

ANNUAL REPORTS

OF THE

American Anti-Slavery Society,

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

FOR THE YEARS ENDING

MAY 1, 1857, AND MAY 1, 1858.

NEW YORK:

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

No. 138 Nassau Street.

1859.

11.18.90
30.1.10
V. A. 9. 11

9.11.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY PRENTISS, SAWYER, & COMPANY,
No. 19 Water Street.

115276

REPORTS FOR 1856-7.

THE arrival of another Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society summons its Executive Committee to lay before their constituents the customary statement of the past year's work, as well as a record of the principal events, affecting the interests of the cause, which have transpired within the year.

SOUTHERN REFUGEEISM.

Nobody ever yet asked that oft-repeated question — “Why do n't you go South?” from any other motive than a very strong desire to send the Anti-Slavery advocate as far away as the limits of the country would permit, and into a region whence the probability of return would be exceedingly small. The benevolent people who have been in the habit of using the question as a triumphant and unanswerable argument, would, if their implied advice were taken, feel, on parting with the man who took it, much as Sydney Smith did on bidding farewell to some clerical brother about to depart on a mission to the Fejee Islands — that he would be served up roasted soon after his arrival. The expectation in our case, moreover, would be accompanied with a most hearty prayer that such a reception should await the abolition emissary.

When the state of public opinion at the North shall warrant the indulgence of a hope that the time approaches when Anti-Slavery Missionary effort at home may be pretermitted, the way

will open, for those who conceive that their path of duty lies in that direction, to take up the Cross, and go down among the Heathen and the Savages of the Southern States. But as yet, even if the work of conversion were finished at the North, no encouragement is offered for a Southern Crusade, except to those who are ambitious of a sudden crown of martyrdom. The South bristles at all points at the approach of danger. To the barbarous despotism which she cherishes as a social institution, the man who thinks is the worst enemy; and she deals with him accordingly. He is visited with ignominious punishment, or with banishment, as the most dangerous foe to the peace and good order of society.

It is not a new thing for her thus to defend herself. Every Northern man who has crossed Mason and Dixon's Line for the last five and twenty years has needed to be careful that, in his trunk, or about his person, he carried no newspaper or book in which could be found any modern notions upon morals or civilization. As a general rule, he was safe only with the *New York Journal of Commerce*, or the publications of the Messrs. Harpers; or, if he were of a religious turn of mind, with the *New York Observer*, or the issues of the American Tract Society. With these in his hand, he was admitted to Southern confidence and hospitality as one whose views could be relied upon as correct on the curse of Canaan, and who could take no other view than a South-side one of the auction block or a chain gang. But as the danger to Southern society for the last year has been greater, so precaution and punishment have been more stringent and frequent. A brief record of some of these proceedings will prove instructive.

Among the delegates to the Republican Convention at Philadelphia, in June, was a Mr. JOHN C. UNDERWOOD, a planter from Clark County, Virginia. Mr. UNDERWOOD is by birth a New Yorker, but has been, for many years, a resident of Virginia. He has never been a Slaveholder, and his opinions in favor of Free Labor, and opposed to Slavery, well known among his neighbors, led him to attend the Philadelphia Convention. When there, he made a brief speech, which was received with a good deal of interest and applause, as coming from a resident of a Slave State. He drew a picture of the present condition of Virginia, as a necessary consequence of the existence of Slavery, and applied to her the words

of her own JEFFERSON, that "God is just, and his justice will not sleep forever;" and, referring to Kansas, he said:—

"This is the work which Virginia is doing to-day. Shall the same infamous work curse the future States to spring up in the West, which were destined to be the homes of freemen? Shall these homes, dedicated to you and your children, and your children's children forever, become the habitations of freedom and happiness, or the habitations of cruel oppression and misery? I appeal to you to let the fate of Virginia be a warning. Let us all remember the admonitions of a JEFFERSON. Let us remember that the curse of Heaven is and ever must be upon human oppression."

When about to return to his home, a few days later, Mr. UNDERWOOD received a warning from his wife, that he could do so only at the risk of violence. A public meeting was subsequently held by the people of Clark County, at which a series of resolutions was passed, denouncing him as "a vile incendiary," and advising him to leave the State as speedily as possible. As to return at all would evidently be, from the excitement which was raised against him, at the peril of his life, Mr. UNDERWOOD remained at the North, and during the campaign did good service as a Republican speaker. After the election he returned home, but the feeling of exasperation against him was still rampant, and a mob was organized to give him a warm reception. He effected his escape, and was banished thenceforth from the State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, however, is one of those men who is disposed to return good for evil. He has, since his final banishment, been very active in organizing, in New York, a colonization scheme, the purpose of which is to purchase the immense tracts of land in Virginia which Slavery has either depopulated or prevented from being occupied, and open them to the emigration settlement of a free people. The day may come when his exile will be remembered as a benefit to the State, though not in the way the people of Clark County intended it should be.

