vent in isolated acts of violence, does not constitute such an exigency" as would justify it, but that "then, and not till then, will it be proper, when it shall appear that freedom of

speech within legal limits is habitually and systematically refused; that an intelligent and upright minority has lost all reasonable hope of maintaining its rights against a brutal or corrupt majority." A minority of the Committee were in favor of the measure, as a "step demanded for the preservation of free speech and a free press, and in order that the criminal law of the Commonwealth, intended to restrain vice and encourage virtue, may not be evaded or openly violated with impunity." They reported a bill in accordance with their views, but the Senate rejected it, by 21 to 7, and we are not aware that it came to a vote in the other House.

Governor MORGAN, of New York, in his annual message to the Legislature, on the first of January, counselled "patience, calmness, conciliation and fraternal affection" toward the South; "but there should be no surrender of important rights, nor sacrifice of vital principles." Without any definite recommendation on the subject, the tone of the message was on the whole adverse to any scheme of compromise which would permit the extension of slavery into any of the Territories. It favored, however, the repeal of the Personal Liberty Laws; gave assurance "that the people of this law-abiding State would in no case suffer their agents in the State or Federal Government to invade any Constitutional right or privilege of the Slave States, but stand as ready to guarantee those rights as to defend their own," and recommended that "the Legislature give such new and solemn utterances to these convictions as shall assure the people of all the Southern States that all their rights under the Constitution and laws will, on the part of the people of this State, be respected and maintained inviolate." Early in the session, a Mr. TOWNSEND, of Queen's County, introduced, in the Assembly, a bill to authorize the holding of slaves in the State for nine months at a time, by sojourners from other States, but we do not learn that any action was taken upon it. In the same House, on the 3d of January, a resolution was introduced, which was supported by the Democrats—a small minority of the House—recommending the division of all the Territories into two States, and that the question of slavery in them be left to the people of each respectively. It found no favor with the majority. On the 21st of March, the Governor received from the President a copy of the resolution of Congress, proposing to amend the Constitution so as to forbid any future amendment empowering Congress to abolish slavery in the States. In transmitting it, the same day, to the Legislature, the Governor earnestly recommended

the adoption of the resolution, as one "which will commend itself to the judgment while it conforms to the sentiment of the people of the State. New York is unqualifiedly in favor of extending any proper Constitutional guaranty desired by her sister States against the exercise of any power to interfere with or abolish the domestic institutions therein." Moreover, "such an amendment would be accepted by the Border States as an earnest of the good faith of the Northern States to preserve for them, for all time, their Constitutional rights." But the Legislature did not see fit to comply with the Governor's advice, and the State was saved from perpetrating that piece of gratuitous folly.

At the election, last fall, the vote was taken on the proposition, mentioned in our last Report as having been submitted by the Legislature to the people, for so amending the State Constitution as to give the colored people an equal right of suffrage with the whites. Shortly before the election, the colored people, through an able Committee, issued an eloquent and forcible appeal to their white fellow-citizens, in behalf of their just claim; but it proved unavailing. The great State of New York, with its fifty thousand Republican majority, refused, by 140,000 majority, to do justice to its colored citizens. The vote stood 197,503 for, 337,984 against the righteous measure. Some progress, however, has been made since the last similar attempt, which was in 1846. Though the opposing majority is a trifle larger than it was then, it is much smaller in proportion to the whole vote. Then the vote for equal rights was a minute fraction less than 28 per cent. of the whole; now it is about the same fraction less than 37 per cent. Or, to state the comparison in another way, the vote for equal rights is now 231 per cent. of what it was in 1846, and the opposing vote is 150 per cent. of what it was then; the former having gained 131 per cent., the latter only 50. In 1846, ten counties gave majorities for the right; in 1860, seventeen, including eight of the former ten, and nine which went the other way before. In both the two counties which changed for the worse, the loss to the right was only 1835 votes; while in a single one—Cayuga—of the nine which changed for the better, the gain was 5131; in another, Chenango, 3135; and in every one quite considerable. In the rural districts generally, an encouraging growth of right sentiment appeared. It was mostly in the cities and large towns, where the proportion of ignorant and degraded men among the voters is the largest, that the vote against equal right of suffrage had most of its in-

crease. From a comparison of the vote for President with that on the suffrage question, it is manifest that while the mass of the majority for continued injustice was made up of the sham-Democracy and its "Conservative" allies, it received considerable accessions from the Republican ranks; a fact unfortunate enough for the injured colored citizens, but far more so for those Republicans in name who showed so little appreciation or respect for Republican principles.

The Legislature of New Jersey met on the 8th of January. The Governor in his message recommended the adoption of a resolution inviting delegates from all the States to "meet and endeavor to agree upon terms by which the Union may be saved." The Legislature conformed to the spirit of the recommendation, by sending delegates to the "Peace Congress" called by Virginia; also adopted resolutions, by 11 to 6 in the Senate, and 31 to 11 in the House, declaring the Crittenden Compromise "acceptable to the people of New Jersey," and requesting the Senators and Representatives of the State in Congress to support it; also requesting Congress to call a Convention to propose amendments to the Federal Constitution. The Republican members of both Houses either refused to vote, or voted against these resolutions; but proposed and unanimously supported, instead of them, a series affirming their willingness to unite with the true friends of the Union in the South, in a final settlement of existing difficulties, on the basis of a sacred guaranty that no branch of the Federal Government shall interfere with the domestic institutions of any of the States; a prompt repression of all armed invasions of any State or Territory, and the speedy punishment of all engaged in such attempts; a faithful execution of the clause of the Constitution relating to fugitives from service or labor, and of all laws passed in pursuance thereof, and the repeal of all State laws intended to prevent such faithful execution; also a faithful execution of the clauses entitling citizens of each State to the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States, securing the people against unreasonable searches and seizures, and that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; and an act providing that all the territory south of 36° 30' shall be formed into a State which shall be admitted to the Union with or without slavery as its people shall decide, and in all north of that parallel, slavery shall be forever prohibited.

Governor PACKER, of Pennsylvania, in his annual message on the 2d of January, recommended the repeal of the law of 1847, which

forbids State officers to aid in slave-catching; the revival of the "excellent and well-considered law" of 1826, which *required* them to do so, and of the "ancient policy" of the act of 1780, permitting slaveholders of other States to hold slaves in Pennsylvania while passing through the State, or sojourning therein for six months; and the instructing and requesting of the Senators and Representatives of the State, in Congress, to support an amendment of the Constitution, "extending the old compromise line of 1820 to the boundaries of California." In these recommendations he breathed out his official life. On the 15th of January, his successor, Governor CURTIN, was inaugurated. Of his inaugural counsel we have already spoken. The Legislature, thus amply advised, saw fit to do nothing by way of conciliating the South, but to resolve that the right of secession cannot be acknowledged; that, if the rights of the people of one State are disregarded by those of another, redress can and ought to be provided by the National Government; that the people of Pennsylvania are most fraternal in sentiment toward their brethren of other States, and ready, and ever have been, to coöperate in all measures needful for their welfare, under the Constitution; that they maintain, and ever have done, the Constitutional right of the people of the South to the uninterrupted enjoyment of their own domestic institutions; that it is the imperative duty of the Government to adopt all measures necessary to uphold the authority of the Constitution, and Pennsylvania pledges her faith and power to support such measures; and that plots and warlike demonstrations against the United States, in any part of the country, are treasonable, and the Government should use all needful power to suppress them, without hesitation or delay.

In May last, Governor DENNISON, of Ohio, received a requisition, sent on the 17th of the month, by Governor HARRIS, of Tennessee, demanding, as fugitives from justice, a man and woman charged with negro-stealing, "which is a felony under the statute law of Tennessee." Governor DENNISON refused to surrender them, because,—as he said, in reply to a letter from Governor HARRIS, asking "what defect, in your opinion, vitiates the requisition,"—the crime of negro-stealing, not being known to either the common law or the criminal code of Ohio, is not contemplated by the Constitutional provision for the surrender of fugitives from justice. That the real object of the demand was rather to make occasion for complaint against Ohio, and to embitter still more the Southern feeling against the North, than

to procure the rendition of the fugitives, is evident from this, that it might have been based on another charge against them—of a theft of jewelry—on which no objection would have been made to giving them up; and that, in fact, when, upon failure of the first requisition, a second was sent, based on the latter charge, Governor DENNISON immediately issued his warrant for the arrest of the offenders. The man was arrested and sent back to Tennessee on the 2d of June, but the woman was not found. From the statements we have seen, it appears to have been really a case of “negro-stealing,” and not like so many called by that name, of helping slaves to escape from bondage. According to the *Memphis Appeal*, of May 27th, the man stole the slaves from his wife, whose “separate property” they were, and, taking also her jewelry, eloped with the woman, sold the slaves in Virginia, and went thence to Ohio. It was manifestly, therefore, no desire to shield the criminals from punishment which influenced Governor DENNISON in his refusal of the first demand; but a belief that he had no legal right to comply with it, and that to do so would establish a most pernicious precedent.

But neither his reasons for refusing the first, nor his prompt compliance with the second, appeased the displeasure of his brother Governor; or rather, the refusal had given the latter the very occasion he had sought, and of which he went on to make the use he had no doubt premeditated. On the 12th of June, he wrote a long rejoinder to Governor DENNISON, laboring to prove the Constitutional validity of his first requisition, and complaining, at the close, that “already much has been done calculated to produce alienation and distrust. Day by day confidence is lessening in the power of mere Constitutional guaranties to protect the rights of the citizen, or the States, because one by one of the guaranties of the Constitution have been shaken or totally disregarded, until it has become the imperative duty of every patriot to rebuke rather than pander to the dangerous fanaticism of the times.” All which is unquestionably true, we think, with an application exactly opposite to that which he intended. The *Memphis Appeal*, not being restrained by the etiquette of official position or the requirements of official dignity, uttered its real or simulated indignation in more emphatic terms, denouncing Governor DENNISON’S act as “one of the most atrocious outrages and most flagrant violations of the Constitutional comity between the States ever perpetrated; an aggression upon the rights of Tennessee which calls for the severest remedial action, in order to obtain indemnity for

the past and security for the future'; a high-handed usurpation of power, and a nullification of the Federal Constitution." It called Governor DENNISON a "negro-stealing Governor," and assured "the Northern States" that they "must hurl such fellows from power, or consequences fatal to the longer existence of the Union are inevitable."

Governor DENNISON having also refused compliance with a requisition from Kentucky for a man who had aided a slave's escape, Governor MAGOFFIN entered a suit in the United States Supreme Court to compel the rendition of the alleged fugitive, but with what result does not yet appear. In his message to the Legislature, on the 7th of January, Governor DENNISON explained his course in regard to these requisitions; also suggested that a repeal of the offensive provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law would induce a repeal of the Personal Liberty Laws; but insisted also that "the Southern States should repeal their laws in contravention of the Constitutional rights of citizens of Free States, who, determined to do no wrong, will not contentedly submit to any wrong." The Legislature, on the 12th, passed a series of joint resolutions in general agreement with the sentiments of the message.

In Indiana, we hear of some attempts to enforce the infamous enactment against the free colored people which disgraces the statute book of that State; but which, from what we read in connection with accounts of these recent attempts, seems not to have been very rigidly executed hitherto. A handbill posted, on the 28th of August, in Evansville, signed "The Vigilance Committee," complains of "the laxity exhibited by the authorities and citizens" of that place, touching this matter, while "other cities and towns in Indiana are expelling the negroes from them"; and threatens summary dealing, by the committee, with any negro found in the city after five days, and not by law entitled to a residence therein.

On the 30th of January, a bill was brought before the Illinois House of Representatives, for the repeal of the "Black Laws" of that State, but, though the Republicans had a small majority of the House, it was laid on the table by 52 to 16. On the 2d of February, a series of resolutions was introduced in the Senate, and passed by 13 to 10, asking the Governor to appoint commissioners to the Virginia "Peace Convention," not as approving the basis of settlement proposed by Virginia, but as showing a willingness to join in an effort to adjust the present controversy; and suggesting that the

proper method of acting on the alleged grievances of the South would be a call for a Convention to amend the Constitution.

In Wisconsin, at the date of our last Report, the conflict between the State and Federal Courts over the case of SHERMAN M. BOOTH was still undecided. BOOTH was imprisoned in the Custom House at Milwaukee, treated, we are told, with great severity. Reports having reached him, that it was said he "could be released for the asking," he wrote, on the 28th of June, a spirited letter to the Milwaukee *Free Democrat*, touching the conditions on which liberty was offered him. Leading Democrats in the city, he said, had petitioned for his release, but Attorney General BLACK replied, that the petition "could not even be considered" till he should ask for pardon. Delegates to the Charleston Convention called, on their way, upon the President, and interceded for him; and one of them wrote back, as the result of the interview, that "the President will remit his fine when he will own that he did wrong in breaking the laws, and promise to do better hereafter, and not till then." He refused to do this, because, as he truly and forcibly said, the Supreme Court of the State had decided that the Act under which he was convicted was no law, and had discharged him from the sentence of the United States District Court, and thereby pledged the authority of the State to protect him against it; the Governor, in his annual message, had approved the decision, and pledged the power of the State to enforce it; the Legislature had sided with the State Court, and forbidden, under pain of fine and imprisonment, the reimprisoning, for the same cause, of a person discharged by *habeas corpus*; and therefore he could not confess to have done wrong, or broken the law, without not only sacrificing his own most cherished convictions, but surrendering "the glorious position in behalf of freedom assumed and maintained for five years by the State of Wisconsin." Shortly after this, according to the *Free Democrat*, he was denied all writing materials, besides being subjected to much rigor in other respects.

In the latter part of July, his friends again applied on his behalf to the Supreme Court of the State for a writ of *habeas corpus*, on grounds somewhat different from those of the former application, mentioned in our last Report; but, as before, failed through disagreement of two of the three judges, and refusal of the third to act because he had been counsel in earlier stages of the case. This result having shut out all hope of release by regular, legal forms, another method was employed. In the words of the *Free Democrat*, "the

People's writ of habeas corpus was served, * * * if in violation of the forms, certainly not of the spirit of the law." About noon on the 1st of August, while part of the guard were at dinner, ten men, "armed with the consciousness of doing a noble act,"—and some if not all of them with revolvers besides—went to the Custom House, took out BOOTH and locked in his keeper, conducted the rescued prisoner openly along the street to a friend's house, before the face of the United States Marshal LEWIS, and through a speedily gathered and generally applauding crowd; and a carriage which was in waiting for him soon conveyed him out of the city. Speeches justifying the rescue were made to the crowd, and were heartily cheered. Said a correspondent of the *New York World*, "all seemed to enjoy the thing except the officials." The Marshal immediately offered a reward of \$100 for the rearrest of BOOTH, who, without trying to conceal his movements, went directly to Waupun, his father's place of residence; staid there two days, and addressed a large public-meeting on the evening of the 3d; thence went to Ripon, and there spoke in a public hall on the evening of the 4th, and to an immense crowd, in a grove, on the afternoon of the 5th, which was Sunday. A Marshal who attempted to arrest him on the platform, Saturday evening, was somewhat roughly thrust from the hall; a resolution to protect BOOTH, at all hazards, was adopted; and a hundred men, increased on Sunday to three hundred, were enrolled to carry it into effect. The City Hall was offered and accepted as head quarters of these volunteers, armed guards were placed around it, and a committee was sent to warn the Marshals to leave the town, which, however, they declared they would not do till they had arrested BOOTH. When the committee reported the reply of the Marshals, most of the people had left for home, but of those who remained, "seventy-five of the most substantial men" signed a paper saying, "we pledge ourselves to resist unto death all attempts to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act among us, and we solemnly swear before the Most High God, that when called upon to protect each other or any of our fellow-citizens here, we will leave every calling, and rally in defence of our common rights." A letter from BOOTH to the *Free Democrat*, relating these events, declares that resistance even to blood-shedding "is now the settled purpose of the people, to an almost incredible extent. It is not the resolve of wild, reckless men, but of peaceable, staid, sober, religious men, including officers of the church and ministers of the Gospel."

A part of the time while he was in Waupun, BOOTH was a guest of Major HEG, the State Prison Commissioner. Marshal LEWIS, hearing he was there, wrote to Major HEG, "You are hereby required, if said BOOTH is within your prison walls, to surrender him into my custody; and, in case of necessity, to assist me with the police of the prison in executing the laws of the United States." HEG answered that BOOTH "is at present visiting with me, and at his own liberty to go wherever he pleases. As to rendering you any assistance to aid you in his arrest, allow me politely to say, that my force is at present employed in a more profitable and honorable way." On the 27th of August, just at day-break, another attempt was made to arrest BOOTH, at the house of one of his friends, a few miles from Ripon, but it was defeated by a prompt gathering of the people of the region, summoned by swift messengers and the blast of a horn. For nearly two months longer he remained at liberty, but on the evening of October 8th, Deputy Marshal TAYLOR, with an assistant, took him by surprise as he was returning from a political meeting in Berlin, accompanied only by two ladies, and after a brief struggle forced him into a vehicle and hurried him off, before a general alarm could be given. Next morning he was recommitted to his old prison, the Milwaukee Custom House. He continued a prisoner till the 10th of March, when a document remitting the sentence against him was received by Marshal LEWIS from President BUCHANAN, dated on the 2d of that month;—seemingly a sort of political-death-bed act of repentance, on the part of the retiring Chief Magistrate. BOOTH has petitioned the State Legislature for \$20,000, as compensation for the damage he has suffered in contending for what every department of the State Government had asserted, in one form or another, to be his rights. Shortly after the rescue in August, Professor DANIELS, of Ripon, was arrested on the charge of having aided therein, and was bound over, in the sum of \$2000, for trial. One or two others have been arrested on the same charge, but none, we believe, have yet been tried. A bill to modify the Personal Liberty Law of Wisconsin passed the Senate, but was defeated in the House, by 44 to 40.

On the 2d of February, the Legislature of Michigan passed a series of resolutions denouncing the Southern rebellion, and declaring that "concession and compromise are not to be entertained or offered to traitors, while the rights and interests of Union-loving citizens are to be respected in every place and under all circumstances."

The Senate rejected, on the same day, by a tie vote, a proposition for the appointment of Commissioners to the "Peace Convention." On the 11th of March, the House, after a spirited debate, refused, by 48 to 24, to repeal the Personal Liberty Law.

The Act of the Legislature of Maryland to increase the oppression of the free colored people in certain counties of that State, as mentioned in our last Report, was voted on by the people of those counties at the Presidential election, and was rejected "by majorities," says the *Baltimore American*, "amounting almost to unanimity." Returns from nine of the eleven counties show 4,301 affirmative, to 13,789 negative votes—a hostile majority of more than three to one. Somerset, the extreme southwestern county on the eastern shore, is the only one which gave a majority for "the unjust and unchristian law," as the *American* truly calls it. There the vote was 1486 affirmative, to 801 negative. In the more northerly counties of Howard and Kent, the negative majority was, in the former, more than twenty-four to one, and in the latter, nearly twenty to one. In Baltimore county, which gave half as many votes as all the other eight, about seven-eighths were negative. But if these facts are to the credit of Maryland and of its chief city, we have to record another which is far otherwise. The African Methodist Episcopal Conference, whose members live, some in Maryland, and some in the adjoining States, Virginia, Delaware and Pennsylvania, was lately advertised to hold its annual meeting, as usual, in Baltimore; but the recent stirring up of the pro-slavery spirit there moved the Board of Police to forbid the meeting as unlawful, under an old statute which imposes a penalty of \$20 for the first offence, and \$500 for the second, on non-resident negroes coming into the State. It is said that the constitutionality of the statute is to be tested before the Courts.

Some facts of interest in their bearing upon slavery in Maryland are disclosed by the last census. One is, that in 1860 the number of slaves in the State was only five-sixths as large as in 1850, having diminished, in ten years, from about 90,000 to about 75,000. Another is, that in Montgomery county, (adjoining the District of Columbia on the north,) where formerly the land was held in extensive tracts by large slaveholders, it has lately, to a great extent, passed out of their hands,—mainly, doubtless, because slavery has made them too poor to hold it,—and has come into those of small farmers from Pennsylvania, who cultivate it with free labor. In

consequence, during the past ten years, the population of the county has increased 45 per cent., and the value of its property to nearly fourfold. Such hints as these, one would suppose mere worldly wisdom would do well to heed.

A Maryland farmer, holder of fifty slaves, writing to the Baltimore *Patriot*, and taking the census of 1850 as his basis, estimates the capital invested in farm slaves in the State at \$30,000,000, or more; their yearly expenses at \$3,475,450; and the value of the crops they raise at \$3,726,326; leaving the holders only \$250,876 for the interest on their investment;—about five-sixths of one per cent. He thinks “the negro has gained more by being a slave, than we by being his master; we have, in a measure, developed his moral qualities, whereas he has served to check education with us.” By way of illustration, he contrasts New Hampshire, of whose 317,489 white inhabitants, 83,148 were attending school, and only 2,958 adults could not read, with Maryland, where only 60,447, out of a white population of 418,590, were attending school, and 20,815 adults could not read. In the Slave State, about one-seventh of all the white inhabitants attended school; in the Free State, considerably more than one-fourth. In the former, about one in twenty of the adult whites could not read; in the latter, about one in a hundred and seven. Speaking “as a political economist, and not as a philanthropist,” the writer very naturally inferred from such facts as these, that slavery is “inimical to the best interests of every civilized society.”

Last August, South Carolina added another to her oppressive enactments against the free colored people. It requires each free negro to have a guardian, to whom he is to be assessed on the tax list as a slave, and to wear a copper badge, bearing his number. For being without the badge, he is to be fined \$20; for being without a guardian, he is to be publicly sold as a slave. Practically, indeed, it is an act to enslave or banish that class of the people. The latter it has done, in many instances, and the former, it is said, in far more. The *Philadelphia Press* states that “up to November 1st, more than seven hundred and ninety persons departed from the port of Charleston, about one hundred and fifty of whom have arrived at Philadelphia. Of these, two-thirds are trades-people; the men, carpenters, tailors, shoemakers, masons; the females, mantua-makers, milliners, laundresses, and nurses.” *The North American* says, “for the most part, they are quadroons and mulattoes, bred to industrial callings,

and first-class people of their kind. The colored people of the city have extended to them a liberal hospitality, and a hearty welcome." A correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, writing from Philadelphia, on the 8th of November, says, "their light complexion and sober behavior have attracted much attention. Many bring certificates of character and qualification. Many had acquired real estate and other property, but in the haste to get away, were compelled to sell at great loss. All have been suddenly driven from employments by which they gained a living." Thousands, we are told, have left the State, many having gone to the West Indies, and some to Africa.

A correspondent of the *New-Yorker Demokrat*, writing from New Braunfels, Texas, on the 1st of July, gives a copy of an Act passed at the last session of the Legislature of that State. It imposes the penalty of imprisonment in the penitentiary, for terms of from two to seven years, on any free person who shall, in the hearing of any slave, utter words calculated and intended to render him discontented with slavery; or who shall publicly maintain, by speaking, writing, or printing, that masters have no right of property in their slaves; or who shall privately do the same, with purpose to bring slavery into disrepute in the mind of any free inhabitant of the State; or who shall cause to be written, printed or published, or shall knowingly circulate, any writing or picture calculated to produce in slaves a spirit of insubordination, with intent to incite them to rebel. Any free person subscribing for such publication, with intent to use it in violation of the Act, is to be fined not more than \$500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both, at the discretion of the jury. Any postmaster knowing that such publication has been received at his office, through the mail, must give notice to some magistrate, who shall examine it, and if he finds it of the character forbidden in the Act, shall cause it to be burned in his presence. Any postmaster failing of this duty is to be fined not more than \$200.

A letter from Nebraska City, to the *New York Tribune*, dated July 18th, 1860, says that "Nebraska, although conceded to freedom by all parties, has been in truth made slave territory by the insidious policy of the National Administration. * * * The last issue of our Democratic newspaper for this city contained a notice offering '\$1000 reward' for the return of runaway slaves." A letter to the Northampton (Mass.) *Free Press*, dated Omaha, Nebraska, December 14th, states that, "only a few days since, an old negro man was sold on the auction-block at Nebraska City, under an

attachment issued by the District Court, to satisfy a debt incurred by his owner, Judge Holly, who is now at the mines in Western Kansas. The old man was torn from his aged wife and taken into Missouri, to be again sold and taken off to some Southern plantation." Our last Report told of the passage of a bill, by the Territorial Legislature, forbidding slavery in the Territory, and of the veto of it by Governor BLACK. At the last session of the Legislature, the bill was again passed, early in December, and was again returned by the Governor, on the 1st of January, with his veto, on the same grounds as before, and because of "its probable influence in augmenting the excitement existing in the country." On the 5th, it was passed over his veto, says the *New York Tribune*, "by an almost unanimous vote, every Republican, and nearly every Democrat, voting for it. The anti-slavery feeling is so strong in the Territory, that even Democrats dare not stand up in opposition to it."

A vigorous effort was made last winter in the Legislature of New Mexico to repeal the infamous slave code of that Territory. A bill for that purpose was brought in on the 1st of January, and, in spite of a desperate resistance, was carried to the second reading, by a handsome majority. It was, however, finally defeated. But we are assured that the feeling in favor of it is strong among the people. It may be remembered that last year we intimated, on the authority of a letter from New Mexico to the *Vermont Watchman*, that the original adoption of the slave code of that Territory was due to influences emanating from Washington, through the Territorial Delegate in Congress. The justice of this intimation has since been confirmed, by the publication of the note of Delegate OTERO to the Secretary of the Territory, begging him, "at the request of General R. DAVIS, of Mississippi, to draw up an Act protecting property in slaves, and cause it to be passed in our Legislature"; hinting at the "advantage to our Territory" which would result from such a measure, carried by "our party"; and concluding, "as soon as the Act is passed, you will have a copy of the same sent to the principal periodicals of the States for publication, as also to the *New York Herald*." Thus it is evident that the Act, instead of being the work of the people of the Territory, or, properly speaking, done for them, both originated in outside influences and was designed for outside effect. Such is sham-Democratic "Popular Sovereignty."

FOREIGN SLAVE TRADE.

The signs of a purpose at the South to reöpen the foreign slave trade have by no means ceased to show themselves since we last had occasion to speak of them. In the National Democratic Convention at Charleston, last May, Mr. GAULDEN, of Ga., while opposing the course of the Southern extremists and deprecating disunion, avowed himself for Southern States' Rights and the African slave trade; was "proud of the position" he held in representing "the African slave-trade interest of the section" he came from; declared "the slave-trading of Virginia more immoral and unchristian than that which goes to Africa and brings a heathen and worthless man here, makes him a useful man, Christianizes him, and sends him and his posterity down the stream of time to join in the blessings of civilization"; pronounced "the African slave-trader a true missionary and a true Christian"; and advocated the repeal of the laws against the trade, as a means of preserving the Union, "by giving us negroes to populate the Territories," so that "the equilibrium of the two sections will be maintained." Moreover, he "could buy better negroes in Africa for \$50 apiece" than those for which he "had to pay from \$1000 to \$2000 a head" in Virginia. "If any of you Northern Democrats," said he, "will go to my plantation, I will show you some darkies that I bought in Maryland, some that I bought in Virginia, some in Delaware, some in Florida, some in North Carolina, and I will also show you the pure African, the noblest Roman of them all";—from which the obvious inference would seem to be, that the Christianizing and civilizing which American slavery does for the "heathen" makes them worse than it finds them, and that the end of Mr. GAULDEN's argument forgot its beginning. His sentiments, however, were not entirely without Northern sympathy in the Convention. While he was speaking of "the great slave-trading State of Virginia" as "all opposed to the African slave trade," a Dr. REED interrupted him to say, "I am from Indiana, and I am in favor of it." And when he spoke of going to Africa "to buy a savage and introduce him to the blessings of civilization and Christianity," Marshal RYNDERS, of New York, part of whose official duty it is to enforce the law against such enterprises, broke in with, "you can get one or two recruits from New York to join with you." It is said, also, that MOSES F. ODELL, elected to Congress in Brooklyn,

New York, last fall, by the sham-Democrats and their Bell-Everett allies, declared himself, just before the election, in favor of opening the foreign slave trade, and having "the poor benighted Africans brought to this country, to be civilized and Christianized under the beneficent influence of slavery."

Mr. SPRATT, of South Carolina, from whom we quoted on a former page, appears to draw encouragement from the progress which his doctrines are making. "I was the single advocate of the slave trade in 1853," said he, in his letter to the *Charleston Mercury*; "it is now the question of the time." He even hinted that if the Southern Convention, then deliberating on the Constitution of the new Confederacy, should "misdirect or impede the movement," another revolution might be necessary, and would come, to ensure its success, "and it is only for the present actors to determine whether they will contribute or be crushed to that result."

A bill was introduced, last fall, into the Legislature of Georgia, entitled, "For the better protection of importers of apprentices." The Southern newspapers have, from time to time, spoken of the presence of native Africans among the slaves in one place or another, intimating that they were fresh arrivals. The *New Orleans Delta* of July 12th spoke of "the landing of a cargo of Africans right under the nose of Judge CAMPBELL, the most ferocious of all the foes of the traffic," and that, too, just after his "ponderous charge to the Grand Jury, and eloquent exhibition of the horrors of the middle passage," and when "orders had just been given to the United States Marshal to pursue all offenders under the statute," and "Judge JONES's decision, that it was no violation of the Act of Congress to buy negroes which had been imported, had been set aside. In face of all this peril and responsibility, some daring adventurer succeeds in landing a gang of good hands in time for the picking season, which will be a valuable addition to our utterly inadequate force of agricultural laborers." The *Mobile Mercury* of July 23d says that "some negroes who never learned to talk English went up the railroad the other day. There were twenty-five of them, apparently all of the pure, unadulterated African stock." A statement also was current in Mobile and New Orleans, a little earlier, though contradicted by some journals, that, on the 10th of July, "the schooner *Clotilde*, with 124 Africans on board, arrived in Mobile Bay, and a steamboat immediately took the negroes up the river." Referring to this alleged transaction, the *Mobile Register*, of July 14th, said

that "whoever conducted the affair has our congratulations on his or their success, as the case may be, whether the Africans came from the Gold Coast *via* Key West, or whether they made a straight-out trip by the shortest route from their native land. We take it that the trade is, to all intents and purposes, opened — why not? Why should not those who are in want of negro labor import it at a low cost, when they are civilizing and Christianizing a set of barbarians by the same course which redounds to their interest?" The Washington correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press*, writing near the end of last May, spoke of the Government's having "received information that the fishermen of the coast of Florida and South Carolina are in the habit of running over to Cuba, on the pretence of disposing of their fish, and returning with two or three native Africans, bought there at a low figure, which they dispose of, at a great advance, to parties who meet them on the coast, purchase the negroes, and take them into the interior. This gross and notorious violation of law," he continued, "has been going on for some time, and it remains to be seen whether any steps will be taken to arrest it."

A token of the feeling in Savannah, Ga., was given on the 1st of May last, in the rescue of Capt. FARNHAM from the jail where he was awaiting trial on a charge of complicity in the Wanderer case. About dusk in the afternoon of that day, four or five persons, among whom was the notorious LAMAR, entered the jail, took the keys from the jailer's deputy, who was in charge at the time, released the prisoner, and took him in a carriage to the Pulaski House, where his friends surrounded him to protect him from arrest. The *Savannah Republican* says, "the parties engaged in the affair, we believe, make no secret of their complicity, but went about their work with a boldness that shows they were determined to set the law at defiance." Capt. FARNHAM, however, surrendered himself to the authorities the next day, was tried soon after, and escaped conviction by a disagreement of the jury, eleven being for acquittal and only one for conviction. No attempt was made to deny the facts alleged against him, the defence resting wholly on the law of the case. It was contended that Congress has no power to make the slave trade piracy; that slaves are property, not only here, but on the coast of Africa, and Congress cannot make the purchase and importation of them a crime, and can prevent the importation only by imposing a prohibitory duty on them, with penalty for smuggling them in; and that, as Judge MAGRATH held a month before, at the trial of Capt. CORRIE, in the

South Carolina District, as mentioned in our last Report, the Act of Congress forbids not the buying and shipping of slaves in Africa, but solely the seizing of free men there, and carrying them into slavery. This view of the law was of course satisfactory to men who meant to acquit, and wanted only a pretext for doing so. The District Attorney entered a *nolle prosequi* in most of the other cases arising out of the Wanderer's expedition, and we have heard of no conviction in any of those which were prosecuted. A correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, who was in Savannah when FARNHAM was rescued, says that "the late charge of the Court in that city legalizes the trade, but those concerned in it do not care whether it is forbidden or not." But if this sort of pirates so easily escape the penalty of their crime, the vessel employed in it—being tried in another part of the country—was less fortunate. After eight months of litigation, the Wanderer was condemned, about the middle of last June, by the U. S. District Court sitting in Boston, as forfeited for being engaged in the slave trade.

We have already spoken of the clause in the Constitution of the new Southern Confederacy, forbidding the slave trade with any foreign country except the United States. In accordance with it, the Confederate Congress has passed a bill to punish the offence. It provides for confiscating all vessels engaged in or fitting out for it, and for fining from \$1000 to \$5000, or imprisoning from five to twenty years, or both fining and imprisoning, all persons concerned in the trade or fitting out slavers. In view of such facts as we have stated in this and former Reports, it would of course be weakness and not charity to cherish any faith that the law will be enforced, or that its authors expected or meant it should be, unless possibly as a lure to draw the slave-selling States into the rebellious Confederacy. But fidelity to the truth of history requires that the enactment of it should nevertheless be put upon record.

Whatever may be the fate of the project for renewing the direct traffic in slaves between Africa and this country, it is certain that the carrying trade from Africa to other slaveholding regions, by American traders, has been active during the past year to a degree probably never before exceeded. The Key West (Fla.) *Key of the Gulf* stated, in May last, that "when the bark Wildfire [captured April 26th by a United States cruiser] left the African coast, fourteen American vessels were waiting for cargoes of negroes; the bark William had sailed eight days before, with 700 on board, and two

Spanish armed steamers were at the Congo river for cargoes of 1500 each, bound for Cuba." The New York *Tribune* gave a list of eight undoubted slavers, which cleared from the port of New York, for Africa, in May and June. Three of these, it said, "have been stopped, and their cargoes discharged. The evidence of their intentions was sufficient to require bonds, though not considered sufficient to authorize confiscation. They have since gone to sea. If these bonds are ever paid, the sum will be a very small per centage on the profit on a cargo of negroes." A correspondent of the New York *Evening Post*, writing on the 25th of July, enumerated by name thirty-nine American vessels "known to have been in the slave trade during Mr. BUCHANAN'S administration," of which, said the *Post*, "the greater part sailed from this port." A few days later, the same journal contained a further list of "eighty-five vessels fitted out from New York, from February 1859, to July 1860," the writer adding that, besides these, "some half dozen have gone through the Sound, the names of which could not be obtained. Some twenty have been detained under suspicion, and many others have cleared from European and South American ports." The names of owners and captains were given in most instances, with those of the vessels, in these lists. The *Post* well says, that "the number of them justifies the disgraceful phrase of the London *Times*, when it denounced New York as the greatest slave-trading mart in the world. Indeed, it has become so common now for the foreigners who carry on the infamous traffic to make the metropolis their headquarters, that the business is scarcely conducted with secrecy." The New York *Leader*, organ of Tammany Hall Democracy, estimated, on the 26th of May, "that an average of two vessels each week clear out of our harbor, bound for Africa and a human cargo." The New York *World*, a little later, making the same estimate, added that they "take on board from three to six hundred negroes, and, after a quick passage, land them in Cuba." This, it will be seen, would make from thirty to sixty thousand a year taken from Africa to Cuba by vessels from the single port of New York. The New York *Times*, about the first of November, in publishing a letter from Havana concerning the traffic, said, "It is estimated that during nine months of the current year, 30,000 Africans have been landed on the island."

The Greenport (L. I.) *Watchman* of September 8th gives, "as illustrating the boldness and impunity with which the trade is prosecuted," an instance in which, it says, "the vessel engaged was locally

known to many of our readers." The *Montaug*, of Sag Harbor, a clipper ship of 512 tons, celebrated for her speed, and used formerly as a whaler, was bought last spring, ostensibly by a Captain QUAYLE, of New London; who took her to New York, and pretended to fit her out for a whaling voyage. The real director of her outfit, however, was a noted slave-dealer, one MITCHELL, nominally a passenger. The attention of the United States Marshal was called to the suspicious style of her preparations, but "nothing tangible could be found against her, and she was permitted to depart," having been cleared "for North and South Atlantic." In ninety days thereafter, she had completed a voyage to Africa and thence to one of the Windward Islands, north of Cuba, and there landed 1300 Africans; after which she was burnt or sunk by her owners. MITCHELL returned to New York, and boasted that he sold his cargo at auction in the public square of a Cuban city, for \$1000 a head, having first "arranged with certain authorities, for about \$50 a head," for permission to enter them; thus making a clear profit of about \$1,000,000 for the cruise. On the 29th of May, the steamship *City of Norfolk* was seized in New York, on suspicion of a design to engage in the slave trade, but, for some reason, was permitted to escape. The next news from her was by a Caraccas paper of July 21st, announcing that she had sailed for Africa, from a South American port; and the next, by way of Havana, that on the morning of October 1st, a Spanish man-of-war discovered her ashore near Sierra Morena, where "she had landed the night previous 800 as likely negroes as were ever brought from the coast of Africa." But we have not space for further citation of particular instances. A Washington correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, writing on the 1st of August, states it as the opinion of "gentlemen of the Colonization Society" there, "that those engaged in the business have an organization almost like a government, whereby an espionage is kept upon British and American naval vessels engaged in suppressing the trade." And the *Boston Traveller* said, about the same time, "incidentally, we have been informed that a regular fleet of vessels clear from different ports of the United States at the same time, and that distributed among them are stores and water to fit out two or three of them for slavers, and that when the coast is clear, they all combine to aid the selected vessel in receiving stores and slaves with the greatest possible despatch. By these means, seven or eight vessels may be all engaged in the slave trade, without having on board sufficient slave material to convict

any one of them." The New York press distinctly charges complicity in the crime on those whose duty it is to prevent it. "It is idle," says the *Tribune*, "to suppose that these vessels get off without official connivance. The destination and purpose of every one of them are as positively known, in certain quarters, as that the Cunard steamers take mails and passengers to Liverpool, weekly. The lading, provisioning and equipment of this 'blackbird' line differ from all other ships; they are always cleared at the Custom House by the master, or by some firm which at no other time has either local habitation or a name. No excuse ever exists for a mistake, for the moral, if not the legal evidence is always perfect. Yet the guilty always escape, while advantage is sometimes taken of the law to make the innocent suffer. The fault is not in the merchants of New York, for of all the regular and reputable traders to Africa in this city, not one is concerned in the African slave trade. It is carried on by a few well-known persons from abroad, who do not belong to our commercial community, and who rely on the imperfection of the law, and the connivance of its administrators, to make this great port the starting-point of their infamous traffic." The same journal, on the 9th of May, after mentioning the dismissal from service, and the indictment of THEODORE RYNDERS and HENRY MUNN, Deputy Marshals of the United States, accused of having aided, for a bribe of \$1500, the escape of the slaver Storm King, went on to say: "It is not pretended that this is the first case of the kind. There are good reasons for believing that such transactions are of common occurrence." And on the 15th of June, having noticed the slipping off of two "strongly suspected slavers" within the preceding week, it added that "it is somewhat expensive to clear a slaver from this port, but it has ceased to be extra hazardous." And the *Leader* of May 26th, quoted from above, said, "We have received information, which we shall verify and publish as soon as possible, to the effect *that the price for the clearance of a slaver* is as well known to those in the trade as the price of a barrel of pork. It is said that a certain amount of gold is placed in a locker in the cabin; the officers board the ship and search for materials arguing the intention of the vessels to carry slaves. They find the gold — commonly ranging from \$2,500 to \$4,000, according to the size of the vessel. This, the inference being that it is at least part of a sum designed to purchase negroes, the officers confiscate; but failing to find any other evidence of a slave-trading purpose on board, they

merely remove the treasure, and offer no further resistance to the departure of the ship. This was the course said to have been followed by the Deputy United States Marshals who have been dismissed." The *World*, in the article already referred to, declared that although "over 2500 negroes have been taken from slavers this year," yet "the fear of capture, or the risk of suffering the penalty of the law, is so small that, instead of striking terror to the hearts of those engaged in the trade, they seem the more active to make up their past losses. * * * As far as we can learn, the officials whose duty it is to search out and bring to justice the men who flagrantly violate the bond which every vessel is obliged to give before leaving this or any other port in the United States, never trouble themselves with doing this part of their duty."

The number of slavers captured by American cruisers during the year, though small compared to the whole number in the trade, was large compared with that, we believe, of any former year. On the 26th of April, and the 9th and 23d of May, three barks, the *Wild-fire*, *William*, and *Bogota*, were taken off the coast of Cuba, having on board an aggregate of more than 1500 slaves. The capture of the first of these was announced to Congress by the President, on the 19th of May, in a message calling for an appropriation to pay the cost of conveying the liberated slaves to Africa and providing for them temporarily there, and recommending, as it was "probable, judging from the increased activity of the slave trade and the vigilance of our cruisers, that several similar captures may be made before the end of the year," that the appropriation should be "large enough to cover such contingencies," and that the President should be authorized "to enter into a general agreement with the Colonization Society, binding them to receive on the coast of Africa, and maintain for a limited period, all captured Africans who may be delivered to our agent there"; also, that the captor should be required, "in all cases where this may be practicable, to carry the negroes directly to Africa, and deliver them to the American agent there, afterwards bringing the captured vessel to the United States for adjudication." A bill in accordance with these suggestions was reported in the Senate by Mr. BENJAMIN, of Louisiana, from the Judiciary Committee, and finally passed both Houses, but not without considerable opposition. Messrs. DAVIS and BROWN, of Mississippi, in the Senate, and Messrs. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, and PRYOR, of Virginia, in the House, denied the right of

Congress to provide for the temporary support of the recaptured Africans. MESSRS. DAVIS and CRAWFORD moved to strike out all but what related to sending them back. Mr. PRYOR, when asked what he would do with them, said, he would "reduce them to a quasi or moderate condition of slavery,—to the apprentice system." Mr. LEAKE, of Virginia, contended that "the Government had discharged all its obligations, when it liberated the negroes from slavery on shipboard, and landed them on the shores of a free country." Mr. MALLORY, of Florida, in the Senate, moved a substitute for the bill, authorizing the apprenticeship of the negroes for five years prior to their removal to Africa. The object was to enable them to support themselves when they returned. The bill, as passed, made it "lawful for the President to enter into contract with any person or society to receive from the United States, upon the coast of Africa, all negroes, &c., delivered from vessels seized in the prosecution of the slave trade, * * * * and to provide them with comfortable clothing, shelter and provisions for a period not exceeding one year, at a price not exceeding \$100 for each person"; also authorized the President to direct the commanders of armed vessels of the United States, when practicable, to proceed directly to the coast of Africa, and there deliver to the agent of the United States all negroes "captured by them from slave ships," and "afterward bring the vessels and persons engaged in the slave trade to the United States for trial and adjudication." Of the cargoes of the three barks taken in April, only 893 were landed in Liberia, the rest having died at Key West, and on the way thither, and on the voyage thence to Africa. During the summer and autumn, 2843 were taken from the Storm King and Erie, captured in August, the Cora on the 26th of September, and the Bonita near the same time. Fifty died before reaching the Liberian port, and 2793 were landed. So that about 4400 slaves are reported as recaptured within about five months, of whom 3686 were restored to freedom in Liberia. Of the four vessels last named, two at least, the Storm King and Cora, had been previously seized on suspicion, but released because the authorities chose not to find the proof of their criminal intent sufficient to justify their condemnation. Another vessel in like case was the William R. Kibbe, taken in the spring, in the Congo river, with her slave deck partly laid, released because it was thought "there was *hardly* cause enough to detain her"; and again captured on the 23d of July, off the island of Anguilla, having just been abandoned by her officers and crew,

after landing more than four hundred slaves, but in their precipitate flight leaving on board three small boys, who had concealed themselves under the fore-castle floor. The boys were found by the captors, just in time to save them from starvation, and subsequently sent back to Africa. Besides those which we have named, several vessels were taken which had not yet received their human cargo, but against which the proof of slave-trading intent was thought clear enough to require the sending home of ships, officers and crews for trial.

The tender spirits of the slaveholders and those in sympathy with them, as might be expected, were deeply grieved by the disposal made of the recaptured Africans who had been landed at Key West. They seemed to regard it as sheer waste of the bounties of Providence. "When once landed on our shores," said the *Savannah Republican*, "it is true economy and humanity to let them remain, to be incorporated with the thousands of their countrymen who came before them. A law providing for turning them over to the government of the Southern States in which they may be landed, and by them to be disposed of in such manner and to such persons as will insure their comfort and kind treatment, would far better answer the ends of morality and right, than the present mistaken and inhuman policy of our Government." The *Atlanta (Ga.) Confederacy* also warmly condemned their return to Africa. There was even talk of invoking State law to rescue them from the grasp of the Federal Government, and secure for them the blessing of continuance in slavery, and for the South some hundreds of sturdy laborers affirmed to be greatly needed there. The *Wire Grass (Ga.) Reporter* argued that if "the General Government introduces negroes from Africa into a State whose laws forbid such introduction, the State authorities have the legal right to dispose of them as provided by their statutes, the same as if introduced by an individual;" contending that "if it is sound doctrine, as has been ruled in New York, that slaves carried there, though only for transportation, become free, it is also sound doctrine, that a free negro introduced into Florida becomes liable to all the rules and regulations of the State, enacted in that behalf." And plenty of such wisdom was uttered in divers parts of the slave land. The Key West correspondent of the *New York Herald* exclaimed, "As for sending the poor devils back to Africa, who believes in it as a measure of philanthropy? Inquire of these captives whether they wish to return to Africa, the invariable response is

emphatically, 'No.' Their native condition is that of servitude, they are brought up as slaves, they know no better condition, and prefer serving the white man."

Attempts have been made during the year to improve the legislation of the country in regard to the slave trade, but with no decisive results. On the 21st of May, Mr. WELLS, of New York, introduced, in the Federal House of Representatives, a resolution providing for a fine and imprisonment for the purchase of Africans imported into the country in violation of the law for the suppression of the slave trade. Being objected to, it lay over, and we do not learn that anything further was done with it. The same day, Mr. WILSON, of Massachusetts, called up his bill for the more effectual suppression of the slave trade, brought in about two months before, as mentioned in our last Report. In a long and able speech in support of it, he thus summed up its provisions:—"It is proposed, by the enactment of this bill, to construct five steam sloops-of-war for service in the African waters; to release naval officers from any legal responsibilities for the capture of suspected slavers not proved to be slavers by the Courts; to incite the zeal of officers and crews by increasing four-fold the bounty for captures; to send a commissioner to Africa to baffle the schemes of the flesh-jobbers on land and sea; to make the fitting-out of slavers, like the sailing of them, piracy; to facilitate the conviction of the slave pirates of land and sea by changing the penalty from death to imprisonment for life; to make the display of the American flag as a badge of nationality by a not legally registered American ship felony, the penalty of which is imprisonment of the crew and the forfeiture of the vessel; to make the sale of American ships on the coast of Africa illegal, and to require the sellers and purchasers of American vessels in any foreign port—in North or South America, the West India Islands, and the Cape de Verde Islands—to make oath that such vessels are not intended to be engaged in the slave trade; to forbid the abuse of consular sea-letters, by vessels sold abroad, by requiring them to return to the United States for new registers before making voyages to the African coast; and to enlarge the powers and increase the duties of the judicial officers of the United States in the examination of ships intended to sail for the ports of Africa, and in the arrest and examination of colored persons imported in violation of the laws of the country." The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

On the 16th of June, the Naval Appropriation Bill being under

consideration, Mr. WILSON returned to the charge, by moving an amendment to use part of the appropriation for the purchase of three steamers to act in the suppression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa. In the debate which followed, Mr. GREEN, of Mo., denied the right of the Government "to put a police force on the coast of Africa. It had no right to interfere with the slave trade between Africa and Brazil or Cuba, but only to prevent the importation to our own shores." He also seemed to favor putting an end to the treaty with Great Britain in relation to the slave trade. Mr. GWIN, of California, proposed an amendment looking to the abrogation of that treaty. Mr. MASON, of Va., though opposing the amendment, "trusted at the proper time the Government would abrogate that treaty;" and "could not conceive of greater cruelty than sending these Africans back to Africa." Mr. HAMMOND, of S. C., alluding to the bill passed a short time before, for paying "a Society \$100 each to take care of the Africans for a year," said, that by the laws of Liberia, all such Africans are apprenticed to the highest bidder, and the consequence would be, that the Colonization Society would pocket the money. Besides, if the Society did take care of the negroes, he had experience enough to know that ten dollars a year was amply sufficient to support one negro. He thought this plan would only have the effect to increase the trade. Mr. DAVIS, of Miss., "was in favor of abrogating that article of the treaty with Great Britain, which required us to keep a squadron on the African coast, and substituting an armed force to protect the American flag;" not, he doubtless meant, from being abused to shelter the slave trade, but from "visitation" by British cruisers suspecting such abuse of it. He also agreed with Mr. SIMMONS, of R. I., "that we had better civilize these wild Africans before sending them back." Mr. BROWN, also of Miss., "did not believe that any Republican would honestly say that there is any inhumanity in taking these Africans to Brazil, Cuba, and this country. He denied that the South were in favor of opening the slave trade. He was against bringing the wild Africans here to debase the slaves of his or any other State." Both Mr. GWIN's and Mr. WILSON's amendments were rejected, the former by 26 to 19, the latter by 25 to 18. In the House, Mr. BONHAM, of S. C., on the 19th of June, asked, but failed to obtain, leave to introduce a joint resolution substantially the same in character as Mr. GWIN's proposition in the Senate.

The most noteworthy judicial proceedings against the slave trade

which the year has witnessed, are the passing of sentence, on the 5th of October, by Judge SPRAGUE, of the United States District Court in Boston, upon the officers of the slave bark Orion, taken in November, 1859, as stated in our last Report, and the indictment, before Judge NELSON, in the United States Circuit Court, in New York, of the officers of the Erie, mentioned on a former page. The commander of the Orion was sentenced to a fine of \$2000 and two years' imprisonment, his first mate to two years, and his second mate to twenty-one months' imprisonment. The indictments against the officers of the Erie are both for the offence which is punishable with fine and imprisonment, ("voluntarily serving on a vessel engaged in the slave trade,") and for the capital offence, of being themselves engaged in that trade. That the captain of the Cora, confined for a time in one of the prisons in New York, is not also now under indictment, with an almost certain prospect of conviction—so clear, it is said, is the evidence of his guilt—is due to the connivance of a Deputy of Marshal RYNDERS, if not also of the Marshal himself, in his escape.

In a debate in the British House of Commons, on the 8th of June last, a Mr. CAVE called attention to the President's Message of May 19th, respecting the slave trade, "from a passage in" which, "he thought there were signs of an intention on the part of the American Government to act more cordially with Her Majesty's Government in suppressing the slave trade on the coast of Cuba;" and therefore asked the Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government had received any recent communications from the Government of the United States, or intended making any fresh proposals to that Government on this subject?" Lord JOHN RUSSELL, in reply, after speaking of the extent of the Cuban slave trade, "between 30,000 and 40,000 slaves being annually imported into the island," and adding that "at present there were no efficient means of suppressing it," said that "one cause of this want was the jealousy on the part of America of any regulations that could interfere with the free action of American vessels. Another cause was the imperfection of American law. * * * Her Majesty's Government had proposed to the Government of the United States, that by keeping the British and American cruisers in company off the coast of Cuba, one might be prepared for a case where the American flag was hoisted, and the other for a case in which no flag was used. The question was now under the consideration of the American Government, and so far as it had been considered, it seemed to have been favorably received.

As yet, however, no promise had been obtained from the American Government to amend their law, but the statement they made was a very well-founded one, namely, that it was not likely that any proposition for rendering the American laws against slavery more stringent would ever receive the sanction of the Congress of the United States." In conclusion, from comparing "many years ago, when 140,000 slaves left Africa in one year, with the present year, in which the number had been reduced to 50,000," he drew encouragement for the "hope of ultimately obtaining the entire suppression of the trade."

In another speech on the same subject, in the House of Commons, February 26th, he referred to the protection given to slavers by the American flag, and said, that "when we remonstrated, the American Government held that the right of search in time of peace cannot by international law be allowed; and they claimed immunity for their ships, however engaged, from any search by our cruisers. No doubt this flag has covered a vast importation of slaves. * * * * I said, 'if your national pride would not allow an English officer to search vessels belonging to the United States, employ cruisers of your own. If you will not allow British cruisers to put down the slave trade, put it down yourselves, and take all the credit and glory which will attach to the successful extinction of the slave trade. Do it effectually, — do it for the sake of your own character, for the sake of that great republic which I hope may still remain the United States of America.' The President of the United States directed the Secretary of State to tell me that the American Government had already heard enough of these remonstrances on the part of the British Government, and hoped that they would not be continued. My reply was, that the American Government might state what they pleased, but that no declaration or diplomatic remonstrances of others would prevent the British Secretary of State from remonstrating, or from declaring that it was a blot on the United States that they did not effectually suppress the slave trade; that whenever occasion arose, I would repeat the remonstrances against which the American President had protested. A proposal which I should be glad to see adopted, proceeded many years ago from the Emperor Alexander, of Russia, that a joint squadron, composed of ships of various countries, but bearing only one flag, should be empowered by all to search for slavers, and carry the prizes before a court empowered to condemn them. But despairing of being able to get such a suggestion ac-

cepted in its integrity, I proposed that the cruisers of various nations should sail together. But the American Government, I am sorry to say, refused that proposition." From Havana, we learn that the Captain-General of Cuba, in consequence of the recent landing of several cargoes of Africans in various parts of the island, addressed a circular, on the 4th of September, to the Governors of the different districts, assuring them of his determination to prevent, by every means in his power, the continuation of the slave trade, and urging them "to keep the most vigilant watch, in order to avoid any infringement of the laws" against it, within their respective jurisdictions, "with the understanding that the simple fact of a cargo of Africans being landed will be deemed sufficient cause to suspend any public functionary who may not use every exertion, and employ all the means which the laws place at his command, in order to avoid or prevent the said landing, whether it is from neglect or from any other cause, subjecting him beside to the decision of the proper tribunals, in case that his behavior or conduct should give cause to suspect his honesty in such cases." That this warning will outweigh the slaver's customary bribe of a golden ounce for every African tacitly permitted to be landed, is more than, judging from the past, we should venture to affirm.

DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE.

From such items of information as are before us, we infer that a change has begun to come over the aspect of the home traffic in human chattels. In the earlier half of the period since our last Report, the statements of the condition of the market were substantially the same as those of the former year. For example, the New Orleans *Delta* says, that on the 9th of June last, "seventy-nine negroes, ranging in years from thirty-seven to sixty-five, the property of the Internal Improvement Department," [we believe the *t* in the first word of this title is *not* a misprint for *f*,] were sold in New Orleans, at public auction, under a recent statute requiring such sale, and "brought a fraction over \$74,000, which," the *Delta* thinks, "is a very good sale, considering their ages." The "lot" included "two engineers, four blacksmiths, good and tolerable, three pilots, three carpenters, two cooks," &c. The average price, it will be seen, was about \$940. "Terms cash." Another sale of eighty,

ranging from one year to fifty-five, realized an average of about \$1,250, "on terms equivalent to cash." The highest price paid for field hands was, for men ranging from eighteen to twenty-five years, \$1,600 to \$2,000; women, from \$1,400 to \$1,600. The Richmond correspondent of the Petersburg (Va.) *Express*, writing on the 7th of August, mentions "the following extraordinary prices realized at a sale of slaves to day, at Dickinson & Hill's auction mart. A bright girl, aged eleven years, \$1,155; a black girl aged nine years, \$970; three brothers, the first aged twenty-one years, \$1,395; the second, nineteen, \$1,375; the third, seventeen, \$1,380. They were all purchased by a trader." [To a thoughtful mind and a feeling heart, what a volume of terrible meaning is conveyed by this last phrase, "purchased by a trader," when taken in connection with the statement of the ages of these "purchased" boys and girls, and especially in view of the fact that this transaction, so coolly related, as if there were nothing in it to awaken emotion, is but a sample of the every-day business of the Virginian slave-traders, and shows how family ties and affections are respected by this infernal traffic.]

But since the movement has begun to be openly made for a slaveholders' rebellion, the reports of the man-market are less exhilarating to the producers of the "vigintial crop." About the middle of November, when secession was first taking visible shape in the Cotton States, the *Valley Star*, a Democratic paper in Virginia, stated that "No. 1 negroes have already fallen more than 25 per cent., and second and third-rate hands from 30 to 50 per cent;" and ascribed the decline to the "cry of disunion raised by these cotton planters." The Richmond *Whig*, attesting the truth of this statement, added, "Slaves have depreciated in value here in the Richmond market—the largest slave market in the Union—some three or four hundred dollars within a very short period;" and foretold a continuous depreciation, unless threats of disunion should be stopped. A few weeks later, the St. Joseph (Mo.) *Democrat* said, that "within ten days, not less than one hundred slaves have been sold in this vicinity, and shipped South. Their owners are panic-struck, and are glad to sell at low prices." It named a recent instance in which "an excellent housekeeper" was offered for \$900, for whom \$1200 had been offered a year before. The Washington correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard* wrote, on 3d of December, that "people in this region are selling off their slaves rapidly and at panic prices. This is the result of the mere threat of disunion." And these statements might be

abundantly corroborated by others of like character, if, indeed, their intrinsic probability did not render such confirmation needless.

To show the respect for human nature exhibited by slave-dealers in grouping the commodities they wish to sell, we copy part of an advertisement which appeared last spring in a Georgia newspaper. "FOR SALE. Negroes, bacon, flour, corn, groceries, &c. Valuable negroes for cash, or on time. 40,000 pounds choice bacon, including sides, shoulders, and extra hams."

KIDNAPPING.

To speak of the undiminished frequency of the crime of enslaving, by force or fraud, men legally as well as rightfully free, is only to testify the obvious truth, that slavery continues to bear, as heretofore, its own legitimate fruit. In a community trained by constant practice to disregard right, — the proper foundation of all law, and the only stable ground of reverence for law's authority, — many will be sure to learn a practical contempt for the merely artificial rules which legislatures and courts arbitrarily set up in place of genuine law. Of this, the past year's history is as full of illustrations as any of its predecessors.

The first instance which we notice belongs, indeed, partly to the preceding year, as well as partly to this last. About the beginning of December, 1859, JAMES WAGGONER, a colored man born in Ohio, of free parents, was seized in Cincinnati, dragged before a United States Commissioner, pronounced a fugitive slave, taken across the river to Newport, Ky., there kept in jail six months, — the kidnapers, it seems, no longer claiming to own him, — and, on the 6th of June last, was sold into slavery to pay his jail fees. Previous to the sale, he was brought before the Mayor of Newport, on a writ of *habeas corpus*, the testimony of his father, offered in proof of his freedom, was rejected, on account of his color, (for so Kentucky law and justice ordain,) and, the other evidence presented being, in the Mayor's sagacious judgment, insufficient, he was remanded to jail. He was bought by the postmaster of Newport, the sheriff who sold him being a secret partner in the purchase, and sharer of the profits; as the postmaster made affidavit a few weeks later, in consequence of a quarrel with his accomplice. WAGGONER's friends did not leave the matter here. A suit for his freedom was brought in the Circuit

Court sitting in Newport, his free birth in Ohio was clearly proved by testimony which even a Kentucky Court could not declare incompetent, and about the middle of August,—the Court having taken time to consider its decision,—he was adjudged free. But this judgment, while it proves conclusively the flagrant wrong which had been done him, makes no compensation for that wrong, for the robbery of eight months of his time, and for all the suffering of body and mind endured in these long months of illegal captivity. Two men, STEWART and WEAVER by name, have been arrested on the charge of having kidnapped WAGGONER, and have been committed to jail, in default of \$2,000 bail, to await trial in the Hamilton county (O.) Court of Common Pleas.

A letter to the New York *Tribune*, from Doniphan county, Kansas, dated May 24th, states that, on the 12th of that month, a Miss MARY JANE ROBINSON, an orphan girl of eighteen or twenty years, with “light auburn hair, light blue eyes, light, fair complexion,” who had been at work for the last previous ten months in Belmont, Kansas, “as a free, white servant girl,” crossed the river to St. Joseph, Mo., to do some trading, and was arrested as the runaway slave of a Mr. TROTT, of Lexington, on the affidavit of two men who had known her in Belmont. She was lodged in jail, and word sent by telegraph to TROTT, who came, paid his volunteer tools for their base services, and took her to slavery, “without trial, save the affidavit of these two men.” She is represented as “industrious, intelligent and respected by all who knew her, and no one could ever suspect that there was a drop of African blood in her veins. The probability is that she is a free, white girl, and that the men who swore she was a slave are perjured kidnappers.”

The Baltimore *Sun*, of May 19th, mentions the arrest of two men in Baltimore, KINSLEY and ENGLISH, by name, on the 17th, for attempting to carry out of the State and sell into slavery several colored persons who had been sold to limited periods of service within the State, as a penalty for violation of the laws. KINSLEY was the buyer of the convicts; ENGLISH had charge of the wagon which was conveying them away. “It was stated,” said the *Sun*, “that another wagon, containing two colored men, was driven off; and a telegraphic dispatch was yesterday sent to Washington, requesting the detention of the party, if they should pass through that city, but up to last night, no answer had been received.” KINSLEY was bound over in \$3,000, and ENGLISH in \$1,000, to await a hear-

ing. On the 18th, one LEVY was arrested and locked up, charged with a like attempt, which failed.

The Cincinnati *Gazette*, of May 29th, says that the day before, one JEREMIAH JOHNSON tried to decoy JAMES UPSON, a free negro, on board a ferry boat, on pretence of wishing to employ him as a hand on the boat, but with real intent to take him across the river and sell him into slavery. UPSON declining to go aboard, JOHNSON seized him, drew a revolver, and threatened to shoot him if he resisted or refused to go; but UPSON's cries drew a crowd about him, and he was rescued, in spite of JOHNSON's protestations that the "negro was a fugitive," and his offers of twenty dollars to any one who would help put him on the boat. JOHNSON was taken to a station-house, and held for examination on the charge of attempting to kidnap.

A correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, writing from Washington, Fayette county, Ohio, on the 27th of June, announces "the kidnapping of a negro named JOHN MARSHALL," in that place, "by three men who arrived by the midnight train from Cincinnati." They took him about 6 o'clock that morning, and hurried him off, it was supposed to Cincinnati, without going before the authorities. He had lived in the place five years, and claimed and was supposed to be free. Officers went in pursuit of the kidnappers, but with what success had not been heard.

The Albany *Evening Journal*, of July 7th, states that "GEORGE ARMSTRONG, a free colored man, born in Jefferson county, in this State, left Watertown some three weeks since, with a man named BENJAMIN. Nothing was heard from him until the 5th inst., when his sister received a letter from a law firm in Washington city, saying that GEORGE was in jail there, on the charge of being a fugitive slave. These facts being made known to Gov. MORGAN, he at once authorized Mr. HADDOCK, of Watertown, to proceed to Washington, and procure the liberation of this free colored man, imprisoned for no other crime, it would appear, than that of being black."

The Chicago *Tribune*, of July 12th, records the case of "a negro man accused of being a runaway slave," who "was kidnapped on the 23d of June, near Carbondale, Jackson county, Illinois, thrust into the cars of the Illinois Central road, and hurried off South," without warrant or process or pretence of examination into his right to own himself. A "Black Republican" who ventured to ask upon what authority the man was taken, was surrounded by a Democratic mob, and obliged to consult his own safety by retiring.

The conductor of the train, when expostulated with against participating in the outrage, replied, "I take all whose fare is paid."

The same journal, of July 19th, gives the substance of an advertisement published in the Jonesboro' (Ill.) *Gazette*, announcing that the postmaster of Dongola, Union county, Ill., had in custody a colored man, marked with cuts of a knife or whip, and with gun-shot wounds, one of the latter inflicted by the postmaster himself, in consequence of the man's attempt to escape; that he had taken him to Cape Girardeau, Mo., to find an "owner," but, no one there claiming him, he had brought him back to Dongola, where he was awaiting a claimant. And Illinois, where such officious baseness proclaims itself shamelessly in the newspapers, is called a Free State!

A correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing from Clifton, a village about sixty miles from Chicago, on the 4th of July, states that on the previous Sunday evening, five colored men were decoyed into a public house in that place, by certain conspirators against their freedom, and a band of armed ruffians attempted to capture them. Two of the most powerful knocked down their assailants and escaped; "the other three were overpowered, handcuffed, thrown into a wagon, driven off before an alarm could be given," put on board the cars of the Illinois Central Railroad, and conveyed to St. Louis. "One of them never was a slave, one had been freed by his master, the third probably had been a slave, and his master was one of the band who figured here." It is stated that he had bargained with his accomplices living in the neighborhood, that if they would help him take his "boy," they "would catch as many more as they could, take them South, sell them, and divide the spoils." Several of the kidnapers were arrested a day or two after, and three of them were held to bail in \$500 each, to appear at the next term of the Court.

A later number of the *Tribune* has an article in relation either to this outrage or to another in the same place, upon the same number of victims; the difference of dates and the likeness of circumstances leaving us uncertain which. The former seems to us the more probable, the later narrative having perhaps made a mistake in the date. But, if so, it adds some very interesting particulars, which had not transpired at the time of the first account. It represents that three colored men were kidnapped in Clifton, on Sunday, June 3d, by an armed band, at a store or grocery to which they had been decoyed; that they were hurried to the Illinois Central Railroad, leaving "the quiet community" of Clifton "thoroughly indignant at the out-

rage ;" were taken to St. Louis, thrust into the negro pen, and questioned as to who were their masters. One answered that he was and always had been free; another refused to answer; and the third, "JIM," said he had belonged to AIME PERNARD, a farmer near Carondelet, seven miles from the city. The other two, after having been cruelly flogged and otherwise tortured, to make them own themselves slaves, but all in vain, were sent South and sold.