On the 14th of June, an armed mob at Rochester, Missouri, seized Rev. WILLIAM SELLEPS, a minister of the Methodist Church North, who attempted to preach there; covered his hair, face, neck and clothes, to his feet, with tar; drove him from the State; and murdered BENJAMIN HOLLAND, "an aged and beloved member" of that Church, residing in the neighborhood.

The occasion—or at least the pretext—for this assault was the action of the last General Conference on Slavery, which the leaders of the mob were stupid enough to regard, or dishonest enough to *pretend* to regard, as amounting to a prohibition of Slaveholding by members of the M. E. Church North. Mr. SELLERS showed them their mistake by telling them “how that matter was adjusted;” but they would not be convinced, or turned from their purpose. The work of the day was fitly crowned by the adoption of resolutions that every Northern Methodist Anti-Slavery man in the County should be notified to leave, and, in case of their refusal, measures should be taken for their immediate expulsion.

About the first of August, JOHN DUBERRY, a native of Virginia, now and for four or five years past residing at Columbus, Miss., was arraigned at that place, on a charge of circulating incendiary documents, and, upon proof that he had received through the mail, packages of *Seward's and Sumner's Speeches in the United States Senate*, though it was not clearly shown that he had circulated them,—was bound over for trial at the next session of the Circuit Court. Whether the trial has taken place, or, if so, how it issued, we have not yet learned.

In August also, the enlightened citizens of Mobile, Alabama, were startled by a report that some incendiary publications had been found in a bookstore in that city. A meeting was immediately called “of some of the best, calmest and most influential citizens,” and a committee appointed to investigate the matter. The evidence brought before this Committee was never made public by them, but they announced that both that and the books found to have been in possession of Messrs. STRICKLAND & UPSON, the persons accused, were of such a character that it would be unsafe to publish the details. They informed the alarmed citizens, however, that the booksellers had “wilfully and intentionally” deceived the meeting; that they were either Abolitionists, and anxious to propagate their faith among Slaves and Slaveholders, or else unprincipled and unscrupulous speculators, without any sense of moral responsibility, and willing to make money by the sale of any sort of book to anybody; and that in either case they were dangerous persons in a Slaveholding community, and ought to be cast out of it. The conclusion, of course, was inevitable, and a Committee was appointed to wait

upon Messrs. STRICKLAND & UPSON, and inform them of the decision of the meeting. Any resort to violence was deprecated, as it was desirable that "the exalted conservative character, which has always distinguished Southern communities," should be preserved. The Committee, however, evidently did not think it possible to preserve that exalted state of society more than five days longer in Mobile, as they would not guarantee the personal safety of the offenders for any longer period. These conspirators against the peace of the State left immediately.

On their arrival in New York, Mr. STRICKLAND made a statement through the newspapers of the facts in the case, which the Mobile Committee thought so unsafe to publish. Though they did not seem very alarming in themselves, "the best, calmest and most influential citizens" of Mobile must be supposed to know best what was dangerous to the good order of that community, and it is impossible to reject their evidence as to the reality of the danger which they apprehended. It seems that some casual customer had observed a copy of the "Life of FREDERICK DOUGLASS" in the shop of the booksellers, and had reported this alarming fact to a clergyman by the name of HAWTHORNE, who, as a protector of the public morals, immediately verified it by sending to purchase that and the only other copy of the book in the possession of STRICKLAND & UPSON. Another book of a similar character was also found upon their shelves, called "The Autographs of Freedom." This last, they aver, had come into their possession accidentally; the others they had on hand, after serious consideration, two years before, as there had been some inquiries for it. They denied, however, any guilty purpose in selling them, and in proof of their innocence declared that they had refused to sell "Uncle Tom's Cabin," though they had kept two copies of that work to lend, which were quite worn out in the faithful use to which they were subjected, and had given away a few other copies among friends whose loyalty and judgment could be relied upon. Mr. STRICKLAND had, at one time, been a Slaveholder; he acknowledged that he had "erred, sadly erred in judgment," but challenged as wholly untrue any assertion or insinuation that "he had ever intentionally done aught except what was manly, right and just to the people or institutions" of the South. This plea, however, had availed them nothing. Banishment was the

least expiation that could be accepted for the crime of having in a large bookstore three copies of Anti-Slavery publications.