Meanwhile, one of the kidnappers visited AIME PERNARD and tried to buy JIM "running;" beginning with an offer of \$100, and gradually rising to \$1,000, but getting only an indignant refusal. PERNARD's suspicions, however, being excited, he sent JIM's mother to St. Louis, to make inquiries, and so learned the previous facts of the case; whereupon he went to the pen, saw JIM, commanded the keeper to treat him kindly, and, this being Sunday morning, (a week after the capture,) left him till the next day. Then he returned, paid the \$100 required by the State law for catching a fugitive, and \$35 for jail fees, dressed JIM in a new suit, took him home, talked over the matter with him, and on Wednesday, put into his hands his free papers, a ticket for Clifton, and a considerable sum of money, crossed the river with him, saw him safe aboard the northward train, and "with tears and a warm pressure of the hand, bade him good-bye, and invoked for him God's blessing to speed him on the way." That evening, JIM's unexpected arrival brought a glad surprise to the people of Clifton; and his joyous meeting with his wife, the *Tribune* says, "left not a dry eye in the little crowd of lookers-on."

The ladies of Clifton united in a letter to PERNARD, warmly thanking him for what he had done. His reply (dated, we notice as a pleasant coincidence, on the 1st of August) shows him, as might be inferred from what has already been told, a slaveholder rather in form than in spirit. "Living, as I do, in a Slave State," he says, "I have had a family of negroes to assist me in the cultivation of my small farm, and to attend to the affairs of my household. They have worked with me, side by side, in the cornfield, and have shared with me the profits and benefits of our labor. I have never sold a slave, for I cannot traffic in human flesh and blood. I have, however, made many of that family happy, by placing them in a condition where they might work for themselves and their posterity, in a climate of their own choice. * * * JAMES * * * ought to have known that he had no reason to fear my course had he frankly

avowed to me his wishes to settle in Illinois. He left my home some five years ago, and although I have often been told of his whereabouts, I never took the slightest steps to recover him, concluding that if he thought he could do better elsewhere than with me, he was welcome to the change. Inasmuch as his return was the cause of so much joy to his wife, as well as satisfaction to the neighborhood, and being convinced that he would prefer to remain at his present home in Illinois, I have determined to place no obstacle in the way of his future happiness. I shall, at the next September term of our Circuit Court, acknowledge the necessary papers, and deed of manumission, giving JAMES SALTER his freedom, unconditionally." The *Tribune* adds, that "JIM, though before one of the truest and best of men, has gained new and admirable qualities in the exercise of the right to own himself." Commenting on the case, it affirms that "the crime perpetrated upon JIM and his fellow-captives is one of frequent occurrence in this Free State. There are neighborhoods, nay, dozens of counties, in which no man of color is safe. There are men who live by making negroes their prey. There are presumptive proofs that, within the past ten years, scores, perhaps hundreds, of free men, guilty of a colored skin, have been kidnapped and sold into bondage that never ends."

On the 20th of July, ten or twelve armed ruffians seized HENRY SPARKS, at St. Paul, Minnesota, forced him into a carriage, and drove away. It is supposed he was taken down the river. SPARKS had been a slave of a Mrs. PRINCE, a Southern woman who had come to spend the summer at St. Paul, and, by bringing him to Minnesota, had, doubtless without intending it, made him legally free. After he was kidnapped, a writ of *habeas corpus* was served on her, but it could not be proved that she took any part in the crime. It is supposed to have been contrived and executed by certain Democrats, in connection with the hotel-keepers of St. Paul, for the purpose of encouraging Southern people to spend the summer in that region. It was indignantly denounced by several of the Minnesota journals, one of which, the *Minneapolis State Atlas*, said, "We wish Southern ladies and gentlemen to distinctly understand, that when they bring their slaves within the borders of this State, they make them, before our Constitution and our laws, their *equals*, so far as civil rights are concerned; and we insist that, where they voluntarily assert their rights, they shall be protected to the full extent of the law of our State." Gov. RAMSEY promptly offered a reward of

\$250 for the apprehension and conviction of the kidnappers, but, so far as we have learned, they remain undetected.

A letter to the *New York Tribune*, from Leavenworth, Kansas, on the 25th of July, gives a detailed account of the kidnapping of CASWELL A. JONES, a free colored man, so light that "he would pass for white," who was seized, on the 18th, at the house of CHARLES ARMSTRONG, of the Delaware Nation, about fifteen miles from Leavenworth, taken across the river, and thrown into jail at St. Joseph, Mo. Among the kidnappers was a Deputy United States Marshal, FORSYTH by name. Unable to compel their victim, by repeated scourgings, to own himself a slave, and finding the traders, who resorted to the jail, unwilling to buy him, partly because of his being so white, and partly because of his protestations that he never was a slave, they told him, after several days, that they had mistaken their man, and released him. Returning to Kansas, he made affidavit against FORSYTH and another, who were arrested, and bound over to appear at the next District Court. Then, to prevent, if possible, JONES's appearance against them, their counsel caused him to be arrested on a charge of passing counterfeit money, and at his trial, three of the kidnappers were produced as witnesses to prove the charge. It came out, however, on cross-examination, that the money they swore to have received from JONES was actually taken from him while he was a handcuffed prisoner in their hands, and the evidence was by no means clear that it was counterfeit. Seeing which way things were tending, one of the witnesses secretly slipped away before he was called to the stand, and another, as soon as his testimony was finished, ran to the river, sprang into a boat he had in readiness, and by hard rowing succeeded in reaching the Missouri shore before his pursuers could overtake him. JONES was, of course, pronounced not guilty, and immediately discharged.

While JONES was in St. Joseph jail, he saw there two colored men, who had been stolen early in July, and who, according to a correspondent of the *Lawrence Republican*, were never slaves, and though "inhumanly whipped, to make them state who were their owners," persisted in asserting their freedom. A Kansas correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, writing July 26th, and evidently referring to the same case, says "efforts are making to secure their release, with what success, cannot be anticipated." He also mentions an attempt, happily unsuccessful, to kidnap a woman from Lawrence, a few nights before. He further states, that several attempts,

some of them successful, have been made to kidnap some of the free colored exiles from Arkansas, whose expulsion from that State was mentioned in our last Report. A letter in the *Lawrence Republican*, dated Wyandot, August 4th, states that, "not long since, a man by the name of HOPE, with scarcely a drop of African blood in his veins, and never a slave, was most brutally kidnapped in open day, from JOE ARMSTRONG'S—a Delaware Indian—about twelve miles west of our city; was lashed to a horse, and hurried to the Kaw bottoms, whipped until his back was one mass of gore, and when night came, was hurried off to Missouri, and finally wound up in the St. Joseph jail, and soon was sold, for twelve hundred dollars, to a 'Southern trader,' destined to perpetual bondage." The *Republican*, referring to some of the facts above related, says, "We can scarcely take up a Territorial newspaper, without finding an account of one of these nefarious attempts. * * * We had known before that there was an organized gang of these wretches, who live by robbery, kidnapping, and murder, but we were hardly prepared to find United States officers aiding and abetting in this devilish business."

The *Baltimore Sun*, of September 3d, states that Gov. HICKS had lately made a requisition upon the Governor of Alabama for two men, STREETER and HERRING by name, charged with abducting from Maryland certain colored persons entitled to their freedom after a term of years; also a like requisition upon the Governor of Virginia, for one MAX MARSHALL, arrested in Richmond at the request of the Marshal of Baltimore, "for fraudulently abducting MARY ANN CARTER, colored, entitled to her freedom after a time, and attempting to sell her into slavery. Steps will be taken," it further said, "against several other parties, as soon as the evidence shall have been analyzed."

In the latter part of September, JERRY BOYD, an honest, industrious free colored man, of Galena, Illinois, and his wife, whom he had bought out of slavery, and a free colored girl of 12 or 14, living with them, were enticed from home by two men named GOODWIN and BOLTON, on pretence that they were to be employed on a farm and in a hotel in Iowa. Mrs. BOYD had with her, also, a white child, which had been placed by its mother in her care. After travelling three days, GOODWIN, finding that JERRY began to suspect them of some evil design, and was preparing to resist, deliberately murdered him. Then they took the woman and children to Missouri, and sold them, near St. Joseph; but before the price was paid, Mrs. BOYD made known the facts of the case, and the kidnappers and murderer were

seized and committed to St. Joseph jail. Information was sent to Galena, whence several gentlemen went immediately to St. Joseph, and, on the 24th of October, returned to Galena, bringing with them the kidnapped party and another person, who had been stolen from Dubuque, Iowa, six weeks before, by the same men. BOLTON they left in the St. Joseph jail, to await his trial on charge of kidnapping. Goodwin they had taken to bring him to Iowa, to be tried for the murder, as it was committed in that State; but, on the way, he leaped from the cars, and escaped. These facts we gather from the *Chicago Tribune* of October 26th, the *Galena Courier* of October 24th, and the *St. Joseph Gazette* of October 20th. We are told, also, that, about the same time, a young colored man of twenty-one, and his sister of seventeen, were kidnapped in Iowa, taken to St. Louis, and offered for sale. A telegraphic dispatch arrived just in time to save them from slavery, and secure the arrest of the kidnappers. The *Sandusky (O.) Register*, of October 15th, relates that, on the Friday evening previous, ten or fifteen kidnappers surprised two cabins about three miles from Sandusky, and dragged thence to the railroad two men with their wives, (one a free woman,) and two children of six months, born in Ohio, and put them aboard the night train for Cincinnati. Some neighbors, roused by their cries, tried, but in vain, to help them. Evidences of severe scuffling were found about the cabins. The ruffians made off with such haste that they left in one cabin a child of seven years, and, in a cornfield near, a child of two and a half years, probably dropped in the struggle or the flight. The kidnapped men had been in the place about ten months, had rented a piece of wild land, cleared part of it, and raised a fine crop of corn. Visitors to the place "report that everything looks as if they were industrious and comfortably situated." From the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, we learn that the leader of the kidnappers was a Deputy United States Marshal, MUNSON by name; but we do not learn that he had any shadow of a legal warrant for his act till he reached Cincinnati, took his victims before a United States Commissioner, and had them "remanded" to slavery.

The *New York Tribune*, of November 21st, gives an account of a case of kidnapping in New York city, a day or two before, in connection with which Marshal RYNDERS figures, to say the least, very suspiciously. JOHN THOMAS was a slave of one WINTER, of Louisville, Kentucky, and became legally free by his master's sending him into a Free State—Indiana—to be employed on a boat plying on the Ohio.

JOHN, probably not aware of his legal right, grew tired of earning money to be paid to his master, and went to Canada, and afterward to New York, where he had been for some months employed as a porter; when, on the night of November 19th, he was taken, by some person unknown, into the United States Grand Jury room in Chestnut street. He got word to Mr. VAIL, his employer, by dropping a note from the window, telling a boy whither to carry it. Mr. VAIL went to see him, and found him with two persons, one of whom might or might not have been a Marshal's assistant, and the other claimed to be WINTER's agent, with a power of attorney authorizing him to recover the alleged slave. Mr. VAIL then obtained a writ of *habeas corpus*, which was duly served on Marshal RYNDERS, as official custodian of the Grand Jury room; and, on the morning of the 21st, that distinguished worthy responded, by producing, before Judge MULLIN, another JOHN THOMAS, who had been several months in his keeping, detained as a witness in a case awaiting trial. Against the remonstrances of the kidnapped JOHN's counsel, the Judge held the return to be satisfactory. Meanwhile, the man really intended by the writ was secretly carried off, it is said, without any legal process whatever; and the next heard of him was by a dispatch from Richmond, Virginia, on the 22d, announcing his arrival there, in the custody of two of Marshal RYNDERS' deputies, and his consignment to prison to await the orders of his pretended master.

The Fernandina (Florida) *East Floridian*, of November 21st, publishes, and attests as true, reports that, a short time before, six free colored seamen were forcibly taken from a Northern vessel, at Cumberland Island, near Fernandina; also, that three free negro sailors, of the crew of another Northern vessel, were taken from Fernandina jail, and removed to parts unknown. The editor condemns Judge PUTNAM's course in denouncing these acts, in his charge to the Grand Jury, and declares them to have been measures of retaliation upon the North.

The Natchez (Miss.) *Free Trader*, of December 12th, says that, "last week, a gentleman of this city," returning home from some town above, on the river, "observed a pensive-looking little girl, aged about nine or ten years, whose black hair and yellowish brown skin would indicate that she was a mulatress." Something about her interested him, and, questioning the captain of the boat, he was told she was a slave of a man on board, who said he had bought her in Northwestern Missouri, and was taking her to New Orleans for sale. Afterward, a conversation with this man awakened the gentleman's suspi-

cions ; the girl was taken aside and examined, and found to be white, with light hair. She said she was an orphan ; that the man had taken her from an asylum in New York, and told her he would take her South, as his adopted child ; that he had had her hair dyed black, telling her that color " was preferred in the South, and was prettier than hers," and had put the stain on her skin, pretending it would in a few days make her complexion whiter. Soap and water soon proved the truth of part of her story, and thus confirmed faith in the rest of it ; the man was locked up in a state room till the boat should land, but by some means contrived to escape at the next place where it touched for wood, and the girl was placed in an orphan asylum in New Orleans.

Besides these, several instances have come to our knowledge, in which kidnapping or attempt to kidnap was strongly suspected, though without absolute certainty of the fact. ROBERT DANIEL, a mulatto boy of about eleven years, who left his home in New York city on the 6th of August, and CAROLINE NORTON, of Brooklyn, New York, aged thirteen, who disappeared about the middle of October, it is feared were kidnapped. WILLIAM PERCIVAL, a boy of fourteen, from Trinidad, came to New York about the beginning of December, as cabin boy of a vessel bound to Charleston, and circumstances inducing a suspicion that the captain, a native of Charleston, meant to sell him as a slave, he was placed, by the authorities, under the care of the British Consul, to be sent back to his parents. On the 18th of October, RENA A. FIELDS, " a colored woman, who had become free some months before, by her master's bringing her from Charleston, South Carolina, to New York city, was tried in New York, on the charge of having stolen certain articles from him. From the absence of any proof against her, the presence of United States Deputy Marshals in court, and some other circumstances, the charge was believed to be only part of a plan for seizing her, and sending her off to slavery. She was discharged, on the testimony of her accuser himself, and " friends in attendance took her out of harm's way."

Our last Report mentioned the carrying off to Baltimore of JOHN BROWN, a free colored man of Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, and the subsequent arrest of the four men who committed the crime. We learn that, about the 1st of December, two of them, FRANCIS WILSON and GILMORE HULL, were convicted, and sentenced to pay a fine of two hundred dollars, half to BROWN, and half to the county, and to be imprisoned in the county jail five years. The other two, GORDON and BOSTRICK, absconded, forfeiting their recognizances.

MANUMISSION.

The past year, like those which went before it, has given us some scattered instances in which conscience, or humane feeling, or natural affection has done its proper work on the slaveholder's heart, moving him to renounce his claim to own as chattels those who share his own nature, and, in many cases, are of his nearest kindred. Early in the year, not far, we believe, from the 1st of June, Mr. A. CUTHBERT, of Georgia, son of a former United States Senator from that State, removed to New Jersey, and settled on a farm, near Patterson, with five negroes, the last of seventy-five whom he has emancipated, the others having gone to Liberia. Previous to the 1st of June, a number of persons in Washington county, Maryland, set free their slaves; a law of the last Legislature having forbidden emancipation after that date, unless the emancipated should leave the State. The Cleveland (Ohio) journals announced, near the same time, that a Mississippi planter had bought a handsome house in Cleveland, for \$7,000, to be occupied by his emancipated octoroon daughter, of sixteen years, while she receives an education in that city; that he "will spare no pains or expense to give her a thorough education;" and that "her income, while she resides here, is to be \$3,000 a year."

The Cincinnati *Gazette* informs us that, on the 21st of May last, the Court of Appeals of North Carolina gave a decision, on appeal from a lower Court, sustaining the will of ELIJAH WILLIS, by which he emancipated his six slave children and their mother, and left to them his whole property, worth about \$60,000. WILLIS brought the woman and children to Ohio, in May, 1855, and immediately on landing at the wharf in Cincinnati, fell dead. The will being found, Mr. JOLIFFE, of Cincinnati, went to North Carolina to secure the property for the legatees, and was, as we remember, in some personal peril from the excitement his errand caused there. The heirs at law resisted the execution of the will, and obtained, in the lower Court, a decision setting it aside. This the Court of Appeals has now reversed.

The New York *Tribune*, of July 19th, states that "Mr. J. MORRISON, cashier of the Manhattan Bank, having lately inherited thirteen slaves in Kentucky, has emancipated them all. Two little boys he has brought to this city to be educated."

The same journal, of July 27th, recites a case which had recently occupied the attention of the North Carolina courts. SOLOMON HALL,

having made a will giving his property, including one hundred slaves, to his daughter, an only child, afterward made another, freeing the slaves, and giving most of his property to them. The daughter brought a suit to set aside the last will; but finally, after the case had gone to the jury, proposed a compromise, which was accepted, by which the slaves obtained their freedom, and she, \$13,000 of the property bequeathed to them. According to the *Hadell* (N. C.) *Express*, the jury were nine against, and three for the will, but it is said that the Judge would have set aside the verdict, if it had been against the will.

It became public, about the beginning of July, that "Miss CORNELIA BARBOUR, a daughter of the Hon. JAMES BARBOUR, of Virginia, formerly Governor of that State, and a member of President J. Q. ADAMS' Cabinet, had resolved to emancipate her numerous slaves, and locate them in a Free State."

Near the end of July, as we learn from the *Fall River Journal*, "a black man of forty-three, and a bright little black girl of five," arrived in Fall River, Massachusetts, from Wilmington, North Carolina, where, till a short time before, they had been slaves. By the death of their master, they had been left, with eleven others, to his relatives at the North. These two fell to the share of WILLARD GRAY, of Little Compton, Rhode Island, who immediately manumitted them. The other eleven fell to heirs living in New Bedford, Massachusetts, who, we are sorry to say, chose to turn them into cash, and pocket them. For their own sakes, it is to be hoped that these heirs, who preferred a few basely-acquired dollars to the wealth bestowed by the consciousness of a just and humane act, and by "the blessing of them who were ready to perish," may yet learn that Mr. GRAY'S share of the inheritance was far more profitably invested than theirs.

The *Pittsburg Chronicle*, of August 11th, says that "W. B. CLIFTON, of the firm of JAMES, HEWITT & Co., of Liverpool, died in Louisville on Saturday, having manumitted all his slaves, four hack loads of whom attended the funeral as chief mourners. A very touching incident occurred at the funeral. During the march, an old slave, who had been greatly attached to his master, came up quietly to the hearse, the fringe of which he respectfully kissed, and behind which he walked all the way to the cemetery. After the prayers at the grave were ended, and all had gone save the blacks, the old man signed to them to kneel, and, throwing himself upon the ground,

prayed most vehemently and tearfully for his master and those he had left behind, which so affected the listening mourners, that the place was filled with cries and groans."

On the 10th of August, thirty negroes, with two white men as guides, passed through New Albany, Indiana, on their way to Kansas; having been emancipated by their masters in Kentucky. Near the same time, a statement appeared in the newspapers, that "Dr. THOMAS BUTTS, of Southampton, Virginia, who died recently, has directed in his will, that all his servants, one hundred and five in number, shall be freed." From the Cincinnati *Enquirer* we learn, that in Cincinnati, near the end of August, "six very fine-looking children, from nine years down to nine months of age, all girls but one, a boy of five years, were brought into Court with their mother, to be emancipated. The mother had traces of negro blood; the children had none, but were of remarkably fair and delicate complexions, and the hair and features of the white race. They were the slaves of Mr. THOMAS MURRAY, of Lincoln county, Georgia, who has purchased for them a comfortable house and lot in this city, as a home." Some two months later, the Paris (Ky.) *Citizen* says, that "Mr. NOAH SPEAR lately left here, for Xenia, Ohio, with a man, his wife and two children, whom he has emancipated, and handsomely provided for. He purchased them an excellent farm, gave them a wagon and pair of mules, a large quantity of provisions, &c. This is the second lot of negroes Mr. SPEAR has taken to the same place." The *Liberator*, of November 16th, states that "Adams & Co.'s Express brought to New York, on Monday, a mother and two children, from Mobile, Alabama, consigned to Rev. Mr. BROOKS, of Newport, Rhode Island. They had been emancipated by their mistress." The *Boston Journal*, a week or two later, says that "a dry-goods firm in this city, having a claim for \$1,000 against a Southern trader, who would not meet it with the 'ready,' adopted a novel course, by which their account was cancelled, and a negro slave obtained his freedom. The firm sent orders to their attorney to attach a slave belonging to the trader for the debt, cause him to be sold, buy him in for the firm, and then send him to a Northern city."

One case we hear of, as to which we are yet doubtful whether it will prove a case of manumission or not, though the master's intent to manumit has been clearly shown. Some time last summer, OWEN SOUTHERLAND, of Casey county, Kentucky, about eighty years old, executed a deed freeing all his slaves, fifty-five or fifty-seven in num-

ber, and was preparing to remove them from the State, when his son-in-law and some of his grand-children instituted legal proceedings, charging that he was in his dotage, and that his negroes had an undue influence over him, and praying for an inquiry, with a view to the appointment of a committee to take care of his property. An attachment was issued against the slaves, and they were detained. The case was to come up at the November term of the Circuit Court, but we have seen no account of the result, if any has been reached.

In the latter part of last May, "a handsome mulatto slave girl," who had been sold to a slave-trader, "appeared in the ante-room of the Representatives' Hall," in Washington, "in charge of Dr. DAVIDSON, with a statement that by raising \$500 cash, and securing the payment of \$700 more, by the 1st of August, she could purchase her freedom. The amount was promptly raised among the Republican members." At the close of a Sunday-evening's services in HENRY WARD BEECHER'S church, in November last, \$800 were raised to make up what was wanting of \$1,200, needed to secure the freedom of LOUISA, a mulatto girl of twenty-two, whose master in Maryland had consented to sell her for that sum. A gold ring, found in the collection, Mr. BEECHER placed on the girl's finger, as her "freedom ring." At this assurance that she was free, her emotion was so strong that she fell prostrate upon the platform. Another case of emancipation, by purchase, is that of CHARLES NALLE, who was rescued from his master's agent, in Troy, New York, a little more than a year ago, as related in our last Report. To enable him to return to his employment in Troy, a subscription was started, a few days after his escape, and, the needful sum being raised, he was bought for \$650, and in due legal form emancipated; and, on the 24th of last May, returned to his former situation. The *Southern* (Tenn.) *Atlas* tells, with glowing indignation, of an instance of unmeant emancipation, which took place in New York city, about a year ago. Mrs. CLARK, widow of the late American minister to Guatemala, took passage at Aspinwall for New York city, on the 9th of April, 1860, having with her "a very likely young mulatto female slave, who had been raised in her family, had been with her during all her residence in Guatemala, and had proved herself a very faithful and devoted servant." Mrs. CLARK seems to have been aware of the legal effect of her act in taking her "very faithful and devoted servant" into a Free State; or, at all events, of the deleterious influence of Northern air on servile faithfulness and devotion; for the *Atlas* states that, on

the way, she disclosed to the captain of the ship her "apprehension about losing her servant in New York, and the plan she intended to adopt, upon her arrival in that city, to avoid such a serious privation. This plan was, to transfer herself immediately to some Southern steamer, in which she designed taking passage for her home, in Tennessee." But the event gives reason to suspect that some one else was forming plans also, though, probably, without confiding them to the captain; for when the steamer reached New York, "before even the gang-plank was thrown out, the colored steward, with the girl, leaped ashore, and disappeared." At this very natural consequence of bringing a slave within the reach of righteous law, the *Atlas* breaks out into a furious tirade against "the GREELEY & GIDDINGS code of ethics;" and asks "the people of New York," among other questions, more emphatic than complimentary, if "abolition thieves and ruffians are for ever to rule that city;" and "of what avail are the conservative meetings, protestations and pledges, which have recently been paraded there, if so flagitious an outrage is not and cannot be punished?" All which, though giving great relief, no doubt, to the amiable editor's feelings, has not, so far as we are informed, brought back to Mrs. CLARK her "very faithful and devoted servant."

FUGITIVE SLAVES.

From the many accounts which have reached us, through the newspapers of all parts of the country, we infer that the northward migration from the slave-land during the past year has fully equalled the average of former years. How large that average is, probably no one has the means of accurately determining. A work lately published in England, by Rev. W. M. MITCHELL, of Toronto, Canada, estimates that no less than twelve hundred refugees a year reach that province; and it is certain that many—probably more and more in each successive year, as the growth of Anti-Slavery feeling in the Northern States lessens the chances of recapture—stop on this side of the line. At times, it is true, a pro-slavery paroxysm seems awhile to change this tendency, causing a sudden exodus of unwonted numbers from the States to Canada; but that soon ceases, and the constant forces, continuing to act, produce their nearly uniform effects. The *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin*, of December

19th, reckons "the number of slaves who have escaped from the South in the last fifty years" at fifteen hundred annually; and "the total loss" to the slaveholders at "about forty millions of dollars." Comparing "the actual increase of the black population of the North," from census to census, with "what it would have been if confined to natural causes," it regards the number of slaves escaping to and remaining at the North as fully equal, at least, to the difference between these two; for, of free negroes, "many more migrate from the Free to the Slave States, than from the Slave to the Free:" a statement which we commend to the careful consideration of those timid souls who are frightened out of their humanity and regard for right, by the groundless apprehension that to abolish slavery would be to flood the North with a very deluge of "negroes-turned-loose." Says the *Bulletin*, and in this we believe it is not beyond the truth, "forty-nine fiftieths of all native negroes of the Slave States, who are found in the Free States, were fugitive slaves when they left the Slave States." But its estimate of the number of those fugitives is, most likely, much exaggerated; doubtless through its desire to embitter, as much as possible, the Southern feeling against the North. For we can hardly believe that, besides all who have gone through to Canada,—and the calculation, it will be noticed, includes only those "found in the Free States"—so many as 75,000 slaves have made good their escape within the past fifty years. Still, the number is unquestionably large; and though many who have fled have been retaken, the proportion has been small, we think, among those who have once set foot within the North. Of the numerous attempts to escape, which we have heard of during the year, not two dozen ended in recapture, legal or illegal, in a Northern State. In a few instances, death was preferred to reënslavement; in far the greater number, freedom was obtained.

In some instances, the slave-hunters have suffered largely beyond the mere loss of their fugacious chattels. One such is related in the *Chicago Tribune*, of June 13th. A slaveholder of Nebraska Territory, from whom two negro girls escaped more than a year ago, pursued them, with an armed band, into Iowa, "breaking into and searching citizens' houses, without any warrant or show of authority, and committing other offences against law, order and decency," but without finding what he sought. R. S. WILLIAMS, one of the citizens thus outraged, afterwards sued him; and "we see by an Iowa paper," says the *Tribune*, "that he has recovered \$8000 damages." The

Tribune adds, "That's good. We like it; and if the same discipline could be enforced in the Egyptian counties of this State, Illinois would make a new and long approach to freedom."

We have not room to even glance at the great majority of the fugitive cases, whether ending in escape or in reënslavement, of which we have had information during the year; and shall particularly mention but a few, which seem especially noteworthy for the circumstances attending them.

The first we notice is the case which gave the Northern delegates to the Democratic National Convention, returning from Charleston, an opportunity to signalize their loyalty to the Slave Power, by helping to thrust back into its grasp one of its escaping victims. On Sunday morning, May 6th, as the steamer *S. R. Spaulding*, which had been chartered by the delegates to convey them to and from Charleston, was off Block Island, upon its return voyage, a negro was discovered in the coal-hole, where he had lain hidden for five days, close by the boiler; having lived all that time upon a few crackers, and entirely without water. As soon as the captain heard of the discovery, a consultation was held, in which several "Honorable" and distinguished men among the delegates took part, "and it was unanimously agreed that the negro should be returned to the South," although he claimed to be a free man. The course of the boat was changed, to intercept the *Ben Deford*, bound from Boston to Baltimore. This being accomplished in a few hours, signals of distress were made, by setting the flag at half-mast, Union down, and firing guns "which had seen service in the Revolution," to attract the attention of the southward-going vessel, in order to obtain its help in carrying out the modern democratic interpretation of the revolutionary principle of equal and inalienable human rights. The *Ben Deford* having responded to the signals, and approached conveniently near the *Spaulding*, the negro was transferred to the former boat, "all the passengers and most of the crews" of both boats thronging the decks, "witnessing the novel spectacle of surrendering a fugitive slave in mid-ocean." As a boat with the fugitive left the *Spaulding*, the passengers called for music; GILMORE'S band played *Old Hundred* and several other sacred airs, "for it was a bright Sabbath morning;" the ladies on the *Deford* waved their handkerchiefs; and thus, with due pomp and ceremony, the victim was sent to the sacrifice. Some called for "Carry me back to old Virginia," as appropriate to the occasion; but, "out of regard to the sacred-

ness of the day," the band declined to play it. We are told that "the Democracy of the Spaulding could not help admiring the ingenuity and impudence of the fugitive in selecting their special steamer as his transport to liberty." The Charleston *Mercury* not long after announced that "the runaway negro, by the steamer Spaulding, hence to Boston, has arrived in town. He is lodged in the work-house for recognition and identification. He still asserts that he is a free boy from Ohio. If he is a slave, he will undoubtedly be recognized soon." For recognition! *If* he is a slave! So, then, it is not certain that he is a slave; and these zealous Democrats, in their officious eagerness, which could not wait for legal warrant or formality, have sent into the house of bondage one who, perhaps, is free by law as well as right.

Another of the cases claiming particular mention is that which a Virginian slaveholder used for the avowed purpose of seeing whether the Fugitive Slave Act could be executed in the reputedly Anti-Slavery city of Cleveland, Ohio. The result was such that Cleveland actually received the public thanks both of the slave-catchers and of the city from whose neighborhood they came;—a disgrace which, sorry as we are to have to say it, seems to have been deserved. SARAH LUCY BAGBY, a young woman claimed as a piece of property by one WILLIAM S. GOSHORN, who lives near Wheeling, Va., left her pretended owner in October last, and went to Cleveland. Although without, probably, having ever read the Cleveland *Herald's* declaration, made some fifteen months before, at the discharge of the Oberlin rescuers, amid the gratulations and triumphant shouts of the citizens of Cleveland, that "this has put an end to nigger-catching in Northern Ohio," she was yet quite possibly led, by rumors of that city's Anti-Slavery character, to choose it as her place of refuge. But the event gave mournful proof that the *Herald's* boast was premature. On the 19th of January last, LUCY was arrested, on the affidavits of GOSHORN and his father, and was committed to the county jail. A writ of *habeas corpus* was promptly obtained from Judge TILDEN, of the Probate Court, returnable at 2, P. M.; at which hour a large crowd, white and black, surrounded the Court House. Some signs appeared of a disposition among the blacks to attempt a forcible rescue; which availed, however, but to show their own generous impulses, and to give the ruffian Deputy Marshals, of whom fifty-five were sworn in for the occasion, an opportunity, eagerly improved, for the display of their intense brutality. Of these spe-

cial deputies, the *Cleveland Leader* says, "a majority had no more idea of the duties pertaining to their post, than to swing a club and knock down every colored man they could find. Some of them have been inmates of our prisons." "So it seems," as the *Anti-Slavery Bugle* well remarked upon this statement, "the emissaries of slavery appreciated their own work, and chose their tools accordingly."

At the hearing before Judge TILDEN, LUCY's counsel, Hon. R. P. SPAULDING, moved for her discharge, on the ground that, by the laws of Ohio, the United States can use the county jails only for the imprisonment of persons charged with crime, and escaping from slavery is not a crime. The Judge having taken till Monday, the 21st, to consider the point, sustained the motion, and ordered "that the sheriff forthwith discharge this woman from her imprisonment in the jail;" but went quite out of his way to add the entirely gratuitous and extra-judicial remark, that, "when outside of the jail, if he chooses to retain her in his custody as the agent of the Marshal, it is not the purpose of the Court to interfere with such arrangement." This, from such pliant tools of the Slave Power as have too often disgraced the Northern bench by acts of base subserviency, would not have surprised us; but we must do Judge TILDEN the justice to say, that it struck us as sadly out of character, coming from him. After his decision, LUCY was handed over to Marshal JOHNSON, and taken before Commissioner WHITE, who, at the request of her counsel, continued the case to Wednesday, the 23d, to give time for procuring testimony by which they hoped to prove that, before her escape, her master had taken her to a Free State, and that she was therefore free. When produced, however, the testimony seems to have failed to establish that defence; whereupon, says the *Bugle*, "Judge SPAULDING surrendered his client to the slave-catchers, and the Commissioner granted a warrant for her rendition to Virginia."