A Rev. Mr. BOARDMAN, a Northerner by birth, was compelled by the state of his health to reside at the South. He chose for his home a place called Barnwell Court House, South Carolina. Here he became the pastor of a Baptist Church, and a warm attachment existed between him and his people. It is not likely that this reverend gentleman was unaware upon what tenure he was permitted to sustain such a relation to a Slaveholding people; for it seems to have been understood, that for the privilege of holding certain opinions upon the subject of Slavery, for his own satisfaction, he should also hold his tongue for theirs. It is said in defence of him, that he acquainted *one* of the leading members of his church with his sentiments, disclaiming a wish for agitation, but avowing himself Anti-Slavery "in principle and action, when action would be alike constitutional, honorable and effectual." The "leading member," into whose hands his conscience was thus delivered for safe keeping, felt, probably, that its material was of a stout, serviceable kind, not easily wounded, and that the repose of the brethren was not likely to be disturbed by a pastor who acknowledged the Constitution as the standard by which he measured his duty to rebuke sin.

But, however cautious Mr. BOARDMAN was as a divine, when appealed to as a mere man for his opinion on the outrage upon Senator SUMNER, he permitted himself to be governed by a generous and impulsive emotion, and condemned, unequivocally and indignantly, that cowardly assault. He even then, however, as he himself says, "repeatedly and distinctly disclaimed all consideration of the Slavery question," in connection with the affair. But he saw, notwithstanding, that "a storm was brewing;" he decided to resign his pastorate, and announced his decision to leading members of his church. To this there seems to have been objections on the part of his society, but, at length he left them for a visit to the North, with the declaration that they now knew his position; "that he was neither an Abolitionist nor a Slavery-Extensionist;" that if, under such circumstances, they wished him to return, he would probably do so. But the choice was not left him. In the course of the summer, he received an official letter from the Church, advising him not to return. Their regard for him prompted the letter. The inference is, that they feared

for the personal safety of a clergyman who ventured to cherish some notions not altogether Carolinian.

Even so near the borders of a Free State as the city of Wheeling, Va., an attempt to enjoy free speech was, in the words of the *Wheeling Argus*, "put down by a healthy public sentiment, and it is believed, in such a manner that" it will not be publicly repeated. A Fremont Association, composed, it is said, mostly of immigrants to that city from the North and from England, met on the 15th of August, and heard, or tried to hear, an address. This called out "the pent-up indignation of the citizens," who annoyed the meeting in its progress with tokens of their displeasure; and as the speaker withdrew at its close, "he was greeted with jeers and groans," and "sundry kicks and knocks," and being pursued till "a general skirmish ensued," in which two of his assailants were wounded, "he met with rough handling," says the *Intelligencer*, "and had to be taken to the jail for safety." He and his associates are gravely warned that, if their efforts are continued, "more serious events may follow." The *Intelligencer* is "not surprised that our citizens are incensed at this Republican effort;" and is "at a loss to know," in the innocent simplicity of its patriotic heart, "how men can come from the North, and settle in Virginia, without the determination to be true to Virginia," which of course means, true to the institution which disgraces and curses Virginia.

In September, the citizens of Cheraw, South Carolina, had occasion to exercise that "sleepless vigilance" which the assaults of "a wild and blood-thirsty fanaticism" has made the peculiar characteristic of that heroic people. Cheraw was invaded by two young Irish peddlers, who, under the pretence of selling window-shades, were suspected of propagating principles which South Carolinians can hear of only with rage and terror. The largest meeting that was ever known in Cheraw at once convened, and by its "calm, cool, deliberate and determined spirit," evinced its sense of an alarming crisis. A citizen whose title is Honorable was called to the chair; a military gentleman with the rank of Colonel "forcibly and eloquently" explained to his fellow-citizens the dangers by which they were environed. A Committee, on which was one reverend gentleman, and one doctor, either of the body or the soul, with other well-known and respected persons, was appointed. In due time they reported that the suspected persons, JAMES CALD-

WELL and JOHN MALONE, were known to entertain and to have expressed opinions hostile to the institution of Slavery, that they had been seen to converse with negro slaves, and that their continued residence there was inconsistent with the public safety. A Committee of five was then appointed to take possession of and hold the enemy as prisoners till they could be delivered into the hands of another Committee of six at the railroad depot, whose duty it was to take them to the nearest seaport for shipment to the North. This accordingly was done, and Cheraw and South Carolina were again in peace and security.

About the same time, the (Richmond Va.) *Enquirer* said that several Northern incendiaries had been expelled from Alabama and Mississippi, but the particulars of these cases we have not seen. In Clarke County, Mississippi, two persons by the name of PIERCE, described as Yankee school-teachers, were accused of tampering with the Slaves, and were banished. Their crime, if they committed any, seems to have been an attempt to teach the Slaves, though probably some more severe punishment would have been inflicted upon them, if there had been any positive evidence even of it. Five more persons, whose names were not given, were expelled from Elba, Alabama, about the same time. At Livingston, Sumner County, Ga., a public meeting was called to consider the case of one SAMUEL SHERWOOD, "charged with being an Abolition incendiary," and he was ordered to leave the State within three days.