The counsel for the claimants declared that they were "actuated by no mercenary motives; their object being simply to test whether our declarations of being law-abiding citizens are true. Cleveland has come up to the work manfully, and no citizen has laid a single straw in the way; and these gentlemen from Virginia *thank you* for it, and it will satisfy them more than all else." Commissioner WHITE also said: "These men want to know if the people will enforce the law — they care nothing about the \$600 or \$800. The South does not believe a slave can be taken from this place, forming the belief from various meetings in a political canvass. This exhibi-

tion to-day shows that this talk was all owing to political excitement, and I wish to show that these people will continue faithful to the law,—that, in spite of unfaithfulness in the South, we will maintain the law, and with a clear conscience bring traitors to punishment, if necessary.” [*Comparatively*, we suppose “these men” *did* “care nothing” for the money value of their prey; that is, what most they sought was a triumph over the Anti-Slavery feeling of the North; but the fact that they expressed a willingness to take, for Lucy’s freedom, after she should have been surrendered and carried back to Virginia, about twice her market value as a slave, shows that they were by no means utterly indifferent as to the dollars, either.] Judge SPAULDING said, in his concluding speech, “We are this day offering to the majesty of Constitutional Law, a homage that takes with it a virtual surrender of the finest feelings of our nature; * * * and is, I almost said, the contravention of a Christian’s duty to his God!” Had he left out, “I almost said,” his utterance would have gained, not more in emphasis and intrinsic truth than, we suspect, in simple faithfulness to his own deepest convictions. “While we permit,” said he, “this poor piece of humanity to be taken, peaceably, through our streets and upon our railways, back to the land of bondage, will not the frantic South stay its parricidal arm? Will not our compromising legislators cry, ‘Hold! enough!’” As if such exhibitions of tameness, especially when contrasted with the far different display made in the Oberlin affair, were not precisely fitted to embolden “the frantic South” in its “parricidal” course, and encourage “our compromising legislators” to insist on yet further concessions to slavery! As if the altered tone and attitude of Northern Ohio would not be ascribed to fears awakened by the movements for secession; and so be taken by the seceders as justifying the wisdom of their policy, and by the race of Northern serviles as a proof that now is the propitious time to urge new compromises for the salvation of the Union!

The Commissioner having given up the prey to the spoilers, the elder Gosuorn was so moved by the tokens of “good feeling” he had witnessed, that he sought and obtained permission to speak his emotions,—or rather, to try to do so, for, as he said, “language would not express his gratitude to the citizens.” He wished the task of representing Virginia had fallen to better hands; hoped his mission would be “oil poured on the waters of our nation’s troubles;” desired “to save the Union;” said “the South *has been looking for*

such a case as this ;” piously and charitably “hoped God would forgive” the North for “persuading away our servants ;” and concluded by exclaiming, “How pleasant it would be if I could come among you with this same girl as my servant, and enjoy your hospitality as I have now !” He could not, it seems, even in the midst of his irrepressible, though inexpressible gratitude, keep back a hint that Northern degradation must be yet a little deeper, to complete his satisfaction. To take a slave *from* Ohio, amid apparently general good feeling, would not suffice ; he longed to hold one *in* Ohio, and be equally well treated. As if all this had not enough humiliated Cleveland—Cleveland, which hailed the “victory” of the Oberlin rescuers with a hundred guns, and martial music, and a shouting crowd in long procession—both the GOSHORNS joined, the next day, before leaving the city, in issuing a card, “to express,” they said, “our unfeigned gratitude for the uniform kindness with which we have been treated ;” and to testify that “nothing but courtesy has been shown to us by all your citizens, who have ever shielded us from the insults of your colored population—as an instance of which,” occurring that morning, at the breakfast table of the Weddell House, “a negro waiter,” who “refused to serve us, was promptly discharged by the proprietor, and ordered to leave the house.” [All honor to the “negro waiter,” who bravely did what one man in a humble station could to redeem the character of Cleveland ; and, at the risk of his situation, manfully refused to treat the woman-thieves as gentlemen, and worthy of the hospitality of honest freemen, merely because their theft was sanctioned by a wicked statute, and aided by official tools of “legalized” iniquity !] The slave-catchers, we know not whether by mere coincidence, or from a fine, instinctive sense of the fitness of things, made their card public through that Cleveland *Herald*, which, fifteen months before, hailed the result of the Oberlin rescue case, as having “put an end to negro-catching in Northern Ohio.” “To what base uses we may come at last,” ought to have been the *Herald’s* motto on that day.

At the close of the proceedings before the Commissioner, the crowd, on motion of Judge SPAULDING, unanimously voted, “that Marshal JOHNSON proceed to Wheeling to-morrow with the girl, accompanied by only two deputies, and that this meeting give unanimous assurance that he shall not be disturbed.” Some of the colored people, however, who were no parties to this pledge, determined to attempt a rescue. For this purpose, some two or three hundred

men gathered at Lima, a small village southward from Cleveland, intending, when the train with LUCY on board should stop at the station there, to rush into the car containing her, and, with such force as might be needful, take her from the Marshal's hands. But the conductor of the train, aware of or suspecting their design, dashed by the station without the usual stop, "regardless of the rights of passengers, except those who were from Virginia," says the *Anti-Slavery Bugle*, and poor LUCY's last hope of deliverance was lost. But slaveholding Wheeling rejoiced and was grateful. On the 12th of February, the City Council unanimously passed a preamble and resolution, acknowledging the "prompt and efficient aid" received by "a citizen of Wheeling, in reclaiming a fugitive from his service," in Cleveland, and especially the "intelligence, vigilance and courage" with which Marshal JOHNSON and conductor CLELAND "baffled the operations of all opponents;" and tendering the thanks of the city to the Marshal, the conductor, and "other citizens of Ohio who have, in like manner, given proof of their good will towards this State, and their fidelity to the Constitution." The Mayor had "the honor to transmit," to the Marshal and the conductor, copies of the preamble and resolution; and it afforded him "great pleasure to convey" to them "an expression of the sentiments of admiration entertained" by the people of Wheeling, for the "promptness and decision" of the conductor, and the "energetic and efficient service" of the Marshal, "in the execution of the laws." He also declared "the firm support given" to the Marshal "by the citizens of Cleveland," to be "worthy of all praise and imitation," and that it "cannot fail to go far towards procuring a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the questions now distracting our beloved country;"—a prediction, of the signal fulfilment of which we earnestly solicit from Mayor SWEENEY the earliest authentic intelligence.

The next case which we notice is one which may be called the practical commentary of a newly-appointed Republican United States Marshal, on the newly-inaugurated Republican President's inaugural pledge of fidelity to the Constitution, in the matter of slave-catching. On the 3d of April, Marshal JONES, of Chicago, as we learn from the *Chicago Post*, "signalized the commencement of his official career by the arrest of five runaway slaves," in that city, "a negro, his wife, and three children." These were a family named HARRIS, who had, a few weeks before, escaped from the neighborhood of St. Louis, Mo. It seems probable, from a statement in the Chi-

chicago *Tribune*, of April 11th, that their place of refuge was made known to their pretended owners by the very man who had persuaded the mother of Mrs. HARRIS (living in Chicago) to employ him in assisting their escape, and whom she had paid \$150 for the service. The claimants obtained a warrant from a Commissioner in Springfield, and on the 1st of April it was put into the hands of the Marshal, who committed the execution of it to his deputy, WEBB. The latter chose, as fit helpers in his task, a knot of pro-slavery Democrats, whose "hard-heartedness was tested," says the *Tribune*, "as a man tries the steel on which he is to rely." A treacherous colored man, named HAYES—hired, it is believed, to betray the fugitives into the power of their pursuers—lodged, on the night of the 2d, at the house in which they were; and, going out early in the morning, left the door unbolted. The Marshal's gang of six armed ruffians entered, just as Harris was rising; and, after a stubborn resistance by him and his wife, overpowered them, put him in irons, dragged the whole family, half-clad, into the street, with brutal violence, thrust them into a carriage, drove to the railroad station, where a locomotive and car, specially provided for the occasion, stood ready for instant departure, and at half past six they were on their way to Springfield. There, after the formality of a brief examination, the Commissioner handed them over to the claimants, who took them back to bondage.

News of the arrest spread rapidly in the city, creating an intense excitement. "In less than twenty minutes after the Marshal left the house," says the *Post*, "it was surrounded by a crowd of Africans, swearing vengeance upon all concerned." Learning, somehow, the treachery of HAYES, they turned their fury upon him, and, but for the timely interference of the police, would have broken into his house, to seize and punish him. He had to be taken to the armory for protection. They rushed also, in hundreds, to the bridge which the regular passenger train was to cross at 9 o'clock, thinking the fugitives would be on board, and meaning to stop the train; but were driven from the track by a discharge of steam from the engine. Nor was the indignation awakened by the outrage by any means confined to the colored people. The *Tribune* denounced the conduct of Marshal JONES and his posse in most emphatic terms. "He has dared," it said, "to outrage the feelings of an entire community with barbarities that would illy become him were his prisoners the veriest criminals on the earth. * * * Man-hunting in Chicago has

never found a more zealous and willing tool. He enters into the business with a zest and keenness which awaken wonder how talents so useful on the track of runaways have, till now, been latent in Northern Illinois, instead of finding active employment in a milder climate. * * * There is a distinction between doing one's painful duty under a law, and making that duty a delight; and yet the latter has been chosen by Mr. JONES. * * * All is done as if the law was a pleasure, and its service a delight to the Marshal. * * * The unfledged LEGREES of our bar-rooms and stews all praise Marshal JONES, and chant his pæans over bad whiskey, but good and humane men hang their heads; Republicans finding this one consolation, just this, that the Marshal does well to choose his tools from the party which has always kept bloodhounds in leash, ready at the slave-driver's beck and bidding." At a meeting of "live men, Simon-pure Abolitionists," (in the words of the *Post*.) held on the evening of the 6th, a Vigilance Committee was appointed, composed of some of the most respectable men of the city, to "see that no more fugitives were taken from Chicago by the officers;" indignant denunciations of the Marshal's course were uttered by the speakers; and resolutions were adopted, charging him with having "evinced a mean and atrocious subserviency to the Slave Power, and outraged the rights of our common humanity;" declaring that "every friend of liberty should become a committee to attend the steps of said Marshal, and his deputies, with such physical circumstances as shall effectually put a stop to such outrages," and that "Republicans do not expect the United States Marshal to manifest an alacrity and love for the nefarious duties required by the infamous and unconstitutional Fugitive Slave Law;" and proposing a petition to the President, for the removal of the Marshal.

The Marshal replied publicly to the *Tribune's* strictures, showing that he felt their sting, but failing, as that journal truly said, to "relieve a single whit the features of the affair, by his careful special pleadings." Beyond the correction of some inaccuracies in the first-published accounts, the chief point of the defence was that he had "taken a solemn oath to execute the law." But how an atrocious wrong is changed to right or duty by the taking of an oath to do it, or where, indeed, he got the right to take an oath requiring of him such wrong-doing, he seems not to have thought it necessary to explain.

The fate of the HARRIS family, the presence of numerous slave-

hunters in the city, and the knowledge that several writs were in the officers' hands, so thoroughly alarmed the colored people of Chicago, "generally, as a class, our most quiet citizens," says the *Tribune*, that, within the week ending April 7th, nearly three hundred of them fled to Canada. Many of these had lived in the city for years, and "not a few were comfortably maintaining themselves in vocations useful to the community." On Sunday afternoon, after "impressive and deeply affecting services" in the Baptist church of the colored people, and a most touching scene of leave-taking between those who staid and those who went, a hundred and fifteen departed together on the train for Detroit, in freight cars chartered for the purpose. "One poor woman, for whom it was known writs were made out, was brought down on a mattress, on a dray, dangerously ill, but determined to brave all for freedom." A sick child was conveyed in the arms of its father. And thus was celebrated, in the chief city of the free Northwest, the advent of a Republican Administration to power.

A case came, last fall, before the courts of Canada, involving a question of vital importance to the refugees from slavery living in that Province. On the 28th of September, 1859, SENECA T. P. DIGGES, of Howard county, Mo., with the help of three of his slaves, attempted to arrest JOHN ANDERSON, a slave who was trying to make his way to freedom. ANDERSON resisted, and, finding that he must else be taken, struck DIGGES with his knife a blow which proved to be fatal, and then escaped to Canada. There he lived a quiet, industrious life, for nearly a year; when, through the baseness of some one in whom he had imprudently confided, his place of retreat became known to DIGGES' friends, and a requisition was sent to the Canadian authorities, demanding that he be surrendered, under the Ashburton treaty, as a murderer. He was arrested in September last, and the magistrate before whom he was brought decided that the evidence justified the demand, and so certified to the Governor General, whose legal adviser, unwilling to take the responsibility of giving an official opinion on the case, brought it before the Court of Queen's Bench. It was argued on the 24th of November last. The article of the treaty under which the requisition was made provides that fugitives shall be surrendered "only upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the fugitive shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial, if the offence had there been committed;" and not till the

examining magistrate shall have certified to the proper executive authority that the evidence is "deemed sufficient to sustain the charge." The act of the Canadian Legislature, prescribing the duties of the Judicial and Executive officers, under the treaty, requires that the examining magistrate, "if the evidence be deemed sufficient by him to sustain the charge, *according to the laws of this Province*, if the offence alleged had been committed herein, shall certify the same to the Governor," before a warrant can issue for the surrender of the person demanded. Of course it was contended, on behalf of the prisoner, that, according to British and Canadian law, a slave trying to escape from bondage is doing a rightful act, and his killing any one who attempts to reënslave him is not murder, but justifiable homicide; and consequently is not an offence for which he can be demanded, under the treaty. The majority of the Court, however, thought otherwise. On the 15th of December, Chief Justice ROBINSON and Justice BURNS decided that the prisoner must be surrendered. Justice McLEAN dissented, holding that the act of the prisoner was justifiable, and not one for which he was liable to be detained under the treaty; that no enactment converting men into chattels ought to be recognized as law; that the proceedings were also formally defective; and that, "on every ground, the prisoner is entitled to his discharge."

A strong feeling was aroused by the decision, which was warmly denounced by public meetings and the better portion of the Canadian press, and "every exertion" was pledged "to prevent the rendition" of the prisoner. Of a meeting held in Toronto, "to express the public feeling" on the subject, the *Globe* of that city said it "was one of the largest and most enthusiastic we have ever seen in Toronto." The Mayor presided, "the leading clergymen were on the platform," with lawyers, merchants, &c., "the speeches were admirable, and were received with enthusiastic applause, especially when the speakers asserted the inviolability of our country as an asylum for the fugitive slave." The excitement reached to England also, and there, as well as in Canada, the prevailing purpose manifestly was that ANDERSON should never be given up. "We suppose," said the *London Times*, "there will be hardly a man in England who will not hope for the success even of his forcible rescue, if things come to that extremity." And again, "are we, therefore, [i. e., even if the law requires it,] to surrender this man to the cruel fate which awaits him in the neighboring State? The suggestion is preposterous. * * * *

Very confident, we are, that this negro is at this moment as safe, in the prison of Toronto, from ever being sent before a Missouri jury of slave-owners, as he would be if he were in the wilds of Central Africa. * * * It is not because we have blindly and unknowingly bound ourselves systematically to outrage all the common laws of God and humanity, that we are therefore now to take the first step, by the same means as the Romans used to adopt when they desired to commit themselves to some nefarious enterprise—by the sacrifice of a slave.” The London *Dispatch* regarded it as impossible “that the English nation would submit to the rendition of ANDERSON. No English minister, as he loves the honor of his country, as he would be saved from universal execration, hatred and contempt, would surrender a fugitive slave, guilty of no other crime than that of winning his liberty by the death of his oppressor.” The London *Morning Star and Dial* thought that the peril to “the sacredness of British soil as an asylum for the fugitive slave,” would “occasion throughout Great Britain a sensation no less profound than it has produced” in Canada; and asked, after mentioning the decision of the Canadian Court to surrender ANDERSON, “Shall this atrocious deed be enacted? Shall this infamous precedent be established?” It commended the opinion of the dissenting Judge, affirming that he “enunciated principles with which every Englishman will cordially sympathize,” and “laid down the doctrines of the British Constitution on this subject, with a legal acumen which was only eclipsed by the eloquence with which he asserted those moral principles that underlie the whole question.” If a warrant should be issued for the return of the slave, it said, “we know, from significant indications,” of which it mentioned several, “that he will not be permitted to return, and that the whole civil and military power of Canada will be powerless to consummate a tragedy from which human nature itself revolts.” An appeal was taken from the Court of Queen’s Bench to the Court of Error and Appeal, but, before the time arrived for hearing it, the case was brought, by *habeas corpus*, to the Court of Common Pleas, sitting at Toronto, and ANDERSON was discharged, on the ground that the warrant on which he was arrested was illegal; leaving—as we understand it—the question still open as to the construction of the rendition clause of the Ashburton treaty. While the case was still pending, the Court of Queen’s Bench, in London, at the instance of Mr. CHAMEROVZOW, Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, issued a writ of *habeas corpus*, to bring the prisoner to

Westminster Hall; and instructions were sent to the Governor-General of Canada not to give him up without express orders from the Imperial Government. Lord PALMERSTON is said to have expressed a belief, that "the case, according to the treaty, is quite clear," and that "the claim of the United States must be established by showing that ANDERSON was guilty of murder, according to the law of England; and as he was quite convinced that no English jury would convict ANDERSON of murder, the claim was not likely to be substantiated." Whether anything has been done in the matter since ANDERSON was set free by the Canadian Court, we do not learn; but probably the main question involved is regarded, on both sides of the ocean, and on both sides of the Canadian line, as practically settled against the assumptions of American slaveholders, although no authoritative interpretation of the treaty has been formally given.

The Cincinnati *Enquirer* relates a case decided lately, in Ohio, which, although it is not, strictly speaking, that of a fugitive slave, we shall find, perhaps, no fitter place than this to notice; while it seems worthy of mention somewhere, on account of the practical importance of the principle affirmed by the Court. On board a boat which stopped at the Cincinnati landing was a slave boy, whom his master was taking from Virginia to Missouri. He was brought before the Court, by a writ of *habeas corpus*, to have the question tried whether he had not become free by his master's bringing him within the jurisdiction of Ohio. Chief Justice GHOLSON, ("elected last year by the Republicans,"—the sham-Democratic *Enquirer* is careful to say,) announced the decision—Judges CARTER, MALLON and COLLINS concurring—and held that "although the jurisdiction of the Courts of Ohio extends, for many purposes, to the boats on the river, yet the citizens of other States have a right to the free navigation of the river; that the stopping of boats at the landing is a necessary incident to this right; and that, as such, it rests on a higher basis than the mere jurisdiction of the river;" and consequently, the boy had not been so brought within the jurisdiction of Ohio as to have become free. He was, therefore, remanded to his master. This strikes us as a rather severe straining of the legal point on which the decision is made to rest; for the right to the free navigation of the river can carry with it, as it seems to us, no "necessary incident" conflicting with natural right and universal law. It cannot confer on the citizens of one State a right to carry within the geographical limits of another a peculiar local law of the

former, at variance not only with the fundamental law of the latter, but also with the moral sentiment of the civilized world. So that, while it may quite properly include the right of a Virginian, voyaging on the river, to stop a convenient length of time at a landing in Ohio,—an act not contrary either to the Constitution of Ohio or to natural justice,—it would not include a right to hold a slave, even for a single instant, within the bounds of Ohio, where the Constitution of that State forbids slaveholding, as the law of right does everywhere.

We close this part of our Report with some testimonies which have lately appeared in regard to the condition of the colored refugees in Canada. The *Boston Courier*, in a brief notice of W. M. MITCHELL's book, referred to on a former page, though doubting whether "this tropical race" can thrive well "in the rigorous climate of Canada," says that "the negroes are said to be better farmers than the Irish, or even the Canadian French. The thousand fugitive slaves in Toronto wash linen, make shirts, are blacksmiths, bricklayers, carpenters, shoemakers, painters, etc. There are six colored grocers in the town, and there is one colored physician. One fugitive slave is worth a hundred thousand dollars." A correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, who announces himself as a "Southron," writes, that as "it is currently reported at the South, that the colored people in Canada are in suffering condition," he visited the Province, "to find out the truth of the matter," and can "say from personal observation, and from interviews with reliable men from different parts of Canada, that the report is utterly false. Many of the colored people are amassing wealth. All parties testify that the colored man's condition is as good as that of any other emigrants." The *Philadelphia Friends' Review*, speaking of a visit lately made to Canada, by JOSEPH MORRIS, a Friend in Ohio, says that "his first call was at Chatham, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, of whom about one-third are colored people; and their mercantile establishments, farms, houses, and other improvements, compare favorably with those of their white neighbors. He was taken, at his request, to the houses of the most indigent, but saw no cases of extreme destitution." At Buxton, whither he next went, "the impressions made upon his mind by his examination into the state of the colored people" were "very agreeable and encouraging. He never saw any people more willing to rely on their own resources." The difficulties which they have experienced, "in common with the inhabitants of

many other newly-settled districts in the Northwest, have been surmounted, and their toil has been abundantly rewarded." At Shrewsbury, the last place he visited, "they manifested a spirit of independence in respect to obtaining the means of living, and educating their children. He thinks the unrestricted enjoyment of the privileges of citizenship largely promotes their improvement." He "returned home, gratified with the results of his investigations, and having reliable accounts of the satisfactory condition of the other settlements."

RESCUE CASES.

Our last Report mentioned the arrest of several colored men in Philadelphia, for attempting to rescue MOSES HORNER from the United States officers who were conducting him to slavery. Seven of them were indicted for the offence, and at their trial, in June last, five were convicted, and sentenced each to thirty days' imprisonment and twenty-five dollars fine. The Philadelphia correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard* says that "one thing very striking in this trial was the intelligence and high tone of character evinced by the accused." When the first was tried, "the others were allowed to come in as witnesses. A more respectable and intelligent set of men have rarely testified in any Court. There was a dignity and self-possession in their manner, and an accuracy and propriety of language in their statements, quite unusual with men of any color, taken promiscuously, as these were, from the crowd. The effect was visible upon the Court and jury; indeed, some of the latter were open in their expressions of pleasure and surprise." The writer speaks also of the "noticeably respectful language" of the Government's witnesses "toward the accused. The word 'nigger,' or even 'negro,' was not once named among them. 'A colored gentleman,' a 'colored man,' 'that gentleman,' were the phrases which, instead of the opprobrious and ribald terms once so common, they used to designate the parties, as they had occasion to refer to them." He adds, that "the amplest testimony was borne to the respectability and general good character of the defendants. ROBERT PURVIS testified that the character of JEREMIAH BUCK was 'unexceptionable;' HORACE BINNEY bore witness equally strong to the worthiness of (his coachman) RICHARD WILLIAMS; and others not less worthy of belief testified to the good character of the rest. On the whole," continues the writer,

“the effect of the trial on the community and the cause will be good. The facts which it brought out are highly creditable to the party accused and to the class they represent. * * * The friends of the cause will cheerfully pay the fine, and, while regretting that that is all that is in their power, will warmly sympathize with them in their imprisonment.”

Last spring, a man named VAN BUSKIRK was arrested and held to bail, charged with aiding in the rescue of NALLE, at Troy, N. Y., of which we have spoken heretofore. At the next succeeding term of the United States District Court at Auburn, the case was submitted to the Grand Jury, who unanimously refused to find a bill, although the Government brought twenty witnesses to prove the offence.

At the date of our last Report, “the Ottawa (Ill.) rescuers,” HOSSACK, STOUT, and KING, were awaiting sentence. About the 1st of last October they were sentenced—HOSSACK, to ten days’ imprisonment and \$100 fine; STOUT, to ten days’ imprisonment and \$50 fine; and KING, to one day’s imprisonment and \$10 fine; the fines and costs of prosecution amounting in all to \$1,600, and the imprisonment to continue till the fines and costs should all be paid. HOSSACK, when asked the customary question, whether he had anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced upon him, “delivered an able speech,” says the *Chicago Congregational Herald*, “arguing, with what in any land where slavery does not exist would be considered perfect demonstration, that the Fugitive Slave Law is a violation of the rights of man, contrary to our Constitution, and opposed to the law of God.” He closed with an “appeal to the Court of High Heaven, where Judge and rescuer and rescued shall all stand at the judgment-seat of the Most High. I have endeavored,” he said, “to obey the divine law, and all the laws of my country that do not conflict with the laws of my God. My humble wish is that it may then appear that I have done my duty; all I wish to be written on my tombstone is, ‘He feared God and loved his fellow-men.’” The popular feeling was strong in favor of the prisoners, and expressed itself promptly in a contribution to pay the fines and costs, the Mayor of Chicago taking the lead in the movement; so that, when the ten days were out, they were discharged, amid general gratulations. They were welcomed with enthusiasm, at a public meeting in Metropolitan Hall, freely granted for the purpose by the proprietor. The *Chicago Democrat* says, “the hall was crowded with men and women of all classes and conditions,” and when it was announced that the amount required to

liberate the prisoners, and even more, had been raised, "we never heard the old Metropolitan Hall ring so loudly before."

About a year ago, a decision of some importance touching the administration of the Fugitive Slave Act was given by Judge PETTIT, of the United States District Court in Kansas. LEWIS L. WELD, having been indicted for helping to rescue CHARLES FISHER, in January, 1859, from the custody of a guardian of two minors in Kentucky, whose property FISHER was claimed to be, the Judge held, at the trial, that there was no legal ground for prosecution, inasmuch as the Act does not authorize reclamation by a guardian, and makes no provision for reclaiming fugitive slaves of minors.

On the 12th of last November, a negro woman named ELIZA, claimed as a fugitive slave by one Knuckles, of Nebraska, was arrested in Chicago, and, in consequence of an attempt by the colored people to rescue, was lodged in the armory for safe keeping. The next day, while the sheriff of the county was conducting her to the office of a magistrate who had issued a warrant against her for a breach of the peace, a company of the colored people took her from him, and conveyed her to "parts unknown." The next week, nine persons, including the justice who issued the warrant and the deputy sheriff who served it, were indicted in the United States District Court, for aiding in the rescue. "The case," says the *Chicago Tribune*, "excites much interest among the members of the bar in this city," as it raises distinctly the question whether a slave can be legally held in a Territory. "The men indicted will make a struggle in the Courts, and, long before their trials are concluded, the attention of the nation will be devoted to them. The guarantees of freedom in the Territories will not be readily given up."

The Grand Jury of the United States Court for the Northern District of Ohio, last winter, found bills against Rev. GEORGE GORDON and six others, charged with obstructing the service of process in a fugitive slave case, by the United States Marshal of the Southern District, at Iberia, Morrow county, Ohio, on the 27th of last September. The same persons were also indicted for assaulting the claimants of the alleged fugitive and their assistants, with the purpose of preventing their reclaiming him.

Last summer, Mr. SMILIE CALHOUN, of Sussex county, Delaware, came North to solicit means from the benevolent to remove his family from Delaware, for the reason that he had been forced to give up his house, farm and stock to a neighbor, one JACOBS, from whom he

had assisted the escape of two persons believed by him and themselves to be legally free, but claimed by JACOBS as slaves. Although JACOBS recovered the alleged slaves, he compelled CALHOUN to surrender his property, in order to escape prosecution; and homeless and penniless, the plundered victim of the slaveholder's rapacity fled from "the robber land, where mercy is a crime."

THE MOB REVIVAL.

The past year has witnessed a revival of the pro-slavery-mob spirit in portions of the North, seeming almost to carry us back to the early days of our enterprise. Its first outbreak was against a meeting held at the Tremont Temple, in Boston, to observe the anniversary of JOHN BROWN'S death, by discussing the question, "How can American Slavery be abolished?" The meeting was announced to be held through the morning, afternoon and evening of Dec. 3d. At the opening of the morning session, a riotous assemblage, "chiefly composed," a correspondent of the *New York Tribune* says, "of North End roughs and Beacon street aristocrats," with shouts and screams and stamping of feet, clamored down the attempts of the callers of the meeting to organize it; and then, in a most dastardly manner, took the organizing into their own hands, appointed a chairman, RICHARD S. FAY, ex-candidate for Congress, who made them a speech in keeping with their proceedings, and proposed for their adoption a series of resolutions, evidently prepared beforehand, with intent that just such an occasion should be made for offering them. The mob, of course, unanimously and boisterously adopted them. One of the series, which will serve as a sufficient sample of the whole, declared that "the people of this city have submitted too long in allowing irresponsible persons and political demagogues of every description to hold public meetings to disturb the public peace and misrepresent us abroad; they have become a nuisance, which, in self-defence, we are determined shall henceforward be summarily abated."

The meeting continued, through much confusion, the rightful occupants of the house now and then, by skillful management, baffling the mob, and out-generalling its leaders, and obtaining, for a brief space, a comparatively quiet hearing, but for the most part overborne by brutal clamor, till about half past one; when, at the Mayor's orders, the rioters and the lawful meeting were both dispersed

by the police. The Mayor also ordered that no meeting should be held in that place in the afternoon or evening. A writer in the *Liberator*, who was present nearly the whole time, says that from about an hour after the beginning of the disturbance, to the close of the meeting, a large number of police were in the hall, enough "to have reduced the meeting to perfect order in any five minutes of the two hours," but so far as he saw, "there was not the slightest interference with one of the rioters, although, in the latter part of the meeting, the police did interfere with some of the legitimate holders of it." The Chief of Police did nothing but make "feeble appeals to all present, alike the holders of the meeting and the rioters, to withdraw." The mob soon came to the conclusion that the police were on their side, and vociferously cheered them. "Prominent rioters were heard saying to each other, 'The police are all right'—'The police are with us'—'The other party pay 'em, and we get the work.'"

"The aspect, manners and language of this mob," says the witness just cited, "showed an active sympathy with slavery and slaveholders." At a speaker's remark that the slaves, from half a million, had increased to four millions, "the mob shouted—'Good! good!' From time to time, they gave 'three cheers' for any prominent representative of the Slave Power that occurred to them. They showed, also, a murderous ferocity of spirit. It seemed evident that they were ready to kill the more prominent representatives of opposition to slavery, as soon as tumult and confusion could be raised far enough to screen the individual perpetrators of such act. I am satisfied that nothing but the firm quietness of the gentlemen on the platform, confining themselves to temperate and orderly remonstrance against this invasion of their rights, prevented the brutal spirit of the mob from proceeding to bloodshed."

FAY and his gang having succeeded, with the help of Mayor LINCOLN, in robbing the callers of the meeting of their purchased right to hold it in the Temple,—a robbery as real, as lawless and as unjustifiable as if the price of the right had been forcibly taken, in money, from their pockets,—the meeting was continued, in the evening, at J. SELLA MARTIN'S church, in Joy street. The mob, summoned by placards posted in the afternoon, gathered in great numbers around the church; but the police, "this time," says the *Tribune's* correspondent, "under the abler direction of the Deputy Chief," prevented most of them from entering, and protected the meeting from any

serious disturbance. After the adjournment, however, the rioters assailed the colored people as they came out, knocked down several of them, and seriously injured a few, besides breaking the windows of some of their houses. The only person arrested by the police was a colored man, who wounded some one with a hatchet, in repelling one of these assaults.

Several of the Boston journals hastened to make themselves accessory, after the fact, to the outrage and robbery perpetrated by the mob. The *Courier* of the next morning vouched for the "respectability" of the rioters, praised their "resolute good nature," assumed that "all good citizens" have a right to do as they did, and said "no such assembly" as that which they disturbed, for that or any similar purpose, is very likely to be held "in any conspicuous place in Boston again. Nor do we believe that our people will listen, hereafter, as they have hitherto done, to the fierce tirades of PHILLIPS and his crew, to the empty platitudes of SUMNER, or the insolent bravado of WILSON." The *Advertiser* said, "The cry of 'free speech,' which will no doubt be set up on behalf of those who yesterday saw their meeting taken out of their hands, can find little support among unprejudiced observers. * * * The chord, which any appeal for free speech touches, will hardly vibrate in response to the appeals of those who claim that glorious privilege only to abuse it. And what abuse of it could be more flagrant, or more deserve condemnation, than to use it simply as the means of adding to a great national excitement and peril." The *Pilot* was "proud of" the mob's achievement, and thought it "not likely that the furious Abolitionists among us will ever again attempt to make themselves the exponents of public feeling. If our city had acted in this manner before, the country would not be so agitated as it unfortunately is. But better late than not at all; and the present ebullition of patriotic sentiment may be followed by a great many." The *Post* did not wait till after the meeting to show where its sympathies were, but took occasion, from the call of it, to publish articles which, while affecting to deprecate a riot, were well calculated, and probably designed, to excite one. "The young men," it said, "who propose to hold" the meeting, "are making a severe test of the forbearance of this community." To hold it, would "augment the principal cause of the distress and trouble" which "the community is suffering." Its principal instigator was "JAMES REDPATH, an Englishman, whose association with the difficulties in Kansas, and JOHN BROWN, has rendered his name

obnoxious to very many peace-loving people." And, as the *Liberator* well said, "having thus played the incendiary, and kindled the fire, the *Post* proceeded to express the hope that no conflagration would follow."

This beginning of mob violence was followed up on Sunday, December 9th, by an attempt, which, however, proved feeble and ineffectual, to disturb the usual Sunday meeting of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Society, in Music Hall, addressed, that day, by FREDERICK DOUGLASS. On the next Sunday, when the speaker was WENDELL PHILLIPS, the mob renewed their attempt; but, their purpose being known beforehand, Alderman CLAPP, acting as Mayor, in the fortunate absence of Mayor LINCOLN, made ample preparation to protect the congregation and the speaker, and though some noise was made at times in the rear of the crowded hall, the interruptions amounted to little, and soon ceased. At the close of the discourse, the mob arranged themselves in the street, to attack the speaker as he came out, but his friends and the police closed around him, and guarded him to his house. According to the statement of one of the police, who was of the party, two hundred of them were employed in this service, and "without them, he never would have got home alive." The mob was composed of "well-dressed young men," mostly, merchants' clerks.

As the time approached for holding the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, the Trustees of the Tremont Temple, in which it was to be held, apprehending another riotous invasion of their rights, applied to the City Government for protection in the lawful use of their property. Mayor WIGHTMAN (the newly-chosen successor of Mayor LINCOLN, whose term of office had lately expired) replied, in a note to Mr. HAYES, Superintendent of the Temple, "I do not consider any action of the City Government necessary in reference to the holding" of the proposed meeting. * * * "It is for you and the Trustees to decide whether it will be of such a character as to render a breach of the peace probable. If you anticipate any result of this nature, the responsibility will rest upon you, as you cannot be justified in wilfully putting the peace of the city in peril." After receiving this precious utterance of Dogberrian wisdom, which puts the responsibility for crime upon its innocent victims, Mr. HAYES, for the Trustees, and Mr. HEYWOOD, Acting General Agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, called upon the Mayor, on the 17th of January, and showed him the resolution above

quoted, of FAY's mob of December 3d, as evidence that the meeting of the Society was likely to be disturbed. The Mayor's response was the same in substance as his note, with the addition, that if an Anti-Slavery meeting should be held, and should provoke violent opposition,—as in the present excited state of the public mind it evidently would,—he should arrest those who called and conducted the meeting, as the aggressors upon the public peace. To questions from Messrs. HAYES and HERWOOD, he replied, that he thought the Trustees had no right to let the Temple for the discussion of exciting subjects, and that he “cared nothing about the legality of the meeting, but that certain things beyond the reach of law must be controlled by *other means*, which it might be his duty to employ.” Whereon the *Courier*, characteristically commenting, demanded “what right” the Anti-Slavery Society “have to ask the protection of the laws;” and affirmed that “the reply of Mayor WIGHTMAN was highly proper, and will secure him the approbation of all good citizens.”

On the 19th, a Committee of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Society waited on the Mayor, told him that, in accordance with an engagement made some months before, WENDELL PHILLIPS was to conduct the services at Music Hall, the next day, and requested protection in case of a disturbance, which they had reason to expect. The Mayor answered, “If you have reason to expect a disturbance, you are not authorized to hold the meeting.” It seems, however, that he took a sober second thought, before the time of the meeting came, for a police force was sent to preserve order, and to protect the speaker on his way home from the Hall, through a “crowd of genteel ruffians of the Bell-Everett persuasion,” gathered in the street, and—not permitted to do worse—venting their spite in howls and groans.

The Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was to be held on the 24th and 25th, in the Tremont Temple. It opened there on the morning of the 24th, and held two sessions, morning and afternoon, most of the time amid the uproar of a mob, which sought to clamor down its speakers with yells and shouts and cheers for the Union, for EDWARD EVERETT, for WEBSTER, for CRITTENDEN, and with an indescribable variety of discordant sounds. In the afternoon, a large number of the police were present, but stood passive spectators of the disorder, evidently without orders to repress it. The Mayor came in, at length, and was about to order the dispersion of both mob and rightful meeting, saying that the Trustees had sent him a letter, desiring him to clear the hall; but several of the Trustees, who were

present, denying this, and calling for the reading of the letter, it proved to be a request for the removal of the rioters only. This, after some parley, he at last consented to do, and, though some of them returned, the afternoon session proceeded, for the little time remaining, without further serious disturbance, and closed with an orderly adjournment to the evening. But before the hour for the evening meeting, the Mayor ordered the Temple to be closed, and forbade the holding of an evening meeting there. The Society, thus wrongfully and lawlessly shut out of their place of meeting, attempted no public gathering on the next day; but met in their own rooms, in Washington street, merely to complete their unfinished business.

The Legislature of the State being then in session, one of its members, Mr. FISCHE, of Shelburne, offered, in the House of Representatives, a resolution to tender to the Society the use of the Representatives' Hall, for the holding of a session therein, in consequence of their exclusion, by the mob and the Mayor, from the hall which they had hired. After a spirited debate,—in the course of which a member objected, that “he believed the mob which assailed the Temple would not be afraid to attack the State House;” and another, Mr. TYLER, of Boston, said that, if the hall should be granted, “he would advise the talented artist, whose busts were exhibited below, not to leave them for the inspection of the crowd who would come,”—the resolution was rejected, by 136 to 69; the majority thus virtually voting to let the State, as well as the city, rest under the shameful imputation of being governed by a ruffian mob.

These riotous demonstrations were not confined to Boston. Threats of the like were made in New Bedford, against an Anti-Slavery meeting to celebrate the JOHN BROWN anniversary; but the presence of the Mayor and the Chief of Police, with an avowed determination to preserve order, prevented any outbreak. Even in a little, out-of-the-way hamlet of Western Massachusetts, known for a dozen miles around as Westfield Farms, the metropolitan example stirred up a few congenial spirits to imitate it. An appointment for an Anti-Slavery lecture, at the school-house, on the evening of January 2d, offered the occasion. A handful of very coarse samples of human nature made so much disturbance at the meeting, that the lecturer and his audience were obliged to withdraw to a neighboring dwelling-house, in order to speak and hear. An attempt to lecture, the next evening, in the school-house, was resisted by the same rabble, with still greater turbulence. In the struggle which ensued, when some

tried to put them out, the rioters overturned the stove, pouring the fire out upon the floor; and although the friends of order hastened to gather up the burning brands and coals, and to replace the stove, yet in the morning the school-house was a heap of ashes; an unnoticed coal having probably been left in a crevice of the floor, and kindled during the night to a consuming flame. In Brooklyn, New York, on the evening of December 16th, HENRY WARD BEECHER'S church was menaced with an attack, insidiously instigated, a correspondent of the *Boston Traveller* states, by the *New York Herald*; but the Trustees, forewarned, had two hundred policemen in the building, and no disturbance was attempted, "except the crushing of one window by the throwing of a stone."

HINTON ROWAN HELPER having been announced to speak at Clinton Hall, New York, on the 14th of January, a large force of rioters, many of them armed, gathered in front of the hall; but their purpose to prevent the delivery of the lecture had already been accomplished by the managers of the hall, who, fearing a riot, had broken their engagement with Mr. HELPER, and kept their doors shut, although, it is said, the police had made ample preparation to protect the meeting.

In Philadelphia, Mayor HENRY did, in effect, the mob's work of suppressing free speech, by using his influence to prevent GEORGE W. CURTIS from lecturing, on the 13th of December, before a literary institute in that city. Some threats of violence, in case of Mr. CURTIS'S speaking there, having been made, the Mayor, whether sympathizing with the lawless spirit prompting them, or cowardly shrinking from his duty to repress it, was either base or weak enough to give it his official encouragement by sending a note, on the 11th, signed with his name and official title, to the chairman of the Committee which had invited Mr. CURTIS, saying that Mr. CURTIS'S appearance as a lecturer at the time and place proposed would "be extremely unwise;" and "if I possessed the lawful power, I would not permit his presence on the occasion." And at the great "Union Meeting" in Independence Square, on the same day in the evening of which Mr. CURTIS was to have lectured, Mayor HENRY made a speech, which—whatever he intended by it—could hardly fail to be regarded, by those who were disposed to invoke mob-law against Anti-Slavery speakers, as giving countenance to such a course. "We must resolve public sentiment," he said, "to the old stand-point; and the misplaced appeals from our pulpits, lecture-rooms and

presses, against a section of our common country, must be frowned upon. * * * We shall do well to repel this officious intermeddling of our neighbors." It is due, however, to Philadelphia to say, that notwithstanding the riotous disposition of a portion of her citizens, and the cowardice or something worse of her Mayor, her prevailing sentiment was in favor of good order and the right of free speech. This was shown a few days later, when HENRY WARD BEECHER, at the invitation of the "Sons of New England in Pennsylvania," lectured on the anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims. Efforts were made to frighten the Committee into withdrawing the invitation; and, owing to the Mayor's disgraceful conduct, the owner of the hall engaged for the lecture refused for a time to fulfil his contract; but the Committee stood firm, and insisted on their rights, the owner yielded, and the lecture was delivered to an immense audience, and with no interruption except the enthusiastic applause which greeted "every allusion to freedom of speech, and every strong affirmation of the doctrines of universal liberty."

A series of Anti-Slavery Conventions held in the State of New York, in January and February, addressed by BERIAH GREEN, SUSAN B. ANTHONY, SAMUEL J. MAY, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, A. M. POWELL, and S. S. FOSTER, were made the occasion for disorderly proceedings by mobs of "broadcloth gentlemen and ugly roughs," in Buffalo and Rochester, in Syracuse and Utica and Rome, in Auburn and in Albany. In Buffalo, on the 3d and 4th of January, after disturbing the meeting with various kinds of uproar, through the first evening and the second afternoon and evening, till it was forced to adjourn in the midst of great confusion, the rioters organized a meeting of their own, and vociferously adopted resolutions reported by ex-Governor HORATIO SEYMOUR, from a Committee appointed for that purpose, expressing "unqualified disapprobation" of "the calling of a meeting in Buffalo, to give utterance to the wild theories of fanatical Abolitionists;" and trusting "that this class of people will in future select some other place, to utter their treasonable sentiments." While the riot was in progress, the Mayor tried for a time to check it, but his police being of the sham-Democracy, so far from duly seconding his exertions, "actually joined the mob," says an eyewitness, writing to the *Anti-Slavery Standard*.

In Rochester, the Convention sat through the afternoons and evenings of three days—the 11th, 12th and 13th of January. On the first evening, "several hundred mobocrats," said a correspondent of the

New York *Tribune*, "with 'intensely respectable' broadcloth leaders," baffled all the efforts of the Sheriff, Mayor, Aldermen and Police to secure a hearing for the speakers; and kept up a scene of wild confusion, till the Chief of Police declared the meeting adjourned. During the other sessions, comparatively good order was maintained; most of the rioters being kept out of the hall on Saturday evening, (the 12th,) by raising the admittance fee, for men, to fifty cents, and the police effectually resisting their desperate efforts to force an entrance. The proprietor of the hall was so alarmed, however, that he would not open it, as he had agreed, for Sunday's sessions, and they were held in a church of the colored people, generously and bravely offered for the purpose, in spite of threats that it should be demolished. The Mayor and other civic authorities, with a strong force of police, attended to keep order, and, though some of the "baser sort" were present, they offered no disturbance.

The Utica Convention was to have begun on the afternoon of the 14th, but when the speakers came to the hall which had been engaged for it, they found the doors closed, and were told that the Directors had decided not to open them. Several hundred persons had assembled, some with intent to hear, but most, according to the *Utica Herald*, to prevent a hearing. The Common Council, "usurping," as the *Herald* truly said, "a power which they had no right to exercise," had held a special meeting, adopted resolutions against the holding of the Convention, and appointed two Committees, one to advise the owners of all public halls in the city not to let them for the Convention, the other to wait upon the callers of it, and urge them to desist from their purpose of holding it. The action of the Council was instigated, the *Herald* states, by "a secret meeting called by notes headed 'confidential,' and signed 'Union,'" and "convened in a private law office, to prevent the Convention." The hand of ex-Governor SEYMOUR, we are told, was in this secret movement, which aptly illustrates at once a sham-Democratic, pro-slavery demagogue's notion of the right of peaceably assembling and of free speech, and his methods of dealing with attempts to exercise them. Unable to procure a public hall, the Convention met in the evening, in the parlors of a private dwelling—Mr. J. C. DELONG'S—where able addresses were given by MESSRS. GREEN and POWELL, Miss ANTHONY, and others; and resolutions were adopted, declaring "that at such an hour as this, we may well be expected to proclaim our convictions" in regard to American slavery; "that this we offered in good faith

to attempt in this city; that we abhor and condemn the lawless act by which the doors of our own 'hired house' were rudely and insolently closed against us; that the Mayor is to be held responsible" for not protecting the right of speech; "that we cannot consent to plunge into the gulf of absurdity, guilt and degradation in which, when the claims of humanity are urged, the majority in Church and State lie prostrate; and that we pledge ourselves anew to God, to our enslaved countrymen, and to each other, to devote arm and soul to our enterprise." The proceedings were published the next day in the *Utica Evening Telegraph*, somewhat to the discomfiture of the zealous "conservatives," who had supposed that the fanatics were completely silenced by their patriotic exertions.

At Rome, on the 17th, a quiet meeting was held in the afternoon, a small but intelligent and appreciative audience giving the speakers an attentive hearing. But in the evening, before the proceedings had begun, an organized band of ruffians, led by a few persons styled "respectable," rushed into the hall, rudely pushing aside Miss ANTHONY, who stood at the entrance to receive the admission fee, and, occupying the platform, threw the table to the floor, and with stamping and yelling, whistling and singing, made it impossible for the business of the meeting to go on. No attempt, therefore, was made to proceed with it; and the speakers returned to their hotel, whither, after a time, the rioters followed them, and tried to force their way in, giving great annoyance to the landlord and his guests. The authorities of the town were understood to have secretly connived at the doings of the mob.

The 29th and 30th were the days appointed for the Convention in Syracuse. As the time approached, the city grew feverish with excitement. The ruffian class, whether of the higher or the lower social grade, blustered and threatened lawless violence. The timid and short-sighted among the peaceably-disposed wished to prevent disorder by a surrender, beforehand, of the right proscribed by the mob. Some of this class sought to attain their object by an appeal to Mr. MAY; knowing him to be at once among the best of their fellow-citizens, and deservedly high in the esteem of his Anti-Slavery associates, and therefore likely to have much influence with them. They sent him, through the Mayor of the city, a communication, which he received about noon on the 28th, urging him to exert his influence to prevent the assembling of a Convention, "which," they said, "can now be productive only of evil." They did not deny the

right to hold it. "We affirm," they said, "now and ever, under the guaranties of the Constitution, the entire liberty of speech to every American citizen;" also, "that our duties as citizens would require us to aid in extending protection to your Convention, in the exercise of the rights which all deliberative bodies may claim;" but they thought that, "in the present excited condition of the public mind, any new cause of agitation" should be avoided. Yet they regarded slavery "as a great moral, political and social evil, whose extension is to be resisted by every means consistent with the integrity of the States and the maintenance of public liberty." They concluded: "We are credibly informed that an organized and forcible effort will be made to prevent the holding of your Convention, and we fear a collision between the police force of the city and a lawless mob." The Mayor, in transmitting the communication to Mr. MAY, expressed full concurrence "in the sentiments and arguments therein set forth;" adding, however, "I wish both you and all others concerned to understand most distinctly, that I believe it your *undoubted right* to hold such a Convention; and, if you decide to go on, I shall fearlessly use every means at my command to secure order, and to prevent any interference with your proceedings." Mr. MAY's reply was just what was to be expected from him; showing the sweet and gentle spirit, the calm courage, quiet firmness, and dignified courtesy well known to characterize so eminently that thorough Christian gentleman. Of course, he declined to use his influence as requested; believing that when "the 'strong' men of the Republican party are trembling," and betraying "want of confidence in moral principle and God," and "concession and compromise are coming to be their only hope, we should at least *offer* to speak, whether the people will hear, or whether they will forbear." And "if you, gentlemen," he said, in conclusion, "will do what you acknowledge to be your duty, and if the Mayor will fulfil his generous promise, I am confident the rioters will be overawed, the liberty of speech will be vindicated, and the city rescued from a deep disgrace."

When the time for the meeting of the Convention came, on the afternoon of the 29th, a large body of ruffians of the different sorts took forcible possession of the hall, having preconcerted their plans, chose one D. A. ORCUTT as Chairman, and, through the whole afternoon, kept up such a tumult that the Anti-Slavery people could do nothing. In the evening, the hall was closed, but a riotous crowd gathered around it, and staid there for two hours. The next morning,

the Convention met, and, with the help of the police, proceeded, till about noon, without serious interruption; but the rioters, gradually increasing in number, renewed the confusion of the day before, continuing it with little intermission till the Convention, early in the afternoon, adjourned without day. In the evening, a rabble of perhaps two hundred men and boys, as we learn from the *Syracuse Journal*, "joined in an elaborately prepared jollification, to celebrate the 'defeat of the Abolitionists';" and bearing effigies inscribed, "REV. SAMUEL J. MAY and SUSAN B. ANTHONY squelched," and transparencies inscribed, "Freedom of Speech, but not Treason," "The Rights of the South must be protected," "Abolitionism no longer in Syracuse," "The JERRY Rescue played out," they paraded the streets, "'making night hideous' with their shouts, hootings and screechings, mingled with disgusting profanity and ribaldry;" then "repairing to Hanover Square, the centre of the business part of the city, and, with the most revolting, blasphemous and beastly orgies," closed the spectacle by burning the effigies, "amid cheers for the Constitution and the Union." The *Journal* ends by saying that "feelings of sorrow, regret and humiliation at these unhappy occurrences are prevalent among all classes of respectable citizens, and among men of all political views." The *Syracuse American Wesleyan* states that "twelve or more of the ruffians have been indicted by the Grand Jury of the County, who were in session, and it remains to be seen what will be the result, when they shall be tried. The prime movers were prominent individuals who kept behind the curtains. The guilt mainly rests on them, though if any are punished, it must be their tools." The *Syracuse Courier and Union*, organ of sham-Democracy, justified the doings of the mob, declaring that, by them, "the JERRY rescue has been signally avenged."

A meeting of Mr. MAY's congregation—held to "express their abhorrence" of those disgraceful proceedings, "and resent, with calm but indignant words, the insults which their minister, whom they respect and love, has received"—unanimously adopted resolutions strongly reprobating the conduct of the mob; pledging themselves to use all proper means to prevent the like in future; reasserting as a foundation principle of their religious organization, the right to the largest liberty of thought and expression on all questions, moral, social or political; denouncing the brutal insults to their minister, "whose life-long Christian labors in upholding the rights of every human being should have been his protection, even from the mob by

whom they were offered ;” declaring the rights of free assembly and of free speech to be natural as well as political rights, and the protection of them by citizens and magistrates to be an essential safeguard against despotism ; and condemning, as even more culpable than the active mob, prominent persons desirous to be accounted good citizens, who, by their countenance, advice and money helped to carry out its illegal and indecent purposes.

The next Convention was in Auburn, on the 2d of February. Its first session, in the afternoon, was undisturbed ; but in the evening, a riotous rabble occupied the hall, organized a meeting of their own, passed characteristic resolutions, and with clatter of tongues and feet, and ringing of bells, and other noises, made it impossible to go on with the legitimate business. The Convention therefore adjourned to the house of DAVID WRIGHT, Esq., where its business was finished in quiet and order. From the Auburn *Union*, we learn that the first attempt of the rioters to organize produced a result not down in their programme, and which gave them a surprise not altogether agreeable. A Dr. MORRIS was nominated for Chairman, and the crowd shouted “ aye, aye,” and gave “ three cheers for MORRIS.” The Dr. came forward, and announced himself as “ an Englishman and a Democrat,” who, “ early imbued with the principles of liberty, had come to America with almost a holy reverence for the Constitutional law of this country, which guarantees freedom of speech to every inhabitant thereof.” He then went on to administer to the mob a most scathing rebuke, to which, as if struck dumb by astonishment, they listened for some time in silence ; but at length recovering their faculties, they replied in their natural language of groans and hisses. Of course it was found necessary to seek another Chairman. In Auburn, also, as in Syracuse, and indeed in nearly every place where these outrages occurred, the mob was justified by the local organ of the sham-Democracy, and is said—truly, no doubt—to have been instigated by persons pretending to respectability.

The time set for the Albany Convention was the 4th and 5th of February. Some days before, a petition signed by one D. V. KING and a hundred others was sent to the Mayor, asking his “ interposition, as Chief Magistrate of the city, to prevent the gathering,” which, they feared, “ would lead to disorderly demonstrations, tending to disturb the public peace and cast discredit upon the city.” At the same time, they had the cool effrontery to say, “ we recognize the right of free speech, and would not in the least circumscribe it.”

The Mayor answered, in an able and manly letter, "I most respectfully but decidedly decline to comply with your request," setting forth at large his reasons for so doing, and declaring, in conclusion, that "come what may, mob-law shall never prevail in our good city with my consent and connivance." When the Convention met, he was put to the test. At the opening of the evening meeting on the 4th, he addressed the people, exhorted them to keep the peace, and assured them that he would exert all the power vested in him as Mayor to enforce law and order. A speech from LUCRETIA MOTT was then heard with but slight interruption; but BERIAH GREEN, who spoke next, was assailed with such a tumult of hisses and stamping that very little of what he said could be heard. MRS. STANTON had for a time a respectful and attentive hearing; but soon her voice also was drowned in an uproar which continued with little intermission till the meeting adjourned. The disorderly crowd lingered after the adjournment, calling for speeches from the Mayor and Judge COLE; who, in response, urged on them respect for themselves, for the good name of the city, and for the right of free speech; and were answered with cheers for slavery, CRITTENDEN, and compromise, and groans for free speech and Abolitionism. The next afternoon, both mob and Mayor were again present; but the latter, finding persuasion and remonstrance unavailing, when the disorder again began, ordered the police to clear the galleries. It was promptly done, and the meeting then went on in quiet. A fresh attempt to disturb the evening session was also speedily put down by the summary ejection of the ruffians, and though the mob outside kept up a discord of yells and groans and shouts for slavery and compromise, and threats of vengeance upon the Mayor, the police and the Abolitionists, yet the Convention proceeded in good order, and closed its business without further interruption. As its leading members withdrew, protected by the police, the mob followed, yelling, cursing and threatening, but not daring to attempt an assault. Thus had a "Democratic" Mayor proved at last the possibility of defending the rights of a peaceable and lawful assembly against riotous intruders; and thus had he put to shame both citizens and magistrates of all those cities where the mob had been tamely suffered to bear sway, or, yet worse, had ruled with the connivance and scarcely concealed aid of the authorities and influential citizens.

A series of Anti-Slavery meetings, held in Illinois and Michigan, attended by PARKER PILLSBURY, and some of them by JOSEPHINE

GRIFFING, EDWIN BROWN and GILES B. STEBBINS, encountered the same kind of treatment—and still harsher, once, at least—as those further east. Of one of the meetings in Illinois, Mr. PILLSBURY wrote, in January, “Mr. BROWN and myself were honored with an encounter worthy of twenty years ago. Irish boys, Republican rowdies, Democratic sloughings, and Presbyterian Sunday-school scholars, all bore a most lively part in behalf of their respective constituencies. For some time, they made a most melancholy display of the religious and political training they had *suffered*; and our friends were apprehensive for the result. But before we closed, a better spirit was awakened, and at 10 o'clock, we closed with a seriousness and solemnity not common even at a Sunday sacrament.” In Farmington, Michigan, on the 5th of February, the meeting was broken up, for a time, by the burning of a cartridge of cayenne and other offensive ingredients; but, after waiting awhile for the admission of fresh air, and for the people to recover from strangulation and coughing, the house was again called to order, and the speaking went on undisturbed. “Week after week,” said Mr. PILLSBURY, in the spring, summing up the results of the winter’s campaign, “we were mobbed by Republicans, among others, till at length their own President had to skulk secretly to his own inauguration to escape a mob, and mob law has ruled him and the nation (as I told every mob it would) from that to the present hour.”

The most violent of all these demonstrations was at Ann Arbor, Michigan. The mob there, says Mr. PILLSBURY, whose experiences in that sort, it is well known, have been neither few nor trivial, was “one of the fiercest I ever encountered.” The Convention was held on Saturday and Sunday, January 26th and 27th, in the meeting-house of the Friends of Progress; fear of the mob, or sympathy with its purpose, having closed every other public building in the place. At the first session, Saturday afternoon, the house was crowded, from before the appointed hour to the close, chiefly with students of the University, many of them very disorderly; and though, in intervals of quiet, speeches were made and listened to, yet the confusion was so great as to prevent a regular organization. In the evening, the rioters had filled the house, and chosen a Chairman, before the hour to which the Convention had adjourned, and when it arrived, he impudently held the platform for a time, but was at length persuaded to yield it. Such a clamor was kept up, however, with groans for LINCOLN and the Convention, and cheers for DOUGLAS and the Union,

that speaking to any purpose was impossible. Still, the Convention sat in patient waiting, till the mob was reënforced by a band of drunken "roughs," who began to break benches, and assail the friends of order with kicks and blows, by which some of them were severely injured, when they quietly retired. The ruffians remained, breaking the seats, shattering the windows, both glass and sash, tearing up the desk, and throwing down the stovepipe; making the interior of the house little better than a complete wreck. The Mayor had promised protection to the meeting, but did not even appear at it, to so much as try to keep his promise. The next morning, the Convention met again, made such temporary repairs as were needful to fit the room for use, and—with a full house—organized, and held an unmolested and deeply interesting session. In the afternoon, some slight, occasional attempts were made to renew the disorder of the former day; but the disturbers were few, and were awed or shamed into silence, and the meeting went on to its close in triumphant quietness. "In no instance," says Mr. PILLSBURY, reviewing his winter's work, "has a mob prevailed over us. Indeed, it is doubtful whether every disturbance did not actually aid us, in an important degree. The outrages at Ann Arbor and Farmington arrested, for a time, all proceedings; but, in both instances, our recoil upon the mob, and ultimate triumph, were signally successful."

From the whole tenor of the accounts of these recent efforts to revive the scenes of five and twenty years ago, it is manifest, that their intent is to conciliate the plotters of treason at the South, to stay the progress of secession, and lure back seceders and armed rebels, by creating an impression that the North is ready to adopt the cowardly policy of concession, and, for the sake of Union, to make such compromises as will ensure to the Slave Power the continuance of its old supremacy, which seemed to be endangered, if not subverted, by the result of the Presidential election. In this base work were joined—with those who all along have ranked as Northern serviles, negro-haters, pro-slavery fanatics, and unprincipled and selfish demagogues, who vainly try to hide their proclivity to despotism under the stolen name of Democracy—some who, professing heretofore, perhaps not altogether insincerely, to be opposed, if not to slavery, at least to slavery-extension, and claiming still to be Republicans, have become frightened, by the movements at the South, into a virtual, and even, in some instances, an avowed abandonment of former principles, or what they called such, stupidly hoping thus to "save the Union."

One needs but slight acquaintance with human nature generally, and with Southern, slaveholding human nature, in particular, to see that one effect of such a course must be to win the well-deserved contempt of those whom means like these are chosen to conciliate.

SOUTHERN BARBARISM.

The Charleston (S. C.) *Courier*, in publishing an account of the mob in Boston, which disturbed the meetings at the Tremont Temple, very appropriately headed it, "The Power of Slavery"; testifying thus, it may be unintentionally, that deeds of outrage and lawless violence are the natural product of the system, and are therefore to be expected, in frequency and atrocity proportioned to its power. If it can do such things in Massachusetts, where its power, though felt, is limited, and counteracted by strong opposing forces, what may it, must it do, in those parts where it rules with absolute, undisputed sway? The inference here implied is borne out, as has long been notorious, by multitudes of facts. These ever-frequent illustrations of the barbarism which always, of necessity, overspreads the slave-land, were more than usually numerous, perhaps, in the past year, because of the excitement attending a Presidential election known to involve the interests of slavery. Hardly would the space at our command suffice for a mere catalogue of all the cases which have been recorded by the press. Murder, as if becoming satiate with the number of its victims, has almost seemed to be seeking stimulants to its cloyed appetite, by varying the modes and circumstances of its bloody banquet. Shot, scourge and steel have been among its instruments; hanging and drowning and burning have all helped to diversify its methods. The unburied bodies of the slain have been left to feed the birds and beasts. Outrages of every grade of less enormity, from coating with tar and feathers, or severely whipping, down to mere expulsion from the South, were the milder penalties for being suspected of disloyalty, in deed or word or thought, to the domestic institution. Preachers and teachers, lawyers and doctors, merchants, seamen, engineers, mechanics, men, in a word, of almost every lawful occupation—Americans and foreigners, strangers but just arrived, and Northern men long resident at the South, and even native Southern citizens—were among the objects of suspicion and proscription.

Some suffered for things said or done, or alleged to have been said or done; others for mere not-saying and not-doing,—declining to take part in the savage work of persecution. But the crime of all, however varied in its form, was “Abolitionism.” True, probably not one in fifty, possibly not one in five hundred of these sufferers ever was an Abolitionist, in any sense in which that word is used here at the North, or in any other portion of the civilized world; but doubtless few, if any of the accused, were innocent, according to the ultra-Southern definition, which we copy from the *Southern Literary Messenger*: “AN ABOLITIONIST is any man who does not love slavery for its own sake, as a divine institution; who does not worship it as the corner-stone of civil liberty; who does not adore it as the only possible social condition on which a permanent Republican government can be erected; and who does not, in his inmost soul, desire to see it extended and perpetuated over the whole earth, as a means of human reformation second in dignity, importance and sacredness alone to the Christian religion. He who does not love African slavery with this love is an Abolitionist.” According to this definition, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, in spite of all the services he had done to the Slave Power, was deemed an “Abolitionist,” and, as such, was greeted with rotten eggs and yells and hisses in the capital of Alabama; and R. S. THAREN, formerly law-partner of fire-eating YANCEY, and never known as an opponent of slavery, fell under like condemnation, and was driven from his Southern home, without being allowed even to see and take leave of his wife and children, but not without peril of his life from mobs, who threatened him with hanging, in the place of banishment. A correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, writing from Memphis, Tennessee, on the 5th of December, said that “it matters not how servile a Democrat a man may have been, or may now be, if he is from the ‘accursed North,’ it is sufficient” to put him in jeopardy. Testimonies to substantially the same effect have come from every portion of the South, besides abundant proof that Southern birth assures no man of safety in his native home, if he holds back from the extreme demands of slavery.

For avowing himself a Republican, JOHN NOTT, of Michigan, as we learn from the *Grand Rapids Eagle*, was hung, near Vicksburg, Mississippi, in January last. About the 1st of September, a man in that city, for having expressed himself in favor of LINCOLN, “was sent adrift on the Mississippi, after being well tarred,” says the *Vicksburg Sun*, which adds, that “a short cord and a strong limb is the

only fit punishment for such incendiaries." A few weeks later, the Wilkesbarre (Pa.) *Record* stated, on the authority of "Mr. DAVID LEVI, just returned from Arizona," that, as the boat by which he came up the Mississippi stopped at Natchez, the passengers voted on their Presidential preferences, when a very respectable looking merchant, from Ohio, who voted for LINCOLN, was stripped by the other passengers, covered with tar and feathers, and set afloat in a canoe." Just before the Presidential election, some men in Dinwiddie county, Virginia, having, it was said, declared their intention to vote the Republican ticket, it was announced, in the Petersburg *Express*, on the authority of "several gentlemen, that any one who comes here and hands in a ticket for LINCOLN will receive thirty-nine lashes, and a coat of tar and feathers." Whether any one ventured to brave this threat, we are not informed; but in Fairfax county, the Alexandria *Gazette* says, one GARTREL, who voted for LINCOLN, "was seized, carried out of the village, and blacked completely with printer's ink." In New Orleans, the *Delta* tells us, the Mayor caused one HARRIS to be arrested and imprisoned, "as a dangerous character," merely for having said "he would have been glad to vote for LINCOLN." Very much, however, to the *Delta's* dissatisfaction, a Judge was found in New Orleans,—Judge Hunt, of the First District Court,—who dissented from the Mayor's views of liberty and law, and HARRIS, having been brought before him, by writ of *habeas corpus*, was immediately discharged. But either the same or another HARRIS, it appears from the Pittsburg *Gazette* of December 11th, was, on the 27th of November, driven from New Orleans by a mob, although the Vigilance Committee, before whom he had a sort of summary trial, acquitted him of the charge brought against him, of having said he was glad of LINCOLN's election, and had voted for him.