The *Savannah Georgian*, of November 21st, says, that at a meeting of the people of Madison County, Florida called to consider the case of an alleged Abolitionist, named GEORGE EATON COLSON, evidence being produced that he was, by his own confession, an Abolitionist of the GREELEY, perhaps even of the GARRISON stamp, he was ordered to quit, on penalty of thirty-nine lashes, in case of his refusal; the number to be doubled in case of further refusal. "*He left.*"

Some time last fall, MOSES C. CHURCH, formerly of Michigan, was driven from Columbus, Ga., by his own uncle, in whose employ he was; having, to enter it, left at his uncle's solicitation a lucrative situation in New York. The crime for which he was banished by the stern patriotic fidelity of this modern Brutus, was having written to his father a letter in which moderate Anti-Slavery sentiments and a leaning toward FREMONT were expressed,

or rather, implied. An extract from the letter having appeared in a Michigan newspaper, and by some means found its way to his uncle in Georgia, he was commanded on a Saturday to leave the State early in the next week, on pain of exposure to the tender mercies of a Georgian mob. He prudently obeyed, though at a sacrifice of four or five hundred dollars. The story is not quite complete without the addition, that the heroic uncle is a native of Vermont; a recreant Yankee, transformed into a Georgian Slaveholder, and *of course* into one of the most vigilant and zealous defenders of the sacred institution.

A "suspected Abolitionist" was also arrested at Columbus, Mississippi, and lodged in jail to await his trial. The result we have never learned. None of these cases received more than a passing notice in the newspapers.

But the case of Professor HEDRICK, of the North Carolina University, attracted more attention. This gentleman was accused, in a public print, by an anonymous writer, of being a Republican. The feeling aroused by such an accusation was so great that Professor HEDRICK was constrained to enter upon his defence through the columns of a newspaper. He avowed, without hesitation or prevarication, that he was in favor of Col. FREMONT for President, from the respect and admiration in which he held his character, and as the head of a party opposed to the extension of Slavery. On that question he declared himself to be on the side with WASHINGTON, JEFFERSON, HENRY, MADISON, RANDOLPH and CLAY, and showed, from the condition of the Slave States themselves, that the system of Slavery was one which no true son of hers, and no lover of his country, should ever consent to see planted in new territory. His letter was one of great boldness and ability, and produced the effect that was to be expected. The Faculty of his University repudiated the Professor's opinions, and expressed their regret at his indiscretion. The Trustees immediately dismissed him. The more indignant public was scarcely restrained from inflicting upon him condign and ignominious punishment, and the obloquy with which he was visited soon drove him from the State.

Prof. HEDRICK held an appointment under the Federal Government as a computer for the Nautical Almanac, from which he was also dismissed when exiled from his native State.

In Virginia, a Republican electoral ticket was nominated, and

in that portion of the State where the Slave population is sparse, and some Anti-Slavery feeling is known to exist, there may have been a few votes cast for it. In Norfolk, a Mr. STANNARD attempted to do so, but it was at the risk of his life, and his vote was refused at the polls, whence he was taken in the custody of policemen. All night the house in which he took refuge was surrounded by a mob, and the next day all the customary avenues of travel to the North were watched to prevent his escape. It was effected at last in disguise, and by taking an unusual route. Mr. STANNARD is a native of Massachusetts, but had resided for several years in Norfolk, as a merchant. He had never — to use his own words — “in any way meddled with the subject of Slavery, having no inclination, nor, as I believed, any right to do so.”

In Jackson, Mississippi, a Mr. SASHA, a Frenchman, who had gone there from the North, and had resided there for eight years, was found, on inquiry, to be in favor of the election of FREMONT. He was repeatedly warned to conceal his opinions, and was waited upon, at length, by a mob, who offered him the alternative of silence or banishment. He declined both, and an attempt was made to seize him which he resisted, and was shot on the spot. In the presence of the dead body of her husband, his wife was threatened with the same fate, unless she left the State within four and twenty hours. She returned to her friends in New York, of which State she is a native.

In one of the interior towns of Louisiana, a Mr. GEORGE CRANE, a lawyer, who had removed there from Cincinnati, about a year previous, was engaged in editing a Democratic newspaper. He was an ardent BUCHANAN man, but avowed, in conversation merely, the opinion that it would be better for Kansas, so far as her own interests were concerned, if she should become a Free rather than a Slave State. An indignation meeting was immediately called, when, with the usual formalities, he was warned to leave the country. He emigrated, at once, to Kansas with this stimulus to his free soil proclivities.

The last case of this sort on our record for this year is that of Mr. JOSEPH L. BLODGETT, of Charlemont, Massachusetts. This man has lived in Jacksonville, Florida, as a mechanic. In December last, he was waited upon by a band of men who style themselves the Regulators, and who, he says, in his published statement, have taken upon themselves the duty of preserving the

public peace by the administration of speedy justice upon all offenders of a certain sort. Several men, he asserts, they have killed, one of whom they whipped to death. Him they seized, without question and without explanation, hurried to the woods, stripped him of all his clothing, tied him to a tree, and administered eighty lashes with a large raw hide. Two days afterwards he was shipped for Savannah, and in the boat learned, for the first time, that the crime of which he was accused was teaching negroes to read, and that he was made the confidant of a runaway slave. Both these charges he emphatically denies. At Savannah, he was lodged in the guard-house as a protection against the mob, as his arrival and the charge against him were made public, and they threatened to hang him. After a delay of four days, during which time he was under the protection of the police, he was put on board a ship bound for New York.

It is not at all likely that this list, though numbering about thirty persons, is a complete one of all those who have been banished, on pain of death, from the Slave States within the past year, because known or suspected to look upon the social system of those States without approbation. For a knowledge even, of nearly all these cases, we are indebted to their own newspapers, and there can hardly be a doubt that many others occur to which no such publicity is given. And yet so accustomed have we become to this thralldom, this permanent Reign of Terror, that the more than monthly recurrence of these acts of rampant despotism hardly excites comment among us. The Northern press and the Northern people are quick enough to resent any invasion of the liberty of an American citizen by a foreign power; and in instances where this has occurred, within the last few years, there have been hardly any bounds to our indignation, and our demands for immediate and ample satisfaction for a national insult. And we receive as a hero and martyr the man who has resisted or escaped from the same sort of tyranny in any European State. But in one-half of the States of our own Union, to be suspected only of believing that freedom is a better condition for man than bondage, is to be convicted of crime, and our own citizens are every month dismissed with ignominious punishment, or are sent flying for their lives beyond the Southern borders, without arousing the North to any sense of her own degradation. It is a significant commentary upon our national character, and the condition to

which the Union has reduced us, that we loudly and boastingly demand a respect and consideration abroad, which we dare not assert, and do not even feel is due to the citizen at home. That the indignities of this sort, however, which the South heaps upon the North, are not the expression of mere "sectional" feeling, or aimed at *Northern men as such*, but only at apprehended Northern interference with her peculiar institutions, is evident from the impartiality with which she administers the same code of despotic ruffianism upon her own citizens, whenever they are suspected of the like offence. Even Slave traders, it would seem, from the recent experience of one of that class in Richmond, Virginia, cannot safely indulge in the weakness of favoring and helping the release of Slaves from bondage, though in a way entirely "constitutional," and strictly deferential to the inviolate sanctity of the Fugitive Slave Law.

E. SCHEFFER, the trader just alluded to, bought, last summer, "through motives of sympathy," as he himself said, a Slave woman, SARAH, in order to give her an opportunity to procure means for her ransom; and agreed to emancipate her—as in the event he did—on payment of a sum \$100 less than he gave for her. HENRY WARD BEECHER, who was deeply interested in the case, and characteristically energetic in bringing it to a successful issue, testifies that SCHEFFER, who "in the whole transaction labored with a humanity worthy of all praise, and proved himself a man of feeling, in spite of his ignominious trade, was *subject to such animosity* on account of his simple kindness, that he was *in danger of being mobbed*, and was obliged for a time to seclude himself." Another part of Mr. BEECHER's testimony ought also, perhaps, to be given. He says that many of the clerks in Government employ at Washington, had subscribed towards SARAH's ransom, but after she had been among the Northern Abolitionists to complete the raising of the needed sum, they refused to pay their subscriptions, "because, if known, *it would cost them their places.*"

Another instance in proof of the impartial despotism of the Slave power we will here cite;—one which most lucidly illustrates the notions prevalent in a Slaveholding community, touching "the right of free opinion, free discussion, and the largest liberty of self-defence," and the proper way of showing respect for these rights.

LORENZO SHERWOOD, an eminent lawyer,—and a Slaveholder, withal—representing the city of Galveston in the Texan Legislature at its last session, had to resign before his term expired, because he had expressed, on the floor of the house, his opinion that Congress has a constitutional right to legislate on Slavery in the Territories; this being the only “Anti-Slavery” doctrine in his creed. Naturally enough wishing to vindicate himself before his constituents, he announced his purpose to address them with that intent, on the evening of the 7th day of July; whereupon a meeting was straightway called, to assemble on the *morning* of that day; not, as we simple souls at the North might suppose, to facilitate or hasten the delivery of the proffered vindication, but “to consider the propriety of *permitting* LORENZO SHERWOOD to address the people, in defence of his course in the last Legislature.”