The Utica *Herald*, of September 21st, mentions the enforced return of a Mr. KEATING, of Utica, from Savannah, Georgia, whither he had gone on business a few days before. Several other persons, from New York, were sent back with him, although the authorities, after an examination of them, pronounced them clear of all suspicion of being "Abolition emissaries." While in Savannah, Mr. KEATING was informed that "a Northern man, at Aiken, South Carolina, had been caught reading the New York *Tribune*, and was tarred and feathered; that an old resident of Savannah, who refused to join a club to supervise the opinions and conduct of citizens and strangers, and was therefore suspected of lacking zeal for the punishment of offenders

against slavery, was compelled to abandon his business, and migrate, to escape personal indignity and violence." The Norfolk (Va.) *Day Book*, of November 30th, mentions a man named BULWARE, formerly a resident in Virginia, whom the people of Winnsborough, South Carolina, had, three days before, sent northward, "in charge of the Express Company, well shaved, and bearing on his back the marks of one hundred and fifty stripes, well laid on, and consigned to HORACE GREELEY, New York." The not very definite accusation against him is, "being too familiar with the ebony race, and uttering incendiary language." What the language was, or wherein the familiarity consisted, his accusers could not, of course, be expected to condescend to tell.

A letter to the *Chicago Tribune*, written the 18th of last September, by FREDERIC AMTHOR, a naturalized German citizen of Texas, (whence he had fled to escape a threatened assassination,) states that, in the preceding December, a young man named EVANS, from Illinois, was whipped to death by a mob, at Henderson, in that State, for having said, "in the mildest manner, and only when pressed into the subject," that he preferred Free to Slave States, and thought slavery wrong. The Henderson *New Era* justified the murder. "I saw," continues the writer, "what I was informed was the body of EVANS, so decayed and swollen, that I did not recognize it. The hogs and buzzards were eating it." AMTHOR'S own offence, for which he had to fly to save his life, was a denunciation of mob-law, which his indignation at this spectacle made him so incautious as to utter, although he "at the same time said, that EVANS had been a fool for not keeping his mouth closed on the subject of slavery." A single number of the Marianna (Fla.) *Patriot*, last fall, announced the fatal shooting of three men in its vicinity, by a gang of self-styled "Regulators." Not far from the same time, JOHN N. SMITH, a planter in Beaufort District, South Carolina, having refused to send off, at the bidding of a "Vigilance Committee," a number of free negroes employed upon his plantation, was seized, with his two sons, by an armed band, who carried them out of the State, forbidding their return, under penalty of death to him, and of five hundred lashes to each of his sons. On the 19th of November, as the Boston *Atlas* of the 20th says, "JOSEPH W. RIBERO, a native of Savannah, a carpenter, and, so far as is known, a worthy man," arrived in Boston with his family. The "Regulators had severely whipped him, cut the hair and beard from one side of his head and face, and put him immediately on a boat bound northward.

His crime was, telling a slave, who, seeing him read a newspaper, had asked what was the news, that it was "nothing but politics," the North contending for freedom, and the South for slavery; and, when asked if LINCOLN'S election would free the slaves, replying that he did not know.

A single number of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, that of November 24th, records no less than eleven cases of expulsion from the South, for reasons no more weighty, if not even less so, than those above recited. One of these was the case of WILLIAM C. WOOD, a graduate of Harvard College, who went to South Carolina, a short time before, to fulfil an engagement as a teacher. He was met, on the 5th of November, at Blackville, in that State, by a Vigilance Committee, who examined him "with politeness and delicacy," told him they found nothing against him, and, after much hesitation, suffered him to go on. He was stopped again at Barnwell, by another Vigilance Committee, "composed of the most respectable men of the place, the educated men,—ministers, physicians, and the principal slaveholders." They "courteously" examined him as to his sentiments "on slavery, its extension, Mr. LINCOLN'S election, the higher law, irrepressible conflict, &c.," after which they "all expressed their admiration at the able and honest manner in which he bore himself throughout," and voted, —22 to 9—that he must leave the State. They had the grace to pay his expenses home. On his way back, he was rudely dragged into the "negro car," threatened with whipping, hanging, &c. At one station—Bamberg's—"where they had hanged a man shortly before," the "fellow" who watched him called in the "Vigilance Committee," several of whom entered and tried to force him from the car, to hang him; but he kept his hold, and, the car starting, they had to leave him. Arriving at Charleston, he was kept over night at the guard-house, for safety; and the next day, an officer attended him to the boat, by which he returned to Boston. We have gathered these particulars from his own statement through the *Boston Journal*, in which he says, "my return is owing to no imprudence on my part. I could not change any act done, or recall any sentence uttered before the two Vigilance Committees. I say this in justice to myself, to show that no Northern man with Northern principles, however prudent and well-intentioned, is wanted in South Carolina to-day; I was told that distinctly many times."

We have dwelt the longer upon this case, because it unquestionably presents, in its very best aspect, the despotic lawlessness of the

Southern oligarchs; shows the intrinsic barbarism of the Slaveland in its comeliest disguise, that to which the pro-slavery "Conservatism" of the North is wont to point so confidently, as if it really did transform into an angel of light the Satanic form it thinly covers. The *Boston Courier*, for instance, boasts of the courtesy and generosity with which the Carolina gentry treated Mr. WOOD; seeming or affecting to believe that robbery so politely perpetrated is no wrong; that "courteously" to banish an innocent and well-disposed young man from a State in which the supreme law of the land declares him entitled to all the privileges and immunities of a citizen; that with bows and smiles to drive him from the honest work by which he earns his living; that, after exposing him to insult and to deadly peril from those whose ruffianism is unpolished and without disguise, to lodge him, for protection, in a guard-house, under an officer's surveillance; and that, lastly, as the crowning excellence of all, to refrain from compelling him to pay for heating the iron with which he is branded "dangerous;"—all this is, on the whole, a rather beautiful exhibition, than otherwise, of the choicest graces which adorn humanity.

But these displays of Southern courtesy were not made to the sterner sex alone. Last winter, the *Boston Transcript* noticed editorially the case of "a cultivated and estimable lady, who has two young children to support, and who, for the sole reason that she was born and educated in New England, has been compelled to leave Charleston, S. C., where she discharged the duties of governess in a gentleman's family." Mrs. CATHARINE BOTTSFORD, of New York city, gave, in the *Tribune* of March 22d, an account of her experience in Charleston. She went thither on business, in December, 1859, and, during her stay, of nearly a year, held no conversation with the colored people, and spoke of slavery—of which she thought unfavorably—only when her opinion was asked, then giving it in a friendly manner, disclaiming any purpose of interference. On the 27th of September, she was rudely arrested, without a warrant, by an officer of the "Vigilant Police," thrust into a dark and filthy cell, with no furniture but a dirty blanket, and kept without food till the evening of the next day. Meanwhile, she was examined by the Mayor, and afterward by another magistrate, who told her that but for her sex she would have been hung on a tree in the park. She was accused of treason and sedition and tampering with slaves. After the second night—when her friends were permitted to see her

and bring her food — her imprisonment was less rigorous than at first; but still she was closely confined till some time in November, when, at length, she was released and sent back to New York.

A Charleston correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, who had “carefully examined the case,” declares that, in her narrative of “her experience and sufferings, Mrs. BOTTSFORD does not, in one particular, overstate the truth, her own accusers being witnesses.”

While yet in prison, she wrote to FERNANDO WOOD, the Mayor of New York, relating the facts in her case, and asking him to take measures for her release. She received just such an answer as might have been expected from the heartless, unprincipled, pro-slavery politician who sent it. With cruel and insulting coolness, worse even, if possible, than the brutal barbarity of her Southern persecutors, he took for granted the truth of the charges made against her; with an intensely disgusting affectation of regard for “the strict rule of morality,” lectured her on the heinousness of her “crime”; and with a most nauseating pretence of a desire “to do” her “a favor,” counselled her to “acknowledge” her “errors in a spirit of contrition before the authorities of Charleston,” who then, he said, “I am convinced will consider your needs, your widowhood and inexperience, and on receiving satisfactory assurance that you will depart from the State, the laws of which you have violated, they will release you. No other power can aid you in the distress you have brought upon yourself, and you must rely solely on the mercy of those who administer the laws you have broken, and the generosity of the people you have injured.” “On reading this letter,” Mrs. BOTTSFORD says, “my astonishment only equalled my indignation.” The indignation, all decent people, of course, will share; but the astonishment, only those who, like herself, are ignorant enough to think that the Mayor of a great city, full of schools and churches and newspapers, must be presumed to have some feeble spark, at least, of the feelings of a gentleman, some slight respect for the dictates of humanity, and some faint notion of the duties of a magistrate toward those whom the laws he is chosen to administer are intended to protect.

These instances of barbarous outrage, in its various forms, with which the Slave Power manifests its rage or fear, are but a few out of the many published by the press. But numerous as are the recorded cases, the actual number is probably much greater. “We have the best reason for believing,” says the Cincinnati *Gazette*, “that not one half the number of occurrences of this character ever

find their way into the newspapers, or are ever heard of by the North. They have become so frequent as to excite no special remark, and newspapers being few and far between in that region, many of them either never reach these means of publicity, or are purposely suppressed."

Before we leave this portion of our task, we have the satisfaction of announcing the deliverance of one noble victim of slaveholding tyranny, whose case was mentioned in our last Report. In that, we gave a narrative of the arrest and trial, conviction and sentence of Rev. DANIEL WORTH, of North Carolina, accused of circulating incendiary publications; and of his appeal to the Supreme Court. The appeal was made, it seems, with a hope not so much of a reversal of the decision, as of his being released on bail, so that he could come North and raise means to indemnify his bondsmen. He had some friends among the slaveholders, and two of these gave bonds in the sum of \$3,000 for his appearance at the Court. A third, the Fayetteville *Presbyterian* says, "conducted him in safety from the State"; and on the 7th of May last, he was joyfully welcomed by a great concourse of people, filling the spacious Assembly Rooms in Broadway, New York.

How slaves are likely to fare, among those who treat white freemen in the way which we have described above, is matter of easy inference. We give, however, to confirm the inference, a few of the facts bearing on this point, which the past year has brought to our notice. The Augusta (Ga.) *Chronicle*, of the 12th of June last, states that on the 11th, a slave of one WILLIAM SMITH was burned at the stake, in Oglethorpe county, by a number of the citizens, for having killed his master, on the 9th. A letter to the Columbus (Ga.) *Enquirer*, from Tuskegee, Ala., dated October 9th, says that a slave belonging to Major COCKEY, of that county, was that day arrested, tried by about 150 of the citizens, condemned, and, before night, was burned to ashes, near Gen. GUNN's plantation, seven miles north of Tuskegee. His crime is not named, but it is said to have been "such that no mercy could be shown;" and the letter pronounces the punishment "horrid but just." From the Harris County (Ga.) *Enterprise* we learn, that in February last, a crowd of men, "in despite of all remonstrances" from the sheriff and other citizens, broke into the jail of that county, took thence a slave named GEORGE, who had been committed a few days before, to await trial at the April term of the Superior Court, on the charge of having

committed an outrage upon a Mrs. MIDDLEBROOK; carried him about two miles from town, chained him to a tree, and burned him to death. He protested his innocence to the last.

We see how crimes committed, or alleged to be committed, *by* slaves are punished. A few instances may serve to show what measure of penal justice is meted to those committed *on* them. The heaviest penalty of which we remember to have ever heard, for a crime of which a slave was the victim, was accorded by the Circuit Court in Mecklenburg county, Va., last fall, to CHARLES HUDSON, a man of over sixty years, convicted of "murder in the second degree." It was proved, says the Petersburg *Express*, of September 29th, that "on the 4th of last July, one of the hottest days of the past summer, HUDSON stripped his slave woman JANE entirely naked, tied her to a tree, and whipped her for three hours, with occasional intermissions of a few minutes. One witness testified that he heard distinctly, at the distance of 600 yards, both the noise of the switch and the screams and entreaties of the woman. She was buried the same afternoon." The murderer was sentenced to eighteen years in the penitentiary. This is boasted of by the *Express* and the Clarksville *Tobacco Plant*, as "one of those cases which thoroughly vindicate Southern character against the aspersions cast upon us by our enemies at the North. It develops what is as true of us as of any other people on the civilized globe, that we utterly detest and abhor cruelty and barbarity, whether to whites or blacks." But if the slave had killed the master, not with three hours of torture, but by a single, sudden stroke, what would have been the punishment?

The Charlottesville (Va.) *Review* relates another slave-murder, which was committed near Gordonsville, not far from the same time as the one just mentioned. A slave of a Mr. GARTH was beaten severely with a stick, by the overseer, and then, with his feet tied, was plunged head downward into a hogshead of water, and held about three-quarters of a minute. When taken out, he died within three minutes. A coroner's jury returned a verdict, "Died from congestion of the brain." The *Review* adds, "We heard recently of another case, where a negro was punished in a neighboring county, and died within a minute or two afterward. The verdict in this case was, 'Died of a combination of circumstances.'" What proof do these cases give of the alleged Virginian abhorrence of cruelty and barbarity? Near Whitesville, N. C., a man named MITCHELL, overseer for F. GEORGE, convicted last fall of causing the death of a

negro by whipping, was sentenced to be branded, and to serve *six months* in prison." In Charleston, S. C., a woman named HERTZER has recently been sentenced to a fine of \$500, and eighteen months' imprisonment, for whipping a slave to death. On the 7th of March, one JACOB PATTEN, living in the southwestern part of Missouri, whipped a slave woman to death. He was arrested, and gave bail in the sum of \$2,500 to appear at the Circuit Court. Had his crime been selling to his white neighbors books to prove that slaveholding is bad economy, his bail would hardly have been so light, as witness DANIEL WORTH'S case.

SLAVE INSURRECTIONS.

Last summer and fall, the South was widely agitated by rumors of insurrectionary plots among the slaves, instigated, of course, by that frightful bugbear of the Slaveland, "Abolition emissaries." Nearly every one of the Slave States had its share of these real or imagined or pretended plots; but their principal theatre, in which was seen the most ferocious and murderous excitement, was Texas. During the excessive heat and drought of July and August, destructive fires broke out in three or four considerable towns in Northern Texas. The whole business portion of Dallas was consumed on the 8th of July; a large part of Henderson, on the 5th of August; and, in the interval, some scattered buildings here and there, and parts of another town or two. Straightway a loud alarm was sounded, as much, no doubt, by malice as by fear, and not improbably a great deal more. Dr. PRYOR, editor of the Dallas *Herald*, in a letter written on the 15th of July, announced the discovery of a "most diabolical plan to devastate this entire portion of Northern Texas;" and ascribed the plot to "white men, friends of the Abolition preachers BLUNT and MCKINNEY, who were expelled from the country last year." The country was to be made helpless by "laying it waste with fire, destroying all the ammunition, provisions, arms, &c.," and then, on election day in August, there was to be a general insurrection, aided by emissaries from the North, and persons friendly to them in Texas. "This sphere of operations is districted and sub-districted, giving to each division a close supervision by one energetic white man, who controls the negroes as his subordinates." The writer added, "Make these facts known by issuing extras to be sent in every direction."

The press in all parts of the State took up the cry, and repeated it from time to time, with such variations and amplifications as were suggested by multiplying reports of fresh atrocities and new discoveries. The few unquestionable facts were multiplied many fold by flying rumors. "It is reported," was the authority for, almost every day, some fresh arrival of dreadful tidings. "It seems," said a journal in the panic-stricken region, "that as fast as the fire is put out in one town, it is kindled in another, and no day passes but that the flames are rising in some portion of the State, kindled by the torches of Abolitionism." The *Bonham Era*, of July 17th, published PRYOR'S letter, with editorial comments, all conspicuously headed with these words of terrible import to a people made cowards by the tyrant's instinct: "Fearful Abolition Raid—Insurrection of Negroes—Ossawatamie Brown among us—Northern Texas to be Laid Waste—The Work already Commenced." The *Houston Telegraph*, of the 19th, spoke of "other fires in that section"; mentioned the arrest of two men from Kansas, who "have been seen in the neighborhood of several of these fires, just before they broke out"; and "sincerely hoped" that, if the origin of the fires "should turn out as suspected, the *New York Tribune* may have something on which to hang a sensation story of Abolitionists being burned alive in Texas"; as "their insanity is of a nature that burning alive will cure, as well as prevent the spread of."

The work of arresting and whipping slaves, to extort confessions, and of driving off or hanging white men suspected of not thinking slavery divine, was begun at once, and prosecuted with the vigor demanded by the supposed extremity of the peril. Such testimony, we may be sure, was obtained as suited the purpose of the examiners. A letter copied in the *Houston Telegraph*, of July 31st, from Judge BUFORD, of Dallas, said that a Committee, just organized there, "had ascertained the existence of a most perfect and thorough organization, having for its object an indiscriminate massacre of the white population. *Under the lash*, the negroes have admitted that they had in their possession deadly poisons, to be administered to their masters' families in food; and when demanded of them, they have gone to the kitchen and produced the poison." On the 28th, the same journal gave the statement of a Mr. CRUGER, "just down from the upper country," that "in Dallas, they have some eight or ten negroes, who appear to be the ringleaders, in confinement. They will probably be hung. They had whipped some seventy or eighty, who knew of the conspir-

acy, but failed to inform on the conspirators." And a week or two later, it said, "runaways are taken up, who, *under the lash*, confess that they were enticed away by white men. * * * Vigilance committees, composed of the best citizens, have been formed in nearly every county. Scarcely a day passes, but some agent of these committees passes through Houston, having in charge a suspicious character, taking him out of the State. Wherever anything is proven beyond possibility of a doubt, a halter at the nearest tree expiates the guilt. We have accounts of the hanging of at least ten or twelve men, of whom five have been whites, according to the verdict of these committees. We uphold the action of these committees, so far as it has come to our knowledge. It is one of those cases wherein the slow process of the law cannot be trusted."

A letter to the *Telegraph*, written in Dallas, July 21st, stated that "nearly or quite a hundred negroes have been arrested," and, when examined, apart from each other, disclosed a conspiracy, abetted by Abolition emissaries from the North, and "by those in our midst"; that "each county in Northern Texas has a white supervisor, and is laid off into districts, under his sub-agents, who control the action of the negroes"; that "many of our most prominent citizens were singled out for assassination, when escaping from their burning homes"; that "poisoning was to be added, the old females to be slaughtered with the men, and the young and handsome women to be parceled out among these scoundrels"; and that a "large reinforcement of Abolitionists are expected, on the first of August, to be aided by recruits from the Indian tribes. * * * Our jail is filled with the villains, many of whom will be hung, and that very soon." A somewhat different account of the purpose of the conspirators is given in the *Telegraph* of the 28th. "Throughout the whole region, embracing Dallas, Ellis, Tarrant and Denton counties, the testimony of the negroes has been the same; that they were to burn the houses and murder the women, then attack the people at the polls, aided by the expected Abolition band, and, having got possession of arms, provisions, &c., fight their way to Mexico." A dispatch, dated Galveston, August 12th, said, "Two thousand Abolitionists are in Anderson county, inciting an insurrection among the slaves."

Large quantities of arms and of poison were said to have been found in possession of the slaves, in different places. The *Navarro Express* stated, that "an Abolitionist was caught, at Fort Worth, who had just distributed fifty guns and fifty six-shooters among the

negroes. Another was arrested, in Parker county, for a similar act. Both were hung." The Quitman *Herald*, of August 15th, reported, on information of "a gentleman from Denton county," that "a negro had been arrested, in that county, in whose possession twenty-four bottles of strychnine were found." The Tyler *Reporter*, of the 7th, said, that at Athens, Henderson county, on the 5th, "over one hundred bottles of strychnine were found in possession of negroes. The plot was to poison as many as possible at breakfast, and then the knife and the pistol, with which they were well supplied, were to do the remainder of the work." The same paper mentioned a letter from Rusk, Cherokee county, giving "an account of a plot to poison the whole community on election day. Poison was found in the possession of several of the negroes, and confessions are elicited of a determination to poison and murder the whole people." In Austin, the *State Gazette* announced the discovery of "pistols, knives, bullets, muskets, a keg half full of powder and a bottle of powder," in the quarters of the negroes. The Colorado *Citizen* said, that an armed negro, who was shot in Colorado county, while running from a white man who had hailed him, "lived a short time, and stated that some dozen armed negroes were together, in Barnard bottom, but he said nothing of their plans or intentions." But a volume would hardly hold all the alarming stories, told by the newspapers, in almost all parts of the State, each paper being apparently emulous not to be outdone by another in this sort of intelligence. How many innocent men, both white and black, were murdered, in the frenzy of fear and rage excited by these tales, none, probably, but the Omniscient, knows. Besides the many published instances of hanging, shooting, and the like, it is not unlikely that many others never were made public. The Belton *Democrat* said, about the beginning of August, "We understand that several Abolitionists have been quietly hung in Northern Texas—the object being not to spread such facts, until they secure many others, whose names have been revealed by appropriate committees." How many were, in all, thus "quietly" disposed of, it would be idle to attempt to guess. A correspondent of the New York *Times*, who had been travelling in Southern Kansas, and conversing with the many refugees from Texas whom he found there, wrote, on the 14th of October, that "but a small proportion of these enormities have yet appeared in print."

Among the victims whose names have appeared was Dr. SUREEVES, an emigrant from Illinois, who, says the Canton (Ill.) *Register*, of

October 23d, was not only not an Abolitionist, but was in favor of slavery, and was preparing to make investments in negroes." But he was "a Northern man, coming from a section where free white labor is respected." Another was a Mrs. FOSTER, also from Illinois, who, with her husband and family, was returning to that State, in obedience to the command of the Texan ruffians, when they were overtaken, and she was hung. The husband, with the rest of his and Dr. SHREEVES' families, escaped. Another was the Rev. Mr. BEWLEY, a native, it is said, of Tennessee, and a minister of the Methodist Church, North. The editor of the Chicago *Christian Advocate*, who knew him, describes him as "a cautious, deliberate man, no Abolitionist, though an Anti-Slavery man of the WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON school, modest and peaceful, and esteemed for his unobtrusive and genuine piety." "His views of slavery," says the *Albany Journal*, "were of the mildest character, and he would be deemed the last man to thrust his views offensively—mild and conservative though they were—upon any community." He had left Texas, but was followed, and taken near Springfield, Missouri, carried back to Fort Worth, "and, on the 13th of September," says a letter of October 4th, to the Texas *Christian Advocate*, "was hung, on the same limb on which Mr. CRAWFORD had been hung before." The letter also gives a rumor, that "the son-in-law of Mr. BEWLEY, Rev. Mr. WILLETT, has been taken, in Missouri, and is now on his way back to Fort Worth, where he will hang on the same limb." This, happily, proved to be a mistake. Mr. WILLETT, though with much difficulty, escaped from his pursuers, and reached Southern Kansas safely, after being eight days in the woods, with no food but nuts.

The Mr. CRAWFORD, alluded to above, was a quiet, industrious farmer and mechanic, in politics a Democrat, originally from Maine, who went, with his young family, from Minnesota to Tarrant county, Texas, in the fall of 1859, and had ever since been diligently following his lawful callings there, molesting no one, and having nothing to do with the slaves, but as his business required. He had received no hint that he was regarded with suspicion, till, on the 17th of July, three armed men—the leader a slaveholding neighbor—took him from his work, about half a mile from home, and hung him on a tree. The next day, according to the *Fort Worth Chief*, "a large and respectable meeting of the citizens of Tarrant county" met, and, among other things, unanimously "resolved, that we endorse the action of those who hung WM. H. CRAWFORD, convinced, as we are,

from the evidence upon which he was hung, that he richly deserved his fate." What that evidence was they did not say, for, though they referred to the alleged incendiary fires, with manifest design to give the impression that he was somehow connected with the supposed incendiaries, they did not charge him with such connection. After the murder, three men went to his house, "appointed," they told his wife, "to examine his letters and private papers." A timely movement to find evidence against him! They searched wherever they thought papers might be concealed, but admitted that they found nothing to criminate him. His wife states, that one man,— the son-in-law of the chief murderer, — who "had been from home, and did not return till after the murder had been done, denounced the act, and said they had killed an innocent man."

The New Orleans *Picayune* relates a case, which, it says, "affords a painful illustration of the state of feeling in Texas, and an idea of the wrong which may, in the haste of the excitement, be done to the innocent"; and presents "a cogent reason for calmness and deliberation" in dealing with the suspected, "who may be not only innocent and true, but friendly and brotherly." It is that "of a well-known citizen of New Orleans, himself a slaveholder, born in a Slave State, and identified with the institutions of the South;" — a Mr. SAVERS, "for twenty years engaged in buying and selling stock in this city." He went to Texas early in the summer, intending to buy and stock a farm, and, on his return, happened to be near Dallas about the time of the fire there. Going thence to Palestine, in Anderson county, and failing there to make connection with the stage for Crockett, he tried to procure a private conveyance, as his business forbade delay. His coming from the way of Dallas, and his anxiety to hasten out of the State, excited suspicion; a crowd gathered; no explanation would satisfy them; and, but for his drawing a revolver, and avowing his purpose to sell his life as dearly as possible, and then making himself known as a Mason to members of that fraternity, and thus gaining time, through their aid, for a cool investigation, he would probably have been hung as an incendiary, flying from the scene of his crime; and another would have been added to the long list of murders, perpetrated under the pretence of meeting, by a summary justice, an exigency, "wherein," as the *Houston Telegraph* expressed it, "the slow process of the law cannot be trusted."

One of those lawless executions, which have become so common, seems to have been regarded as not entirely explicable, even by the

organs of Supreme Judge Lynch themselves. The *Navarro Express* states, that, "on Thursday morning, the 2d inst., [August, probably, as Thursday was the 2d of that month,] four respectable citizens of the county, all members of our County Court, were found hung in the public square of this town. Various are the conjectures as to the causes of this unfortunate affair. We presume, however, that it was owing to the fact that they were members of the County Court." The precise point of this attempted explanation, it must be owned, is not quite clear to us. Is it, that Judge Lynch and his ever-prompt executives consider it a sort of treason to hold a regular judicial office within the assumed jurisdiction of his self-constituted tribunal? "Manifestly so," is the first thought. But then, the *Express* goes on to "enter" its "declaration, that we know of no conduct of theirs which deserved such a severe penalty"; says, "it is thought the presence of the Chief Justice could have saved them from such a fate"; and "withholds comment," till it shall get "possession of all the facts." So it is left a mystery, why the hanging of "four respectable citizens," in the public square of the county capital, should be "owing to the fact that they were members of the County Court."

For more than two months, the panic, or the pretence of one, continued, though with varying intensity; but bearing all the while its fruits of violence and blood. For a time, the stories of the Texan journals found a measure of belief at the North, also, and furnished marrowy texts from which to preach against the wicked Abolitionists. But the measure of belief, we think, was scanty, at its largest; and ere long, as the tragic farce went on, the utter absurdity of much, the great improbability of more, and the dubious authority of nearly all, which was reported, brought those to doubt who had inclined to trust, and confirmed, in disbelief, those who had been unbelieving all along; till it became the general conviction, that, in the words of the *New York Evening Post*, "the great Texas Abolition Plot was no plot at all; the negroes have never been tampered with; and all the real strychnine that has been distributed in the State is that which is compounded with the nauseous whiskey, sold as a beverage, on the borders." The real plot was not among the slaves and their white friends, but was a scheme of the extreme slaveholding party leaders, we believe, to rid the State of that class of its people, who, they thought, would be opposed to the ulterior designs of the extremists. The Anti-Slavery Germans, and the little handful of Meth-

odists adhering to the Northern Church, as well as all those emigrants from the North, who were suspected of loving the Union more than slavery, might, if permitted to remain, be hindrances to the execution of plans now almost ripe, and destined soon to be disclosed. They must therefore be removed; and, to that end, the passions of the populace must be sufficiently inflamed against them to render their expulsion sure. Opportunely for this nefarious purpose, a few unusually destructive fires broke out, which were most likely accidental, or, if not, were set by men of widely different characters and aims from theirs, and with whom they had no connection. But no matter for that. It was the easiest of tasks to make the unreflecting, prejudiced, excitable masses of a slaveholding State believe, that they were instigators of the mischief, and the slaves their agents in it. To gain this point, it was not necessary to construct such tales as would abide intelligent, impartial scrutiny. Exaggeration, inconsistency, and violent improbability, even to what would elsewhere be incredibility, were therefore boldly ventured, and with the evidently expected result.

As to the alleged extent of the pretended insurrectionary plots, the New York *Tribune*, of September 7th, well says: "Having so much, we naturally expect much more. An insurrection, ripe enough to have advanced to conflagration all over a State—well organized enough to do all this with impunity—must be advancing, in other ways, to some final consummation. We have the insurrection—where are the insurgents? That any negroes have publicly banded together; that any murders have been committed by them; that there has been anywhere any symptom of violence or outbreak, or even any rumors of such violence, other than the alleged fires; that any of them have armed with murderous intent;—for any of these things, there is not the slightest evidence, of weight enough to make it appear even in a Texas newspaper. * * * The story of the strychnine, one would think, would have destroyed the credulity of the most alarmed. A hundred bottles of this deadly poison, a grain of which any man, however trustworthy and respectable he may seem to be, would find it difficult to purchase of any druggist in this city! A hundred bottles in the hands of negroes, in a small and obscure frontier village in Texas, all of whose inhabitants, no doubt, could be disposed of by a vial full!" The same journal, a week later, after citing the testimony of two Southern papers, to corroborate its own, continued: "It may now be considered as an established fact, that the pretended plot was a pretence and a sham."

The correspondent of the *New York Times*, from whom we quoted on a former page, says of the refugees from Texas, whom he met in Kansas, they every one "protested solemnly against there being a word of truth about the thousand rumors of slave insurrections, burning of houses, fomenting troubles, and the like, by the Abolitionists." It was their belief, that the accusers "had, in some cases, fired their own buildings, to furnish a pretext for these false charges." They all agreed in saying, also, that the cause of the present outbreak is the determination of the Slave Power to "purge the Northern portion of the State of its freedom-loving population," lest it should become a Free State, in case of a division — soon expected — of the original State into two. A correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*, writing from St. Joseph, Missouri, alluding to the accounts of fires in Texas, says he is reminded that, "some time ago, certain leading men, connected with the Blue Lodges in Missouri, were heard to say that, in order to defeat the Republican party, it would be necessary to get up another JOHN BROWN raid upon the South, and that this would be done, at the proper time. When it was suggested, that a step of that character would result in the loss of life to many innocent persons, answer was made, that a few lives were nothing in the scale, compared with keeping the Federal Government in the hands of the Democracy and of the South." The slaveholders of Texas were no doubt as zealous to keep the Federal Government in the hands of the South as were those of Missouri, and as unscrupulous about the means of doing it, as well as of providing for the contingency of failure in that direction. A letter to the *New York Tribune*, dated "Nacogdoches, Texas, October 5th," in reviewing "the probabilities and facts" relating to the "Abolition plot," says, that "more strychnine is found, or said to be, in the hands of slaves, than has ever been imported into the State"; speaks of the arms and ammunition they are reported to have; and adds, "Is it not time to begin to look for some fruits of all this preparation? * * * It is quite strange, that all the hanging and shooting and whipping is confined to the Abolitionists and negroes. But it is so. There is not one exception yet."

Some even of the Southern journals helped to expose the absurdity of the rumors about the "plot." The *Mobile Register*, of September 9th, treats them as unworthy of belief, and as bearing "contradiction on their face"; and, alluding to the strychnine stories, says, "a hundred bottles of strychnine are found in the keeping of a single individual, when probably all the chemical laboratories in the Union could not furnish that quantity at any one time." The *New Orleans*

Picayune, of September 8th, says, "The investigations which have been prosecuted in the disturbed districts of Texas have not developed, with any degree of distinctness, the existence of any other plot for ruin than what a few desperate characters, without connection with or hope of help from any other quarter, might have formed. In some cases, the negro population have been demoralized evidently by the insidious promises of white men. But not half of what has been confessed seems to be borne out by later facts. The strychnine said to have been discovered in the hands of negroes turns out to be very harmless, having no affinity with the deadly poison which it was supposed to be." The Marshall (Texas) *Republican* also states, on the authority of "Mr. JOHN D. EVANS," who had made a tour through several of the disturbed counties, that "the supposed poison in the hands of the negroes, when subjected to chemical analysis, turned out to be a harmless preparation." And of their statements, that they had been told to poison their masters with it, the *Republican* sensibly enough remarks, that "very little reliance can be placed in testimony obtained by coercion or intimidation." The Cameron *Sentinel*, after mentioning that the patrol in Cameron had found four guns, a pistol, a dirk knife, powder, shot, &c., in the hands of the negroes, adds, that "it does not certainly appear that the negroes had these arms for any bad purpose." The Houston *Republic*, of July 28th, could not "for a moment suppose that the suspicion excited of Abolition incendiarism can be well founded in fact." A resident of Lamar county, Texas, wrote in September to the Louisville (Ky.) *Democrat*, declaring the "reports of emissaries, insurrections, &c., circulated through our State, and published and accredited by many of the papers in the older States," to be "altogether unfounded." "The origin of the fires," which had been imputed to incendiaries, "as far as ascertained, was from some accidental cause. I have not been able to learn of a single instance in which there was the slightest evidence that it was the work of an Abolition emissary. I have not met with a single man who knows of an authenticated instance of poison found in the possession of negroes, and in wells, &c. It is the opinion of many of our best citizens, after mature deliberation and thorough investigation of the subject, that these reports had their origin in the minds of scheming politicians, and are a part of that great plan concocted and being put in execution to 'nerve the Southern arm, and excite the Southern mind, preparatory to precipitating the Cotton States into a revolution.'"