This meeting adopted a letter to be sent to SHERWOOD, “as embracing its sentiments in relation to his contemplated address.” In it he is told:—

“*Your right, in common with every other citizen, to free opinion, free discussion, and the largest liberty of self-defence, is fully recognized, and will be respected. But on one subject connected with your course in the Legislature—that of Slavery, neither you nor any one entertaining your views will be permitted to appear before the community in a public manner.*” He is further assured that he has “wholly misapprehended the views of the people of Texas,” in supposing that he can, “by explanation and argument, make” his “Anti-Slavery theories and plans inoffensive and acceptable. *The Slavery subject is not one which is open to you before us.*

“You are, therefore, *explicitly and peremptorily* notified that in your speech *you will not be permitted to touch*, in any manner, on the subject of Slavery or your opinions thereon, either directly or indirectly, or by way of explanation, or otherwise. Under the *pretext of the personal right of self-defence, you will not be tolerated* in any attempt to defend your course in the Legislature, on this subject. * * * * * The entire subject of Slavery, in all its connections, *is forbidden ground* which you shall not invade. Your introduction of it, in any manner, will be the prompt signal for consequences to which we need not allude.”

One would think, taking a North-side view of the matter, that the law had been laid down with all needful explicitness and stringency in these exquisitely modest paragraphs; but not so deemed our meek and unassuming censors of "*free opinion and free discussion*" in Galveston. They graciously add, "we trust that you will confine yourself to matters of legitimate public interest and discussion, and will not hereafter, either *in public or in private*, farther *abuse the patience* of a people with whom, on that question, you have no congeniality."

A genius equal to the production of the precious document which has furnished us these extracts, could not fail to perceive, and perceiving, to supply, yet one thing more which was wanting to its completeness. Its perfection is, therefore, made to culminate in this, its closing sentence:—

"This communication will be read to the assembled public, before you proceed with your speech; and, you will clearly understand, is *not to be the subject of any animadversion* by you."

MOBOCRACY IN THE SENATE.

The outrage upon the person of Senator SUMNER, of Massachusetts, familiar and still fresh as all the facts are to the whole civilized world, is not to be passed over with a mere cursory allusion in a document of this sort, which is offered as a current history of the yearly progress of the Anti-Slavery movement. This assault is one without a parallel among nations sufficiently advanced in civilization to pretend to any of the forms of civil government. As a merely isolated case of personal attack upon a gentleman, on the floor of the Senate Chamber, by a drunken ruffian, however much its brutal cowardice might move our indignation, or its entire disregard of place and circumstance might excite our contempt, we should not ascribe to it very great importance. But when the political relations of the assailant and the assailed, their high official positions, as well as the time when and the place where the assault was committed, the sequence of events that led to it, its immediate cause, and the consequences that flowed from it, are considered, it at once assumes historical importance.

In the earlier days of the Anti-Slavery movement, not a year, sometimes hardly a month passed, that did not bear upon its record the report of mobs, almost always ferocious in spirit, and sometimes cruel and blood-stained in act. It was the first instinctive and brutal response of a Pro-Slavery people convicted of guilt and called to repentance, and it was almost universal. Wherever Anti-Slavery was preached, honestly and effectually, there the mobocratic spirit followed it, so that, in those times, he who escaped this ordeal, was, with some justice, held to be either inefficient or unfaithful. Hardly a town or city, from Alton to Portland, where much Anti-Slavery labor was bestowed, in the first fifteen years of this enterprise, that was not the scene of one of these attempts to crush all free discussion of the subject of Slavery, by violence or bloodshed. Hardly one of the earlier public advocates of the cause that was not made to suffer, either in person or in property, or in both, from popular violence—the penalty of obedience to the dictates of his own conscience. Nor was this all; official countenance was often given to the mad proceedings of the mob, or if not given, its protection was withheld from those who were the objects of popular hatred; and, as if this were not enough, legislation was invoked to the same end. It was suggested to the Legislature of one of the Southern States, that a large reward be offered for the head of a citizen of Massachusetts, who was the pioneer in the modern Anti-Slavery movement. A similar reward was offered for the head of a citizen of New York. Yet neither excited the popular indignation, nor legislative resentment in either of those States for so foul an insult. On the other hand, Governor EVERETT, of Massachusetts, suggested to its General Court the passage of a law which should make Anti-Slavery discussion an indictable offence; and the late HARRISON GRAY OTIS, when Mayor of Boston, at the requisition of a Southern Governor, made it his special duty to seek out the editor of the *Liberator*, and only refrained from abating him as a nuisance, because he could not believe that any mischief was to be apprehended from a man who could sleep in a garret, live upon crackers, who had no social influence, and no visible assistant, except “a little negro boy.”

The North, in all these years, maintained the attitude of one vast mob to the Anti-Slavery movement. Before the South, it was always on its bended knees, bowing submissively to any insult, meekly consenting to any aggression, or only beseeching with bated breath that some semblance of rights be accorded to it. The

annexation of Texas, the Mexican War, the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, anything and everything that the South demanded, was either readily granted, or only feebly protested against. In almost every instance where the rendition of Fugitive Slaves was sought for, New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Cincinnati have quietly, and almost without emotion, witnessed the humiliating spectacle, and sometimes aided, by their police force, the return of men, women and children to the accursed condition of Southern bondage. The South had accepted us at our own estimate; required from us such duty only as we ourselves acknowledged, and had come to consider that the constitutional phrase of "bound to service" was one of unlimited application, including not merely the chattel bondmen of the plantations and the kitchen, but implying a Northern vassalage, almost as complete as that of her own negroes, and a great deal more abject. Not a man arose among us with a promise of strength but we bound him, and handed him over to these Philistines to grind their corn; and not an institution was created among us for any religious or moral purpose, which we have not made so completely subservient to our Slaveholding masters, that we have denied, or repudiated, or scoffed at the plainest dictates of common sense, the clearest suggestions of conscience, the most obvious principles of the Christian religion, and these bonds we have sealed with the blood of martyrs, and testified to by the fires of burning buildings and the destruction of printing presses.

It was natural enough that any sign of impatience on the part of the North, when she began to discover how base and contemptible a part she was playing, should be received at first with indignation, and then with rage. It excited the South like a fear of servile insurrection. She expelled GIDDINGS, and she attempted to expel JOHN QUINCY ADAMS years ago from the lower House of Congress, because they were, in some measure, the representatives of that very small portion of the North, who at that time were growing indisposed to be either kidnappers or mobocrats in defence of Slavery. When their numbers increased, a Southern champion threatened, on the floor of the Senate, to hang HALE "as high as Haman," should he venture to visit a South-Western State. Had these cases been reversed, and such insolence come from the North, the insult would have been wiped out in blood, and perhaps

have dissolved the Union. From the North, it only secured new submission.

But, within the last seven years, the party opposed to Slaveholding aggression has grown rapidly larger, and when Mr. SUMNER was sent to Washington as a Senator by Massachusetts, he went there as the representative of this party, as distinguished from those who would govern that State in accordance with the spirit which reigns in South Carolina. He was received as such, and when he spoke or acted at all, he was faithful to the convictions to which he owed his seat. His position, his character, and his abilities made him a formidable opponent, whom it was necessary to render harmless. To defeat him in debate, and cripple his influence by enlisting against him the reason and the conscience of the country, though it might seem the proper method to pursue with a Statesman and the leader of a party, was not the one which would satisfy the exigencies or jump with the inclinations of the Slaveholders. The natural way was to meet him as the Anti-Slavery advocate has always been met, with violence. It would be an easy thing to kill him, or cripple him, or degrade him by personal chastisements. It was only necessary to wait for sufficient immediate provocation. He gave it in a speech on Kansas in the Senate on the 19th and 20th of May, 1855. "I shall pronounce," he said in a letter to a friend in Boston previous to its delivery, "the most thorough philippic (against Slavery) ever uttered in a legislative body." Whether it was that or not, it answered the purpose of the Slaveholders. For two subsequent days he was narrowly watched for an opportunity to attack him. On the 22d, while sitting writing at his desk in the Senate, after an adjournment, totally unprepared and unsuspecting of any hostile intention, he was approached by two ruffians, BROOKS and KEITT, both members of the House from South Carolina, and suddenly, without warning, was struck by the former, while seated in his chair, repeated murderous blows over the head with a cane till he fell, bleeding and senseless, upon the floor of the Senate. BROOKS afterwards acknowledged, in a defence which he was permitted to make in the House of Representatives, that it was his intention to kill the Senator, if it had been necessary for his own protection. KEITT was there as an accomplice in the assassination, or to prevent any interference with it, had the necessity arisen. There was, however, no interference, though the assault was witnessed by Senators DOUGLAS, SLIDELL and TOOMBS, and with evident satisfaction, till

Messrs. MURRA and MORGAN, members of the House from New York, rescued the prostrate man from the blows which his assailant even then showered upon him. It may be that the Senator owed his life to these gentlemen; it is more probable that the brutal and cowardly ruffian was willing to desist, because satisfied that his end was gained more completely by maiming, than by murdering his victim. The following is Mr. SUMNER's own statement, which was corroborated by the unimpeached testimony of several disinterested spectators:—