Next to Texas, Alabama seems to have been the most alarmed by stories of slave conspiracies. The *Selma Issue*, of August 31st, reports "our town and vicinity" as excited by "vague rumors of a contemplated insurrection," which, after "floating around for some time, began to assume a more tangible form." A Committee was organized, and their investigation "developed a number of facts, tending to show that the rumors were by no means groundless." Two white men and eight or ten negroes were arrested and committed to jail to await examination. Before light on the morning of the 29th, a party gained access to the jail by stratagem, took out one of the white men, MAHAN by name, and "hung him to a shade tree, in full view of the jail." The *Issue* also spoke of eighteen men arrested at Talladega, and three hundred more implicated and to be put into custody as soon as they could be taken. The *Montgomery Mail*, of August 30th, under the heading "THE RIGHT MOVE AT LAST," states that "on Tuesday night, the 28th, the citizens of Talladega took from the jail there a white man, the ringleader in the plot among the negroes, and hung him." The *New York Times* "learns, through a private source, that the evidence of the plot was extorted from a slave by the application of eight hundred lashes to his back. After this gentle manifestation, his memory was entirely restored, and he was able to verify every suspicion of his tormentors."

The *Montgomery Advertiser*, of December 13th, announced the discovery of "an insurrectionary plot among the negroes between Dublin and Pine Level," in Montgomery county, and said "the evidence against the two white scoundrels who incited them to it is so overwhelming, that the citizens of that vicinity have determined to hang them to-day, together with several negroes." The *Mail* published a letter from Ramer P. O., in that county, dated "December 11th," and signed by eleven persons, saying, "We have found out a deep-laid plan among the negroes of our neighborhood, and, from what we can find out from our negroes, it is general all over the country. They are to make a general rise during the Christmas holidays. We are now whipping the negroes—taking them as they come. Their plan is to kill the families they live with on a certain night, and then get together and take the country. They look for aid from Lincoln and the Northern people." Of course, under this sagacious and humane policy of "whipping the negroes, *taking them as they come*," not waiting to know first whether they were innocent or guilty, but making the punishment extort the evidence of guilt, testimony

would not be wanting to any point it was desired to prove. By this process, any number of conspiracies could be "found out," and any number of conspirators convicted, with the utmost ease and expedition. Only it might not be amiss for these astute inquisitors to bear in mind, as just a possible defect in their ingenious method, that forcing slaves to own themselves conspirators *may* some day teach them to conspire; so dull are they, and so incapable of nice discrimination. A white man or two, and several slaves, were hung, as the result of this Montgomery county panic. The adjoining county of Autauga had a like excitement, though in a less degree. There, too, confessions were whipped out of the slaves, and one white man and some slaves were executed. A few weeks later, as we learn from the *Atlanta Intelligencer*, a plot was detected near McKinley, in Marengo county, where, as the stereotyped rule of procedure in such cases is, "the negroes were furnished with arms and ammunition by white incendiaries, for the purpose of servile insurrection." It is always "these white fiends in human shape," who, as the *Intelligencer* mildly puts it, "prompt the happy and contented negro to deeds of blood and violence." And yet we simple folks here at the North cannot but feel a little puzzled to understand why such a "happy and contented" being is all the time so ready to be prompted to that sort of deeds; and why the chivalrous and gallant people among whom he lives so happily, and to whom, indeed—under the Providence which kindly brought him to these fair abodes—he owes his enviable state of tranquil bliss, should look on him with such a feverish suspicion, and be filled so suddenly with wild affright if one but whispers "servile insurrection" in their ears.

In September, an alarm was raised in Mississippi. The story of its rise and progress is related in a letter of October 1st to the *Central Inquirer*, of that State, from three men chosen for the task by a meeting of the citizens of Plattsburg and vicinity, in Winston county, held on the 30th of September. They say that, on the 20th, as a Mr. KELLY was chastising his slave woman, she, to induce him to desist, offered to tell him an important secret. This was, of course, a plot for a negro insurrection. The master, calling to his aid a half a dozen of his neighbors, began at once the customary process for obtaining evidence. They "visited successively most of the plantations in the neighborhood, took up negroes and chastised them without questioning them, or intimating what the chastisement was for," and thus "induced" just such confessions as we may be sure the

negroes knew well enough they were desired to make. They were, substantially, repetitions of the Texan stories,—the details almost fac-similes of them, as to the intended massacre; its means, poison, pistols, guns and knives; and its instigators, “white conspirators,” who were to supply these means. They did “not think proper to publish, as yet, the names of all the whites who were impeached by the negroes,” but gave that of one man, HARRINGTON, a travelling ambrotypist from the North, whom “the negro informants unanimously” pronounced “the original instigator of the insurrectionary movements, and their frequent adviser.” A Vigilance Committee, to obtain facts, and a Council of twelve, to deliberate and act thereon, were appointed at the meeting on the 30th; and, “knowing well that the law is too tardy in its course, even if it could be effectual in its process” to meet the exigencies of the case, “the meeting unanimously committed to the Council the power of passing sentence on all persons, black or white, that may be impeached before it, of aiding or abetting in insurrectionary plans or movements, heretofore or hereafter.” Rather extensive powers to be conferred by a mere mass meeting, without corporate character or collective responsibility, on an extemporized tribunal, wholly unknown to the law! A later account, published in the *St. Louis Evening News*, states that the ambrotypist and one negro had been hung. Another “unsuccessful insurrectionary attempt,” in the same State, is said, by the *Aberdeen Conservative*, to have been made, some time last winter, “by the negroes of a neighborhood twenty or thirty miles from Aberdeen.” A servant girl betrayed the plot; her master and a few neighbors secreted themselves near the place where the conspirators were to meet, and overheard their plan, which was to rise some time between that and the 4th of March. “They were all captured and flogged severely; the leaders so severely, that it was thought they would die.”

The *Columbus (Ga.) Sun*, of August 29th, had news, “by a private letter from Upper Georgia, that an insurrectionary plot had been discovered among the negroes in the vicinity of Dalton and Marietta, and great excitement was occasioned by it, and still prevails.” On Sunday night, the insurgents were to burn Dalton and the neighboring villages, and slaughter their inhabitants; seize the railroad train on Monday, and go down the road, stopping at each station; reach Marietta at night, and kill and burn there; “and thence as far on the road as they were successful. They had quantities

of arms in their possession, and white men instigated the plot, though none have yet been arrested, for want of sufficient proof. Thirty-six negroes were arrested and confined in jail." About the same time, the Rome (Ga.) *Courier* announced an attempt "to incite an insurrection among the slaves" in its region. "There is no evidence that white men are implicated, though such is doubtless the case." Of course! Had ever a black man original genius enough to conceive the thought of stinging the foot which trampled him?—or even to try to crawl from under it, but at a white man's instigation? According to a letter published in the Macon (Ga.) *Daily Telegraph*, "the negroes at Hickory Grove and vicinity, in Crawford county, attempted an insurrection" on the 6th of November, "but were suppressed, without doing any damage to life or property. Twenty negroes belonging to Rev. W. C. CLEVELAND, and three of an old Mr. DAVIDSON's, "were the only negroes captured." DAVIDSON's negroes "told him on Monday," with a frankness quite unusual in conspirators, "that they intended to kill him, and all the white folks." The inevitable "white men," in this instance, were a Yankee tin pedlar and a son of the slaveholder DAVIDSON. They and the captured negroes "are in custody."

The Norfolk (Va.) papers, of October 6th, contained alarming accounts of a meditated insurrection of the slaves in Princess Anne and Norfolk counties, which was to break out on the 7th. The *Argus* said, "several negroes have been arrested in Princess Anne, and their confessions (though in some cases extorted) have developed the same story, and led to further arrests. The confessions show that the matter was instigated by free persons, some of them free negroes. On Thursday night, [the 4th,] a white man named FLYNN was shot dead by a patrol party, in Norfolk county, and a free negro, DICK SMITH, has been shot, but is not dead. Ten negroes are said to be in custody in Princess Anne, and two in Norfolk city." The *Day Book* stated that a free negro, JOHN WHITEHURST, had told Justice GIBSON, who had that morning committed him to jail, "that a plan of operations had been maturing ever since last spring, and that a free negro named DICK RYAN had written to the North, and engaged the services of parties there, who were to arrive at Old Point or Norfolk this evening in a vessel, with arms and men, who were to assist in the liberation of our slaves to-morrow (Sunday) night." The *Argus*, of the 13th, had information that the conspiracy had spread into North Carolina, extending "from Currituck through

Gibbs' Woods, Blackwater, Great Bridge, and all the district southwest of North River and the Chesapeake and Albemarle Canal. Every kind of instruments that could be procured was to be used on the occasion, such as pickaxes, pitchforks, etc." A letter from Currituck, written October 8th, said, "There is a tremendous excitement out here in consequence of an intended insurrection of the negroes. The jail here is full; and they are constantly bringing them in." Three or four weeks later, Lancaster county was alarmed by the statement of a free negro, that the slaves were going to meet at Lancaster C. H., at a given time, break open the jail, seize the firearms therein, and commence an indiscriminate slaughter of men, women and children, and that means of their escape was provided by a vessel lying in the creek." And again, near the end of the winter, the Virginians took fright at "intelligence" received by the Mayor of Norfolk, "from the Mayor of Petersburg, that an outbreak will soon follow the inauguration of LINCOLN"; and at a story from some other source, that "twenty-five kegs of powder have been found secreted in various places" in the neighboring counties.

THE CHURCH.

In relation to the cause of freedom, the Church, collectively surveyed, still holds the practically hostile attitude in which we have so often shown it heretofore. Slavery still sits at its communion tables; still occupies its pulpits; still largely inspires its literature, or, at least, shuts out a better inspiration; still, to a great extent, controls the action of its legislative convocations, by what divers names soever called. The exceptional instances, which we never have been slow to recognize, are but exceptions still. If any portions of it have made changes for the better since our last Report, they are not such, in number or in magnitude, as to demand any essential alteration of our standing record as to the position of the whole. That able and genuinely anti-slavery religious journal, the *Free Church Portfolio*, commenting on an article by Rev. Mr. MATTISON, of New York, in which the principal denominations are classified as respectively pro-slavery and anti-slavery churches, very justly says, "We hold that no Church is entitled to the Christian distinction of being anti-slavery unless, like the Baptist Free Mission, it excludes slaveholders from its communion, and gives the weight of its influence against the

accursed thing. If this judgment be correct, Mr. MATTISON must transfer nearly all the churches in the anti-slavery column to the other side."

The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held its Quadrennial Meeting at Buffalo, in May and June last. Memorials were presented to it from about 46,000 members of the Church, asking for, and from about 4000 opposing, such a change of the Discipline as will extirpate slavery from the Church. They were referred to a Committee of forty-seven—one from each Annual Conference—who, on the 16th of May, presented a majority and minority report, the former from thirty, the latter from seventeen members. The majority report argued the wrongfulness of slavery, chiefly from the Golden Rule, with which, it said, every distinctive attribute of the system is incompatible; but did "not affirm that the holding of a slave, or the buying or selling, is under all circumstances sinful. When, owing to whatever circumstances, the immediate sundering of the legal relation would be manifestly a greater injury to the slave than its temporary continuance, and when the evident intention is to give freedom at the earliest practicable moment, such an act of holding is not only not wrong, but it may be a duty." It concluded by recommending the amendment of the General Rule on slavery, so that it shall forbid "the buying, selling or holding of men, women or children, with an intention to enslave them"; and the change of the chapter on slavery, so as to make it "declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery. We believe that the buying, selling, or holding of human beings as chattels, is inconsistent with the Golden Rule, and with that rule in our Discipline which requires all who desire to continue among us to 'do no harm, and to avoid evil of every kind.' We, therefore, affectionately admonish all our preachers and people to keep themselves pure from this great evil, and to seek its extirpation by all lawful and Christian means."

The minority report deprecated the agitation of the subject by the non-slaveholding Conferences, eulogized the conservatism of the Border Conferences, held the present rule sufficiently expressive of the anti-slavery doctrines of the Church, contended that the course advised by the majority would "embarrass and cripple, if not altogether destroy our Church in the slaveholding States, and along the border; would operate most disastrously on the interests of the enslaved"; would "enfeeble the moral power of the whole Church, by the strifes and divisions which may ensue; and incapacitate her for

the great work to which God is calling her, and in which, if her resources are properly husbanded, she may achieve so glorious success." It recommended the adoption of resolutions declaring that "the Methodist Episcopal Church has never ceased openly to bear its testimony against the sin, and to exercise its disciplinary powers to keep its members from criminal connection with the system, and to remove the evil from among men; that any change of the Discipline on the subject of slavery, in the present excited condition of the country, would accomplish no good, but would disturb the peace of the Church, and be especially disastrous to its ministers and members in the Slave States; and that the Committee on the Pastoral Address be instructed to state our position in relation to slavery, and to give such counsel to our churches as may be suited to the necessities of the case."

After several days of animated discussion, the vote was taken, on the 28th, upon the proposed amendment of the General Rule. It was lost for want of the requisite two-thirds, having 139 for, to 74 against. This shows some progress since the last previous meeting of the General Conference, in 1856, when substantially the same amendment had 121 votes, to 95 against; then, 26 majority, now, 65. On the same day, the editors of the general and local organs of the Church were chosen. The election was considered a triumph for the Anti-Slavery party. For the general organ, the New York *Christian Advocate and Journal*, in place of the rank "conservative," Dr. STEVENS, heretofore in charge of it, the Conference, by 142 to 73, chose Dr. EDWARD THOMPSON, "a splendid man, and a thorough-going extirpationist," says the corresponding editor of the *Northern Independent*. "The elections for the Pittsburg and Central *Christian Advocates*," the same writer tells us, "were as great a triumph as that for the New York paper. Anti-slavery men went in by overwhelming majorities over the men who, for the last four years, were editorial abettors of slavery." * * * The most conservative editors now left in office "claim to be among the progressives. In this respect, there has been an almost total revolution during the last four years." On the 31st, the vote was taken upon the proposed change in the chapter, which was adopted by 154 to 57; but, the next day, by 171 to 6, it was declared that the chapter was only "declarative and advisory." That is, the Methodist Episcopal Church, as represented in its General Conference, first *declares* a certain practice to be inconsistent with a divinely-inspired precept,

and with a rule in its own Discipline; and then deliberately refuses to forbid that practice, calls it not a sin, but an "evil," and *advises* its members and preachers to avoid it and seek its extirpation; leaving them, of course, at liberty to heed the advice as much or as little as they may choose.

The result, although regarded as a step in advance of the former position of the Church, was by no means satisfactory to its earnest anti-slavery members. The *Northern Independent* called it "simply the substitution of a pious exhortation for the weak and worthless directions contained in the chapter" as it stood before. "The true course was abundantly plain—that of express, unqualified prohibition in the chapter. Anything short of this is mere trifling. * * * Did we view the enormity in its true light, we should be no more embarrassed with this question than with any other gross, deadly sin." A correspondent of the same journal said, indignantly, "The old chapter on slavery, which contained a little law, and a little penalty, has been changed, by a sort of homœopathic dilution, to an infinitesimal sugar-pill advice!" Rev. HIRAM MATTISON said of the new chapter, "As a simple declaration of sentiment, it is tolerable; but as a means of purifying the Church from slavery, it will be next to useless. It will not put out a slaveholder, nor prevent one from coming in. The old chapter did forbid ministers and other officers to hold slaves, but this really forbids nothing." The *Independent*, however, in a later number, after pronouncing it "anything but satisfactory, considered as a finality," added, "but if we regard it merely as a beginning, it may have some importance. * * * Let us work on, then, and transmute advice into law. Heretofore, we have not been able to even advise; but, having gone thus far, there can be no difficulty in taking the only remaining step, that of making the counsel mandatory. Disappointed and chagrined, we are not discouraged. Stern prohibition will come at last, and chattelism *shall* be driven indignantly from the sanctuary of God."

The opposers of anti-slavery progress were not agreed among themselves as to the new measure. The *Buffalo Courier*, heading its comments with "DEFEAT OF THE ULTRAISTS IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE," was "pleased" to announce "a complete conservative victory. The Church," it said, "is now safe from disruption for at least four years, and the ultraists who have endeavored to introduce a measure more radical and extreme than has been deemed necessary by any of the leading Church organizations of the country, have sig-

nally lost prestige." The New York *Observer* copied a statement, that the President of the Conference, Bishop MORRIS, asked, after the vote, if this was the conclusion of the subject, and, when answered in the affirmative, he said, "God grant that it may be, world without end!" emphasizing it by a heavy stroke of the gavel. "In this prayer," continued the *Observer*, "the whole Church ought to join with a long and loud AMEN." Then, after reciting the action of the Presbyterian General Assemblies, Old and New School, it concluded, "On the whole, we find in the results of 'the subject' in these three Conventions of Christians, hopeful indications of the prevalence of a more scriptural, national and patriotic spirit than has marked the meetings of many previous ecclesiastical bodies." It is not generally hard to guess the character of any course of action, touching the slave question, in which the *Observer* can find "hopeful indications." A special correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun*, writing from Buffalo, on the 2d of June, thought that "an examination of the result will be a source of congratulation to the friends of conservatism in the country, and show that the agitation has culminated in a more mild and temperate expression of doctrine than could have been hoped for. * * * Law has given place to 'admonition,' and such and no more is the result of this long and troublesome agitation. Fanaticism was exceedingly chagrined at the result of its labors, while the great body of the Conference rejoiced in the happy termination of this mischievous and threatening agitation."

But in some of the Border Conferences, the action of the General Conference was not regarded so complacently. The members of the Front Royal (Va.) Circuit, Baltimore Conference, at a meeting held on the 16th of July, resolved that "we totally disavow the declarations and disrespect the admonitions of the late General Conference in relation to slavery; and will not live under its jurisdiction longer than may be necessary to develop and execute an orderly plan by which our connection may be dissolved." To the same effect resolved many similar meetings in the slaveholding Conferences.

The Baltimore Conference met at Staunton, Va., March 13th, Bishop SCOTT presiding, and on the 14th, took up the question of withdrawal from the Church North, on account of the action of the General Conference. To come at a clear understanding of the effect of that action, several questions were presented to the presiding Bishop, whose answers were, in substance, that nothing in the Discipline would, in his judgment, be a bar to the ordination of a local

preacher holding slaves; or hinder the admission of a slaveholder into the Church; or justify the arraignment of a slaveholder; or authorize the bringing of a member to trial who holds slaves for gain; that "in the sense of the Discipline, *whatever that sense is,*" [we do not wonder at the Bishop's putting in this qualifying clause,] every man who holds a slave is a sinner against God, the laws of nature and the precepts of the Bible; and that it is no more the duty of members of the Church under the new than under the old Discipline, to engage in active efforts for the abolition of slavery. A long discussion followed, in which all parties seem to have agreed in condemning the new chapter, but those on one side urged that it was not law, and that a repeal might be asked for, and therefore they need not withdraw; while on the other, it was contended that the chapter, in pronouncing slavery wrong, taught a false doctrine, that the General Conference has no power to change the doctrines of the Church, that its act is unconstitutional, and that the Conferences repudiating the new chapter were the only true Methodist Episcopal Church. On the 23d, the vote was taken, and the Conference resolved, by 88 yeas to 3 nays, 44 declining to vote, "that the General Conference has sundered the ecclesiastical relation which has hitherto bound us together, so far as any act of theirs can do so; that we will no longer submit to their jurisdiction, but declare ourselves independent of it, still claiming, notwithstanding, to be an integral part of the Methodist Episcopal Church." If, however, three-fourths of the Annual Conferences which should meet before their next session would disavow the action of the General Conference, and demand "the most thorough and satisfactory redress," to be secured by abrogating the new chapter, transferring the subject of slavery to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Annual Conferences, and placing a fair proportion of the periodicals of the Church under the direction of those Conferences, "then, and not till then," they would "reunite in the organization of another General Conference."

The East Baltimore Conference condemned the new chapter, and resolved in favor of calling an extra session of the General Conference, with a view to its undoing what it had done. The Western Virginia Conference regretted the passage of the new chapter; did not consider it as law; would be governed by what they regarded the teachings of the Scriptures, amenable only to God and the Annual Conference; and would not interfere with the legal relation of master and servant. The Philadelphia Conference — part of which is

within the Slaveland — voted, by 174 to 35, in favor of a repeal of the new chapter; by 151 to 43, for leaving each Conference to settle its own practice on slavery; and, by 143 to 31, against so dividing the Conference as to separate the slave from the free territory now belonging to it. The Missouri Conference unanimously, and by a rising vote, accepted the new chapter as “declarative and advisory,” and declared, that they had “no grievances to be redressed, and no complaints to make, and intend to stand firmly by the Church of their choice.”

From this summary of recent proceedings in the General and Annual Conferences, it will be seen, that, though the Methodist Church North claims, in some sense, to be an Anti-Slavery Church, and, though it has gone so far toward a right position as to displease a portion of its slaveholding members, and even to repel its most pro-slavery Conference, it is yet far from true anti-slavery ground; still has persistent slaveholders in its membership and ministry; and has no law to put and keep them out, or hinder more from coming in. And, speaking of its anti-slavery pretensions, it may be well to mention here an incident, which serves to show how high the tone of anti-slavery feeling was in its last General Conference, — the nearest to an anti-slavery one which it has held for many years. On the third day of its session, a man came in, whose highest title to distinction now and to remembrance in the future is, that by his signature, he gave the name of law and power for mischief to the slave-catcher's infamous statute of 1850. Mr. FILLMORE was unanimously invited to a seat upon the platform, and “was received by the Bishops, and cordially welcomed, the Conference rising in a mass.”

At the meeting of the Old-School Presbyterian General Assembly, held last May, in Rochester, New York, several memorials, touching Temperance, Colonization, the Slave Trade, &c., were referred to a large Committee, who, with only one dissenting voice, reported a resolution that, “in view of the oft-repeated action of the Assembly, in reference to the subjects above referred to, it is inexpedient to take any further action in relation thereto.” Now it strikes us, that just precisely because of *such* action as the Assembly has oft repeated on some of these subjects, it is expedient, not only, but an urgent duty, to do something else. But so thought not the Assembly. The resolution was unanimously adopted, without debate, “no man having anything to say, except AYE,” says the delighted New York *Observer*, “and that was the ‘end of the subject.’ This was unity, decision and

principle. Let all the churches take the same ground, and a great step will be taken toward the restoration of peace and harmony to our distracted country." Thus moralizes that pious, patriotic print. And the Rochester sham-Democratic *Union and Advertiser*, less pious, perhaps, but no less patriotic, deems it "noteworthy, that so much inflammatory matter should be thus judiciously disposed of in a body representing every State in the Confederacy"; thinks that, if all other bodies representing the same constituencies had been as discreet, the American people would now be one, in respect to all the party and religious organizations of the day; and, "were it becoming a secular journal, would congratulate the Assembly and the country, that one organization maintains its unity, by rigidly adhering to the one cardinal idea that called it into existence." Sermons — such as an Old-School Presbyterian D. D., HENRY J. VANDYKE, preached to his Brooklyn (N. Y.) congregation, in December last — defending slavery from the Bible, and representing Christ as giving tacit countenance, at least, to a slave system having laws severer than the very worst slave codes of modern times, no way endanger, it must be presumed, either the country's peace or the Church's unity, and may be preached without departure from the "cardinal idea" of the Presbyterian sect. But nothing must be said about the matter in the General Assembly. One subject, however, we perceive, a "view of its oft-repeated action" thereon did not deter the Assembly from acting on again. It "adopted a report discountenancing the practice of social dancing, but" — probably to maintain the unity of the Church, and restore peace and harmony to our distracted country — "leaving the matter of discipline to the several Sessions."

The New-School General Assembly met in May, at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. "The subject" was not quite so summarily disposed of there as in the Old-School Assembly; but still, it does not appear to have given much disturbance. A memorial from Dr. BEASLEY asked, "whether respect for the action of former Assemblies does not demand from our Southern Presbyteries some explanation of the condition of the Church under their care, in relation to slavery." It would seem, from this, that there are slaveholding New-School Presbyteries. To the memorial, the Committee on Bills reported, for an answer, that they "have not been supplied with any information which brings before them, in a manner authorized by our Book of Discipline, relations, practices, or delinquencies in relation to slavery, which demand or render desirable any action of the Assem-

bly on that subject, at the present meeting." A memorial from the Mission Church of Dacotah, offered by Dr. WILLIAMSON, asked the Assembly to instruct the Committee on Church Extension to aid no church which tolerates slaveholders in its membership. It was supported by a speech from Dr. WILLIAMSON, who, as a South Carolinian, knowing slavery from personal observation, argued the inconsistency of the Church, with its past testimonies, in building up slaveholding churches. The Committee to which the memorial was referred reported, that "we see no defensible principle on which the Committee on Church Extension could discriminate, on moral grounds, between churches recognized as having the same ecclesiastical standing; our church is understood to be opposed to the spirit and system of slavery, and we have no reason to believe that any churches connected with us are using their influence to sustain and fortify that institution; [as if assuming the consistency of slaveholding with Christianity, by admitting slaveholders to church membership, were not sustaining slavery!] and if any members of churches in our connection hold slaves, under mistaken views of their duty towards them, we do not see that this affords sufficient reason for withholding from them the bread of life." The removal of sin from the Church "is to be accomplished, not by withdrawing the Gospel from those who need it, but by efforts to apply the principles of our holy religion to the heart and conscience of every Christian who is willing to receive instruction." As if refusing to recognize as a saint the sinner persisting in his sin were the same thing as "withdrawing the Gospel" from him!—and as if to treat slaveholding as no bar to membership in a Christian church were "to apply the principles of our holy religion to the heart and conscience" of a slaveholding church-member! The report concluded by saying, in effect, that the Committee did not need instruction. The report was adopted, and Mr. WILLIAMSON and two others entered a protest against it. Among the delegates from other ecclesiastical bodies, received by the Assembly, was one from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which was mentioned in our last Report as engaged in a little slave-trading transaction, for the benefit of its missionary fund. "The coöperation," we are also told, "between the General Assembly and the American Board is felt to be sincere and cordial, and it is thought another year will develop an increase in the amount of contributions."

On the 27th of September last, JOHN JAY presented, in the Con-

vention of the New York Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a preamble and resolutions, reciting facts in regard to the extent to which the African slave trade is carried on by persons within the Diocese; affirming the want of an enlightened and conscientious public opinion with reference to the traffic; respectfully asking the Bishop to address a Pastoral Letter to the people of the Diocese upon the subject; and recommending the clergy to preach from time to time against the wickedness of the slave trade, and the laity to use their influence to stay the further prosecution of it from within the Diocese. He was about to speak upon the resolutions, when he was interrupted by calls to order, and different motions made in utter disregard of his right to the floor, on which he steadily insisted; and, at last, after a brief period of disorder and confusion, a motion to lay the resolutions on the table was put, in flagrant contempt of all parliamentary usage, and carried by a nearly unanimous vote. Having been told, during his attempt to speak, that his course should have been, to preface his resolutions with such remarks as he desired to make, he acted on the suggestion, at the evening session, by announcing that he had a series of resolutions to offer, and then proceeding in an able speech to show why they ought to be adopted. The resolutions, offered at the close, referred to the missions of the Church on the coast of Africa, the interference of the slave trade with those missions, and the pernicious effect of the doctrine taught by a class of persons in the Diocese of New York, that Christianity justifies the slave trade; and declared that the Church utterly rejects that doctrine, and condemns the traffic as a great sin against God and man. He was often interrupted by the raising of the most absurd points of order, and by the noise made by members leaving the house in a rude and disorderly manner; but through the Bishop's gentle firmness in maintaining his right, and his own calm dignity in exercising it, he succeeded in finishing his speech in comparative quiet. The resolutions were immediately laid on the table, by a vote of 108 to 12. The next day, another member tried to offer a series of resolutions meeting the criticisms of the religious press of England on the Convention's course the year before touching the slave trade, with a declaration that "this Convention condemns" that trade "as a fearful crime, and calls on all members of the Church in the Diocese to set their faces against it." But points of order were raised to prevent the reading of the resolutions, and the Chair's decision, that the reading was in order, was, on appeal, reversed by the Convention, so that the reading could not be finished.

Such a discreditable exhibition as we have described is to be wondered at the less when we consider what sort of light some luminaries of the first magnitude in the Episcopal Church have shed upon the subject of slavery and human rights. Dr. VINTON, a most active opposer of JAY's resolutions, writing last winter to a brother churchman at the South, repelled the imputation of Abolitionism, saying, that on the late Fast Day, he so "expounded the Scripture authority for slavery" as to meet the full concurrence of CHARLES O'CONNOR, who, it is well known, affirms that property in man rests on the same basis with any other property, and that no law of God or nature forbids slaveholding. The Bishop of Vermont not long since undertook to "notice the various objections to Southern slavery," and directly assailed, as "first on the list," the affirmation of equal human rights in the Declaration of Independence. The *Churchman*, a prominent Episcopalian journal, published in New York city, "cannot understand how any class of men, not utterly blinded by fanaticism, or totally ignorant of the negro and all that pertains to him, can for a moment pretend to doubt the abstract justice of that system of negro servitude established in the Southern States"; and, "from the inherent characteristics of the negro race," deduces "the fact that the black man is intended by God to be the servant of the white man, * * * and that negro slavery, in some form or other, is part of the harmonious system established by God, in his good pleasure, for man's governance." Need we marvel that the flock of such pastors, and the patrons of such a journal, should so behave, collectively, as to lead the London *Christian Observer* to declare that "even the Episcopal Convention there is quite prepared, not merely to justify 'men-stealers,' but to add the weight of its authority to their hideous cause"?

Of the anti-slavery character so often claimed for the Congregational churches, we perceive no better proof than heretofore. Resolutions may be passed from time to time, by single churches, or by associations representing many churches, in general terms condemning slavery as a wrongful system; sermons may now and then be preached expressing more or less decided anti-slavery sentiments; but we do not see the ground yet taken, that slaveholding is a sin to be at once and utterly banished from the communion of the faithful, barring from church-membership the individual who practices, from the fellowship of other churches the church which tolerates, and from the pulpit the preacher who defends it. How strongly and how fre-

quently the pulpit testifies against the sin, let the leading organ of the sect in New England bear witness. The *Congregationalist*, which claims to be an anti-slavery journal of the proper kind, and thinks the churches mainly right on the slave question, declares — as proof, not of a gross neglect of duty, but of judicious moderation in the ministry — that of all the sermons preached by the thirteen hundred Orthodox Congregational ministers of the six New England States, during the last ten years, in all human probability, not more than one-tenth of one per cent. have made “any allusion whatever” to the subject of slavery. The labors of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, whatever else may be said of their results, have been, at least, a searching test applied to the pretensions of the various sects called “evangelical,” and in particular, the Congregationalists. Few of their ministers or members have given the Society the slightest show of favor; though from their stand-point, no exception can be taken to the religious standing or opinions of its members; and, but for lack of genuine and earnest sympathy, in the churches, with the principle and purposes of the Society, they would, for aught we see, “like kindred drops, have mingled into one.” The *New York Observer* and *Journal of Commerce* rejoiced over the scanty attendance at a Convention held under the auspices of the Society in New York city, on the 23d of January last. “It was severely let alone,” the former said; and the latter spoke of “the long array of empty pews,” which showed “the propagators of the movement, that they had come to the wrong market with their speeches.” Its Annual Meeting, held last May, in Boston, was more numerously attended, but thinly, if at all, by the representative men of the churches. Rev. H. T. CHEEVER was refused a hearing, as its agent, by the General Association of Massachusetts, at its last meeting. The General Association of Connecticut, last June, indefinitely postponed, by a unanimous vote, a series of resolutions which he offered, affirming the great influence of the Church and ministry over public opinion, ascribing to them mainly, therefore, the responsibility for the continuance of slavery, and recommending earnest coöperation with the Church Anti-Slavery Society in its attempt to array the churches against slavery. The New Hampshire General Association gave Mr. CHEEVER a hearing at its meeting last fall; and its Committee on Overtures reported a series of resolutions evidently from his hand, being in substance those rejected in Connecticut, with an added clause, proposing “a refusal of Christian fellowship with slave-

holders, as the scriptural means of bringing them to repentance." But when they were taken up for action, a substitute was moved and adopted, declaring "unabated" the Association's "often-expressed abhorrence of the grievous sin of slavery"; recognizing the powerful influence of the churches and ministry upon public opinion; and affirming that "this sin should meet the same kind, firm, decided and constant rebuke" from ministers and Christians, as other morally wrong practices; but omitting to recommend non-fellowship with slaveholders, or coöperation with the Church Anti-Slavery Society. We are not aware that any ecclesiastical body in the country has requited Mr. CHEEVER's faithful efforts with a single utterance of sympathy with the Society he zealously and ably serves; though possibly some scattered churches here and there, not strong in numbers or in influence, may have given him such. His brother, Rev. Dr. CHEEVER, testified in Great Britain, during his late visit there, that the Society, "organized as it had been on such a basis as to afford no ground of exception to any, had yet met with so little sympathy from the churches of America, that it was unable to sustain even one agent in the field; "and that the reason is, its declaring "slavery a crime, and slaveholding, in itself, a sin against God."

Of the position of the ecclesiastical organizations at the South, we hardly need to speak. So far as we are informed of their proceedings, they have, except within the Border States, gone bodily for secession, political and ecclesiastical, from the North, or are fast tending in that direction. Baptists and Presbyterians and Episcopalians, in Conventions and Assemblies, or whatever else their representative gatherings are called, have given in unanimously [for who would dare avow dissent?] their adhesion to the disunion movement, on the ground of a divine authority for slaveholding, and the consequent duty of maintaining slavery against the assaults of "fanaticism, the product of infidelity," which "would substitute its disorganizing dogmas of liberty and equality for the conservative teachings of the New Testament. In this view," says the Rev. Baptist Professor of a Southern College, from whom we are quoting, "the struggle upon which we have entered assumes the grandeur of a divine mission. We are the champions of God's truth, and he who falls in the contest will fall a 'blessed martyr.'"

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

At the last meeting of the American Board, which was held in Boston on the 2d-5th of October, "place was not given, even for an hour," says the well-pleased *New York Observer*, "to the exciting subject of slavery." Only one man attempted to introduce it, and he was "promptly put down." On the third day of the meeting, immediately after the reading of the minutes, Rev. H. T. CHEEVER took the floor, saying he had a brief paper of inquiry to offer, in behalf of some of the churches and ministers. The purport of the inquiry being probably suspected, he was interrupted with a call to order, on the ground, that by a rule of the body, all matters for its consideration must go through the Business Committee. To that Committee, therefore, he took his paper, which they referred to the Committee on the Gaboon Mission. The latter reported in the evening, without alluding to the paper; when Mr. CHEEVER rose and moved to amend, by adding to the report a recommendation that the Secretaries be requested to tell the Board what had been done with the memorial on the slave trade, referred to the Prudential Committee the year before; and that a special Committee of three be appointed to consider and report what further action of the Board is necessary to vindicate the honor of Christianity, scandalized by the revival of the slave trade. He was proceeding to speak on his motion, but had hardly well begun, when he was again interrupted, by Chancellor WALWORTH and others, in deference to whom the Chair with some hesitancy decided that no amendment to a report presented was in order. Thus he was once more silenced. Yet "previously," a correspondent of the *New York Tribune* says, "an unknown man had been allowed to comment on the report, and argue that money spent upon the Gaboon mission was wasted, because the African race could not be leavened with the Gospel." The next morning, Mr. CHEEVER tried again to get a hearing, by rising to a personal explanation, which, he said, was always in order. Reviewing the ruling of the previous day, and showing that, under it, no member not on the Prudential Committee, nor intrusted by it with something, could ever be in order in submitting anything to the Board, he seemed about to obtain a reversal of the decision, when a new call to order cut him short, and he was unable to get the floor again, or have any action taken on his resolution. This triumph of majority-despotism over

parliamentary law and the rights of the minority, the *Observer* hails as "ominous for good, not only to the American Board, but to our other religious institutions."

The Abstract of the Board's Annual Report announced that the Prudential Committee had discontinued their support of the Cherokee mission. "This is not owing," the Committee say, "to the relations of our work among these Indians to the system of slavery"; thus implying their continued willingness to sustain a mission which deliberately persists in tolerating slaveholding in its churches. Nor is it for want of confidence in the missionaries under whose ministrations slavery has nestled in the bosom of the mission churches through so many years; for they are pronounced "exemplary in the discharge of all their missionary duties," and are judged so worthy to be kept about "their work," to which they are "devoted," that "it may be hoped that some of our various Home Missionary Societies will interpose, to sustain them longer at their stations." But the chief reason for withdrawal is that "the Cherokees are a Christian people,"—[a slaveholding people though they also are;] their "Constitution recognizes the Christian religion," [as well as the right to own human chattels,] "and requires a belief in" the former "by all who hold office under the government," [as well as a practical acknowledgment of the latter by all its subjects, private or official.] Of course, the Board has nothing more to do with the Cherokees; its work being to convert heathens to Christianity, not to maintain Christian institutions among a Christian people.

A striking illustration of the character of that slaveholding "Christianity" which has grown up among the Indian tribes under the supervision of the Board and the religious teaching of its missionaries, was brought, last fall, before the public, by the disclosure of an event which took place in the Choctaw nation while that was still a portion of the Board's field of operations; although, its Secretary says, the Board knew nothing of it till after its withdrawal from the mission there. It was communicated to the *New York Independent*, on the 23d of last November, by Rev. SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, of Chicago, through a copy of the correspondence which he had then lately held about it with the Secretaries of the American and Old-School Presbyterian Mission Boards. On the 22d of October, Mr. BARTLETT wrote to the Secretaries of both these Boards, that he had "been recently informed, on good authority, that while the Choctaw mission remained nominally under the care of the Amer-

ican Board, viz., on the first Sabbath in January, 1859, a slave-woman was burned alive at a public meeting in the Choctaw nation, after having been previously tortured in the vain attempt to extract from her a confession of guilt"; that, as he "was informed, she was a reputable member of a mission church, and her master and mistress were members of the same church"; that "this transaction took place within ten miles of a missionary station," and that church members were said to have participated in it. He then asked several questions "to elicit all the facts of the case," and to ascertain how far they had been known by the respective Boards. Secretary TREAT, of the American Board, replied, October 27th, that no information of the facts alluded to had been received, "while the Choctaw mission was connected with the Board," though Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of that mission, had given some hints, then unintelligible, but now supposed to refer to this transaction. And since the Board's withdrawal from the Choctaw mission, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN had "intimated," in a letter received in August, 1860, "that he might at some future time make a statement 'in connection with the burning of slaves on the first Sabbath of January, 1859.'" Secretary LAWRIE, of the Presbyterian Board, replied, October 30th, that "the painful transaction" referred to "took place a year before the missionaries of the American Board were received by us, and, of course, no report of it was made to us"; but "a letter from one of our original missionaries, dated the 12th of January last, gave information that 'about a year ago, a black man killed his master, a worthy member of Mr. BYINGTON's church, and afterward confessed the deed, and accused a black woman of having instigated it. He got away from those who had him in charge, and drowned himself. The woman was taken by the enraged relatives, and burned. She was also a member of Mr. BYINGTON's church, and protested to the last her innocence. It was a terrible affair, but the mission and the church here are not responsible for it.'" The missionary's care to disclaim responsibility looks as if he felt that the facts recited have a rather ugly aspect in relation to "the mission and the church."

Mr. BARTLETT says he wrote to Mr. BYINGTON, also, on the subject, but that "five weeks have since elapsed, and no reply has been received. I now earnestly call upon him to break the portentous silence which he has kept for two years, concerning this fearful slaughter of one of the 'little ones' of his flock, and to show us that his church and *all its members* not only are clear of all complicity

in the affair, but have discharged their whole duty in the case. It also requests Mr. CHAMBERLAIN to tell what he knows of this extraordinary tragedy—a Christian woman, the mother of eight children, ‘owned’ by another Christian woman, persisting in her innocence, though three times hung up to extort confession of guilt, and burned alive with the words of prayer and praise upon her lips.” Mr. BYINGTON was, at the time of this tragedy, one of the oldest missionaries of the American Board. He has also since been Commissioner from the Indian Presbytery, in the Old-School General Assembly. We are told that shortly after this horrible murder of one of his church-members by some of her fellow-members, his church had a meeting for the communion, but neither minister nor church-members made any reference to the crime.

And now, in presence of the fact, that for so many years the missionaries of these Boards have, with their knowledge and acquiescence, been giving countenance in various ways to the atrocious system from which its own intrinsic character and many terrible examples have taught the country to expect just such atrocities as that above described, the Boards and their officials seem to think that *they* are clear of all responsibility, if they can only say “we never heard of this while we had charge of the mission where it happened”; or, “it was done before the mission was transferred to us.” But well may it be said of them, as Mr. BARTLETT says of the particular church and mission among whose members the fearful tragedy was acted, “they *have* a responsibility in regard to it, which they do not appear to have met.”

THE TRACT SOCIETIES.

In regard to the position of the American Tract Society, as represented by those who hitherto have managed its affairs, no better testimony need be offered, than is implied in the exultant declaration of the *Journal of Commerce*, just before its last Annual Meeting, that, if life-members were allowed to vote by proxy, the managers would have the votes of “the entire Southern States, however remote.” No doubt of it. Elective affinity would draw to their support every oppressor and upholder of oppression in the whole dark land where justice and humanity are branded outlaws. In deeds, if not in words, the champions of perpetual slavery and the revival of the foreign

slave trade would hail these men as virtual allies and fellow-laborers; as having thrown the influence of the powerful corporation which they represent into the scale of tyrant power, against the wronged and weak; and as being, therefore, just the men who, for the interest of slavery, should still remain in office. But they seem to be in little need of direct Southern help to keep them there, so long as the Society shall hold its Annual Meeting in the great commercial centre, where Mammon is the practically acknowledged God, and the *Journal of Commerce* is his prophet.

The last Annual Meeting was held in New York city, on the 9th of May last, with a prominent sham-Democrat, of Princeton, New York, in the chair. Dr. DEWITT, from the Executive Committee, presented a brief statement, introductory to the business of the meeting. First, gratefully acknowledging "the help of the Divine Spirit," which had "enabled the Committee, through another year, to prosecute their work with a concord of counsel and a harmony of feeling, undisturbed by any unfriendly differences," he eulogized "the principles on which the Society was founded, and the manner in which they had been applied"; commended the administrators of its trusts, as "true to its original design" of promoting "vital godliness, by the employment of those vital truths which only are productive of sound morality"; claimed that experience had shown the wisdom of their course in refusing "to listen, for a moment, to any suggestion intended to dissuade them from pursuing the well-defined path in which the providence and grace of God have conducted the institution"; alluded to the "adverse criticism" they had encountered, but to which they had "no liberty to reply," their duties being "not controversial, but simply the fulfilment of a trust"; and concluded with an assurance that "we have earnestly labored to carry out, as understood, the wishes of the Society, with what success, it is for our constituents to determine." That is,—to give a free translation of the statement, in the light of well-known facts,—we have refused, and still persist in our refusal, to apply to slavery, and its manifold and measureless abominations, "those vital truths which only are productive of sound morality," and which we often have applied to other and less flagrant immoralities; not thinking the broad generalities enough, in view of these, to which we sedulously keep, when those ask our attention, and, in this refusal, we believe we carry out your wishes; now, let your choice of officers for the ensuing year show whether our belief is right or wrong. After the

Annual Report, an abstract of which was next read, had been adopted, and the publication of it ordered, the Society proceeded to answer the Executive Committee's appeal, by unanimously choosing, once more, its old officers, except one of the Vice-Presidents, who declined a reëlection, and adding several new Vice-Presidents—among them, DANIEL LORD, Esq., whose signal services to the Tract-House managers, the year before, are mentioned in our last Report.

Rev. Mr. WOLCOTT, of Chicago, then submitted a series of resolutions, asserting that the resolution of 1857, about discussing the duties and the evils growing out of slavery, is still in force, and the reasons for it press upon the Society with accumulated weight; referring to the last year's declaration of the Society, that it has no doubt of the great wickedness of reviving the slave trade; affirming, as notorious, the fact that the trade has been reëopened by vessels from this country, and declaring that the publication of suitable tracts, setting forth its wickedness, would meet the Society's approval. He made a brief and forcible speech in favor of these resolutions, for offering which he had three reasons;—first, to vindicate the freedom of debate, which was suppressed the year before; second, to maintain unabated the proper sphere of the Society's responsibility and controlling agency, against the assumption of Mr. LORD, at the last meeting, that the only proper function of the Society is to choose its officers; and, third, to elevate the policy of the Society to a more scriptural standard. When he closed, Rev. Mr. LEE, of Brooklyn, New York, got the floor, and moved, as an amendment, "that the opening of German lager beer saloons, upon the Sabbath, is contrary to the law and the Gospel of God, and many practices in New York, and Brooklyn, and New England, deserve our condemnation"; and "that the Executive Committee be directed to publish documents denunciatory of the evils of Abolitionism." The motion being evidently meant for a display of caustic wit, was received, appropriately, with laughter and applause; whereupon, a motion to adjourn was made, and, amid considerable confusion, was decided to be carried. Thus, with an imposing exhibition of becoming dignity, the Annual Meeting of the great evangelizing corporation came fitly to its close.

The Boston American Tract Society also held its last Annual Meeting in the city of New York; as one way, probably, of reminding the religious public that, — contrary to the impression which the name it is familiarly known by rather tends to give, — though Boston is its birth-place, it is not a local, but a national society. As here-

tofore, so far as we can gather from the year's developments, the difference between the two societies is only this,—that while the other contemptuously refuses to look at the slave question, in any aspect, this entertains it, so far as to “fraternally discuss the duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, and the moral evils which it is known to promote”; and some of the speakers at its meetings, and a portion of its publications, condemn the system, in more or less emphatic terms. Dr. TYNG, the principal speaker at its last Annual Meeting, contrasting the positions of the two Societies, said: “This Society had an unrestricted field. At last, there was a Society that was not restricted to tobacco and dancing, a dirty man's mouth, and a silly woman's skirts. We believe the oppression of man to be a sin against God, and the selling of him to be an enormity in the sight of Him who made him in His own image.” One, also, of its tracts, as stated in our last Report, proves that slaveholding is against the teaching of the Scriptures. But it has also published tracts which treat the practice as in certain circumstances right. And we infer, alike from the general tenor of its action, and from the attitude of its leading members in their various other relations, that it would as promptly as its rival repudiate the doctrine, that slaveholding is itself intrinsically sinful, and to be dealt with accordingly, by all who assume to teach the doctrines or administer the discipline of the Christian Church. Rev. Mr. BULLARD, its agent in New York city, said, at the Annual Meeting, that “they were helped even by slaveholders, for such there were in the city of New York, who confessed that they had labored under great misapprehension as to the Society, thinking, erroneously, that it was doing an immense deal of mischief.” We are not told the nature of this misapprehension, or how it was removed. Did those New York slaveholders apprehend that the Society meant not only to “discuss the evils growing out of slavery,” but to assail slavery itself, and condemn slaveholding as a sin? And did they learn that this was a misapprehension, by being shown the Society's own published words:—“We are not an Anti-Slavery Society”;—our purpose is “not to be an Abolition Society”? We do not know; but one thing seems to us quite plain,—that a Society which makes its purpose manifest to deal with slavery and slaveholding as essentially immoral, will not be likely to receive much help from men who still persist in holding slaves, and that, too, while they live in a State whose laws permit no slavery on its own soil.

This, too, seems plain to us;—that they who take right views of the relation of slavery to “the interests of vital godliness and sound morality” will consider efforts to abolish it, by the dissemination of anti-slavery truth, as forming an important part of the great work in which the organized religion of the country is professedly employed. Does the Boston American Tract Society regard them so? In its *Tract Journal*, for last July, is one whole page devoted to “a retrospective view of the great work of Christ”; professing to recount “what has been done during the past year for his kingdom,” and to relate “the trials and successes of a year’s march of the great army which the Christian public have commissioned and are supporting on the field of benevolent operations.” It tells us that this great army has “been vigorously prosecuting the work of aggression upon the kingdom of the prince of darkness”; but not a hint appears, in the whole page, that his grim stronghold, Slavery, has received a single shot; or that the little bands assailing it belong to the “great army” warring on the rebel prince. Battalions virtually marshalled to defend it, or standing, in the guise of armed neutrality, across the path of its assailants, are honorably mentioned as a portion of the sacramental host; but on the assailants, not a syllable of recognition is bestowed. The Southern Baptist Convention, emblazoning its red-cross banner with symbolic whip and fetter; the New York American Tract Society, spiking the guns aimed at Oppression’s Bastile, and at the pirate clippers of the Congo soul-trade; and the American and Old-School Presbyterian Mission Boards, sustaining Slavery’s outposts on the Western frontier, are all enrolled by the *Tract Journal* in that great army which is making war upon the prince of darkness; but not an anti-slavery organization is named upon the roll,—not even the Church Anti-Slavery Society, composed although it is of members of the *Journal’s* own evangelical brotherhood. Is this the record of a body which believes that slavery is a portion of “the kingdom of the prince of darkness,” and the abolition of it, part of “the great work of aggression on” that kingdom, in which the loyal soldiers of Christ’s army are required by their great Captain to engage? Or is it a confession, made unconsciously, that the Society considers efforts for the overthrow of slavery as not among the duties of the Church and its auxiliaries, and consequently not among its own?

NATIONAL UNITY SOCIETY.

A recent movement among the Northern adversaries of our cause pays us the compliment of borrowing our plan of operations; thus practically confessing that the only way to prevent the triumph of our principles is to imitate, in opposing them, the method by which we are laboring for their advancement. "For twenty-five years, now," said the *New York Express*, "our people have been educated by Abolition tract societies, and Abolition preachers and lecturers, into the belief that negro slavery is 'a sin and a crime'; * * * * that the African negro is the equal of the Caucasian white man; and hence that the Declaration of Independence was made as much for the African as for the American. * * * The Republic can never be permanently reconstructed, till the prejudices of our people are removed. Tract Societies, then, should be forthwith formed in every large city of the Union, and a powerful organization should be started, which will meet the Abolitionists on their own ground." A correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce* "ventured to predict, that if we organize associations devoted to the discussion and promulgation of doctrines antagonistic to Abolitionism, by the dissemination of tracts and other publications, and by the employment of lecturers to travel through the country, and harangue the people after the manner of the Abolitionists themselves, the contest will be equally brief and decisive." By means of these associations, the three necessary conditions of union with the South, he said, "can soon be brought about,"—permission to the slaveholders to remove with their property into the Territories and organize new Slave States; repeal of the State laws which "conflict with the Federal Constitution"; and permission to the Southern people "to visit the Free States with their body servants." He then proposed "a basis for organization";—its principle, that negro slavery as it exists at the South is a necessary institution, founded upon the natural inequality of races, and constituting, in the ordination of Providence, a relation of protection on the one side and of dependence on the other; and that interference with it in one State, by people of another, is contrary to the Constitution, humanity and Christianity:—its purposes, to disabuse the public mind of the false theories of the Abolitionists, to discountenance the desecration of the sacred desk by the discussion of this question, and to sustain the execution of all Constitutional Federal laws.

The preliminary note having thus been sounded, a meeting was held in New York city, on the 6th of March last, and a Society was organized, calling itself the "American Society for promoting National Unity." Its object is, as stated in its Constitution, "to promote the union and welfare of our common country, by addresses, publications, and all other suitable means adapted to elucidate and inculcate, in accordance with the word of God, the duties of American citizens, especially in relation to slavery." It elected SAMUEL F. B. MORSE for President, and HUBBARD WINSLOW and SETH BLISS for Secretaries, with an Executive Committee of kindred spirits, among whom was the editor of the *New York Observer*. "In the hands of such men," said the *Journal of Commerce*, "the interests of the Society are safe, and of the country also, to the extent of the influence they may be able to exert." Their views were set forth in a "programme" which ascribes "the unhappy state of our country" to the fact that "the creation of popular sentiment has been left in a great measure to visionary reformers"; condemns as "a pernicious error" the notion "that all men are created equal and entitled to liberty," if it is understood thereby that they are "created equal in their relation to providential arrangements"; [as, for instance, in that "providential arrangement" by the profane world denominated slavery, one man being "created" in the relation to it of a chattel, and another in the relation of that chattel's "owner," how plain it is that they are not "created equal"!] affirms that "four millions of immortal beings, incapable of self-care, and indisposed to industry and foresight, are providentially committed to the hands of our Southern friends"—a "trust they cannot put from them if they would";—and that "emancipation, were it possible, would be rebellion against Providence, and destruction to the colored race in our land"; that "we at the North, by assuming an attitude of hostility to slavery, only put it out of our power to do the good which humanity and religion demand"; declares the slaves to be "under a providential dispensation lifting them up from the degradation and miseries of indolence and vice," and "training them for the services and joys of heaven"; asks "if the climate and institutions of the South are such that our fellow-citizens there can afford to take the onerous care of them, in return for their services, should we not gladly consent?" asserts that the slaveholders freely concede to us our conscientious convictions, our rights, and all our privileges," [witness the facts recorded in the foregoing pages, from 191 to 200,] and asks,

“should we not as freely concede to them theirs?” says that “the Church of God has no brighter ornaments, and our country no truer friends, than are found among them; and expresses an undoubting faith that “they are destined to be the providential instruments of unspeakable and endless blessings to those under their charge, and eventually to the whole African race,—without us, and to our shame, if they are forever separated from us by any fault of ours; but with us, and to our mutual honor, if we shall be united with them in the bonds of an affectionate brotherhood.” Such is the substance of the manifesto with which this new array of the allies of Slavery opens its campaign; setting itself squarely against the grand old doctrine of the fathers, that all men have, by the Creator’s gift, the same inalienable rights; maintaining the unfitness of the slaves for freedom, and the rightfulness, divine authority, and superlative beneficence of the system which chattelizes them; eulogizing the justice, liberality, piety and patriotism of their enslavers; and, with sublime effrontery, laying on the North the blame for the nation’s present troubles. We give it a frank welcome to the field of open conflict, whither from the first we have invited all who wish to controvert our principles, our measures, or our aims. Let the encounter show to which antagonist

———“the sword
Of Michael, from the armory of God,
Is given, tempered so, that neither keen
Nor solid may resist its edge.”

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

In Russia, an Imperial edict was issued on the 3d of March last, fixing definitely the day when the emancipation of the serfs shall be complete. They are regarded as at once released from actual serfdom, but will continue for two years from the date of the decree in a “transitory state,” dependent on and obedient to their former proprietors. “The proprietors, retaining their rights of property on all the land belonging to them,” are to “grant to the peasants, for a fixed rental, the full enjoyment of their homesteads, and a quantity of arable land allotted to assure them livelihood, and the fulfilment of their obligations to the Government.” The peasants have the right, with consent of the proprietors, of purchasing their home-

steads and allotments of land, and will thus become "free peasant-landholders." The domestic serfs are also for two years in a "transitory state," adapted to their occupations. At the expiration of two years, all are to "receive their full enfranchisement." The Emperor commends the nobility "for the disinterested support it has given to the accomplishment" of his designs. "Russia will not forget," he says, "that the nobility, acting solely upon its respect for the dignity of man, and its love for its neighbor, has spontaneously renounced rights given to it by the serfdom now abolished, and laid the foundation of a new future, which is thrown open to the peasants. And the freed serfs," he hopes, "will understand that the blessing of an existence, supported upon the base of guaranteed property, as well as a greater liberty in the administration of their goods, entails upon them, with new duties towards society and themselves, the obligation of justifying the protecting designs of the law by a loyal and judicious use of the rights which are now accorded to them." The Emperor has created a Special Committee, at St. Petersburg, with the Grand Duke Constantine as its President, "to take measures for the organization of the entire rural class, upon general and uniform bases." We are told that "the Imperial Manifesto has produced a good impression in St. Petersburg and Moscow," and "the emotion created throughout the Empire" is said to be "immense." Among the good results already produced by the prospect of emancipation, the correspondence of the St. Petersburg *Le Nord* mentions a rapid increase of the means of general education. "Our papers are filled with news, which comes to them from all parts of the country, of the establishment of free schools and of Sunday schools. Every day sees new schools opened of a character to attract and to educate the lower classes of the population. They are already very numerous, and scattered over the whole extent of the country. We see them starting up in remote hamlets and villages, under the patronage of the landholders, or of other public-spirited persons." It also states that, "thanks to the Temperance Societies, the brandy monopoly is abolishing itself before the term fixed by Government."

The New York *Tribune* mentions an instructive incident connected with this movement for emancipation. Last summer, the deputies of the nobility, gathered in St. Petersburg to arrange the plan for emancipation, celebrated the completion of their task by a public dinner. Among the guests was Mr. BULGAKOFF, under-Secretary of State, who gave four toasts:—first to the Emperor,

second and third to the emancipation cause and the nobility, and fourth "to the memory of EMILIAN PUGATSHEFF, the first emancipator of Russian serfs." PUGATSHEFF was himself a serf, who, in 1774, escaped from his master and raised an insurrection which was with difficulty suppressed, after it had seemed for a time to endanger the Imperial throne itself. In short, he was a Russian NAT TURNER, acting on a vastly larger scale than the black Virginian had the means of doing. He was taken at last and executed, and his body was burnt, and the ashes were shot into the air from a cannon. And now comes an under-Secretary of the Empire to gather up, as it were, the scattered ashes of the slain insurgent slave, and in the presence of a public meeting of the representatives of the whole Russian nobility, inurn them in the grateful respect and memory of the posterity of his murderers! Who shall say that the JOHN BROWNS and the NAT TURNERS, the GABRIELS and the DENMARK VESEYS shall not yet have their ovations in the land which now execrates their names?

O B I T U A R Y .

A wide gap was made in the ranks of the friends of freedom, when, on the 10th of May last, THEODORE PARKER was called away from earth. He died in Florence, whither he had gone in the faint hope of repairing his health, broken down by his superabundant labors for humanity and truth. So grand was he in spiritual stature and proportions; his mind so ample, vigorous and active; his heart so large, so true, so full of sweet and generous affections, of noble sentiments and tender sympathies, of lofty scorn for falsehood, and quick-kindling indignation at baseness and injustice, and deep abhorrence of oppression, and high aspirations after excellence in character and action; and his life was so enriched and beautified with achievements and attainments manifold and varied, that to attempt to do justice to his memory within the compass which our space allows us, would be like trying to compress the Mississippi into the channel of a wayside brook. He enlisted years ago in the Anti-Slavery cause, and it has had no firmer friend, no braver champion, no abler advocate than he. In thorough comprehension and hearty acceptance of its principles, in zealous devotion to its interests, in constancy and earnestness of effort, in alert readiness for its every emergency, and watchful alacrity to seize every occasion for its ad-

vancement, and, briefly summing all, in the whole scope and value of his labors, he was the peer of its most faithful, earnest and efficient workers. And no other of them all could consecrate to its service so abundant stores of knowledge, drawn from almost every field of intellectual research; the ripe and plenteous fruits of such a mental culture as, in its thoroughness and breadth and rich variety, has seldom been surpassed, not to say rarely equalled, anywhere. For it has been truly said of him, by one who knew him well, that "while his learning and reading were so vast that the entire faculty of a college could have been well fitted out from his single brain, on the other hand, he could teach common sense to mechanics, homely simplicity of speech to draymen, and sympathy with the every-day interests of mankind to all. He was more a recluse student than any merest scholar; and he inhabited a wider out-of-doors than sea-captains." And another competent witness has testified, that while "other men have brought us brave hearts, keen-sighted and vigilant instincts, he brought us, as no one else could, the loftiest stature of New England culture. He brought us a disciplined intellect, whose affirmation was evidence, and whose statement the most gifted student took long time before he ventured to doubt or to contradict." In every department of anti-slavery labor in which he had opportunity to bear a part, he proved himself a workman that needed not to be ashamed; whether it was in rightly dividing the word of truth, or rightly exemplifying the truth in act. Of his ability upon the platform, multitudes, in different portions of the country, who listened to him with a delight which grew with every renewal of the privilege, have borne abundant witness. His potent pen has traced its own attesting record of its power and faithfulness, which coming generations will rejoice to read. His wisdom in council, all who have been associated with him there will cordially acknowledge. The resolution, courage and sagacity with which he baffled the slave-hunter, and aided fugitives from bondage on their perilous way to freedom, are recorded deep in the memories of grateful hearts now joyous in the consciousness of unfettered manhood, and of womanhood safe from degradation and pollution. He never stopped to count the steps which must be taken to defeat a prowling kidnapper, skulking beneath the cover of a wicked statute to spring upon his prey; nor ever were his more than golden hours too precious to be given, if needed, to ensure the safety of the hunted refugee.

Nor was it only in the service of the Anti-Slavery cause that he

labored for the welfare of his kind. It was well said of him in one of the many notices of his death, that "none of the exciting interests of the day escaped his attention, and none which promised to benefit society, promote the cause of knowledge, and advance the progress of man, failed to win his sympathy"; and in another, that "his ambition was to serve his race, and to banish superstition and error from the earth"; and that extraordinary as was his ability to acquire knowledge in every direction, it was not "greater than his disposition to use that knowledge with unbounded prodigality for the enlightenment and welfare of his fellow-men." "He was the uncompromising enemy of all social vices," said another, "and the purity of his life commanded the respect of all." If his home gave refuge to the bondman, flying from the Southern prison-house, so did it a free welcome to "those noble but unfortunate exiles who came from time to time to Boston from the old world, driven out by the edicts of European despotism. They found in him a sympathizing friend, a trusty adviser, and a generous assistant in their time of sore distress." The *New York Tribune* testified that he "was one of the most truly benevolent men of the day; and had not his brilliant fame as a public man eclipsed the reputation of his private virtues, he would have been celebrated as 'the Man of Ross.' In the receipt of a generous income from his profession and his literary labors, one third of his surplus for many years past has been religiously devoted to deeds of unostentatious charity. The sincerest mourners at his death will be the troops of young people whom he has helped to an education and an establishment in life, and the poor and unfortunate, whose wants never appealed to his sympathies in vain."

Among the tributes to his memory, none do a higher honor at once to it and to their own authors, than some of those which came from the strongest adversaries of his peculiar theological opinions. Said one of them—the able editor of the *Free Church Portfolio*— "Our readers know that Mr. Parker was a distinguished Good Samaritan, who worshipped on Mount Gerizim, instead of at our Jerusalem. * * * His life was a glowing commentary on the moral law. His house was the home of the friendless. His hand was ever open to the cry of the needy. He was the friend and advocate of afflicted and wronged ones. In all the remarks, editorial and otherwise, made on this remarkable man since his death, we have not seen a line charging that the beautiful Christian *life* he lived was a hypocrisy, assumed to cloak over his here-

sies, and give him influence with the confiding and undiscerning. All seem to admit that he was candid and free from guile. If so, how can we account for the fruit he bore? The Scripture says a good tree must bear good fruit, and a corrupt tree evil fruit, and that the only way of estimating the tree is by the *fruit*." And Rev. N. J. BURTON, pastor of an Orthodox church in Hartford, Ct., thus spoke of him, in a sermon preached last summer in Fair Haven:—"THEODORE PARKER, it seems to me, has propagated some enormous heresies; but he died the other day in far Florence, and as I sat in my dark room the other evening and thought of him gone, I remembered only his ever-fervent humanity, his memorable eloquence whenever any right of man was violated, his championship of the slave, his woman's heart for the wants and woes of the widow and orphan, the drunkard, the prostitute, the disappointed, the dying, and all the pitiful children of crime and ill-luck; his love of whatever is beautiful, his more than soldierly courage, his unspeakable abhorrence of pretension and insincerity—these were what I remembered; and I wanted to get up and pronounce before you here, at an hour's length, a tender eulogium of that large, brave man, called away in his early autumn prime."

But we must not yield further to the temptation of a theme which only seems to widen as we dwell upon it, impressing us in each successive moment with a deeper sense of the inadequacy of our attempt to do it justice.

Another faithful champion of our cause went from us to the higher life on the 30th of April. JOHN W. BROWNE, of Boston, was among the earliest to enter, as a whole-souled volunteer, into its service, and though for some years he has been seldom seen upon its public platform, he has never ceased to labor ably and efficiently in less conspicuous but not less useful ways for its promotion. Said of him one who was well qualified in every way to testify his worth, "Though hidden, he was no slight or trivial servant to the great cause. The purest of all human hearts—but not, as is sometimes the case, with that rare and childlike simplicity, a merely negative character; for he graduated at Harvard in the same class, and was linked as a room-mate and nearest and most intimate friend, with one whose intellect is the admiration of millions—our Senator, Mr. SUMNER; and he was thought by many, indeed by most, of those who stood at the goal of collegiate reputation, the most original and ablest intellect which that class gave to the world. In the bloom of

youth, in the freshness of a rare success in his profession, he placed himself on this platform in the mob years of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, when to speak an anti-slavery word was starvation, when to hold up an anti-slavery banner was political suicide. Patient of labor, in that little heeded and hidden toil so indispensable to every reform, he was ever ready. Many of us stood here dowered with the result of his toil, many of us brought to you his ripe thoughts, which his own lip and his own life would have given so much better; and when he fell, I, for one, felt lonelier and weaker in my place in this world and its battle."

On the 27th of February, Dr. BENJAMIN STANTON, a venerable friend of freedom, and for many years an earnest laborer in its cause, was summoned from his earthly work, in Salem, Ohio, where he had been long revered for his eminent moral worth. He was one of the early settlers of Salem, where, for nearly half a century, he was recognized as "the beloved physician," a friend of the poor and the unfortunate of every class, and the supporter of every moral and philanthropic enterprise. He was an unflinching Abolitionist, the early friend and counsellor of BENJAMIN LUNDY, and his house and purse were always open to the Anti-Slavery lecturer and the fugitive from Southern bondage. He combined great firmness with great gentleness, and large intellectual power with rare modesty.

71 2009.084 05144