“I attended the Senate as usual on Thursday, the 22d of May. After some formal business, a message was received from the House of Representatives, announcing the death of a member of that body from Missouri. This was followed by a brief tribute to the deceased from Mr. GEYER, of Missouri, when, according to usage and out of respect to the deceased, the Senate adjourned at once. Instead of leaving the Senate Chamber with the rest of the Senators, on the adjournment, I continued in my seat, occupied with my pen, and while thus intent, in order to be in season for the mail, which was soon to close, I was approached by several persons who desired to converse with me, but I answered them promptly and briefly, excusing myself for the reason that I was much engaged. When the last of these persons left me, I drew my arm-chair close to my desk, and with my legs under the desk continued writing. My attention at this time was so entirely drawn from all other subjects, that, though there must have been many persons in the Senate, I saw nobody. While thus intent, with my head bent over my writing, I was addressed by a person who approached the front of my desk; I was so entirely absorbed, that I was not aware of his presence until I heard my name pronounced. As I looked up with pen in hand, I saw a tall man, whose countenance was not familiar, standing directly over me, and at the same moment caught these words: ‘I have read your speech twice over carefully; it is a libel on South Carolina and Mr. BUTLER, who is a relative of mine.’ While these words were still passing from his lips, he commenced a succession of blows with a heavy cane on my bare head, by the first of which I was stunned so as to lose my sight. I saw no longer my assailant, nor any other person or object in the room. What I did afterward, was done almost unconsciously, acting under the instincts of self-defence. With head already bent down, I rose from my seat—wrenching up my desk, which was screwed to the floor—and then pressing forward, while my assailant continued his blows. I had no other consciousness until I found myself ten feet forward in front of my desk, lying on the floor of the Senate, with my bleeding head supported on the knee of a gentleman whom I soon recognized by voice and manner as Mr. MORGAN, of New York. Other persons there were about

me offering me friendly assistance, but I did not recognize any of them. Others there were at a distance, looking on and offering no assistance, of whom I recognized only Mr. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, Mr. TOOMBS, of Georgia, and I thought also my assailant standing between them. I was helped from the floor and conducted into the lobby of the Senate, where I was placed upon a sofa. Of those who helped me here, I have no recollection. As I entered the lobby, I recognized Mr. SLIDELL, of Louisiana, who retreated, but I recognized no one else, until I felt a friendly grasp of the hand, which seemed to come from Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio. I have a vague impression that Mr. BRIGHT, President of the Senate, spoke to me while I was on the floor of the Senate or in the lobby. I make this statement in answer to the interrogatory of the Committee, and offer it as presenting completely all my recollections of the assault, and of the attending circumstances, whether immediately before or immediately after. I desire to add that, bearing the words which I have given as uttered by my assailant, I have an indistinct recollection of the words 'old man;' but these are so enveloped in the mist which ensued from the first blow, that I am not sure whether they were uttered or not."

On the cross-examination of Mr. SUMNER, he stated that he was entirely without arms of any kind, and that he had no notice or warning of any kind, direct or indirect, of this assault.

In answer to a cross-question, Mr. SUMNER replied that what he had said of Mr. BUTLER was strictly responsive to Mr. BUTLER's speeches, and according to the usages of parliamentary debate.

There is, of course, no positive evidence that this fellow BROOKS acted, in this affair, as the chosen instrument of a band of conspirators, but it is extremely probable that such was the fact. But even if he acted on his own responsibility, his intentions were known to many, perhaps to the whole of the Southern Congressional delegation. Who, and how many, his accomplices were, however, before the assault, is of little consequence; the whole South became accessories after the fact. It has rarely fallen to the lot of any man to leap so suddenly to such distinction as BROOKS achieved by this act. Such an assault without warning, upon a defenceless, unarmed man, and from his confined attitude, literally incapable of any defence, would anywhere else, in Donnybrook Fair, a street brawl, a pot-house row, have cost the assailant his life as a mere assassin and brutal coward, in whose speedy extinction all men had a common interest. But in one half of this country it raised him, at once, to a height of unparalleled great-

ness. Fifteen States fell prostrate in gratitude and admiration at the feat of the man in whom were united the virtue of TELL, the valor of WALLACE, and the wisdom of WASHINGTON! And the value of his services in behalf of Southern institutions was acknowledged in public meetings, in newspapers, and by presentations of plate and canes from all parts of the country. Of the man who had fallen beneath the blows of his bludgeon, their newspapers spoke as the "blackguard SUMNER," "the nasty scamp," "the perjured wretch," "the beast of an Abolitionist," "the infamous traitor," "the proper saint for a free-love saloon, or an infidel convention," "the outrageous," "the unscrupulous," or "the cowardly Abolitionist," and many other similar terms, equally euphonious, and equally well-selected. It was a new evidence of how destructive the negro-driving form of society is of all sense of honor, and even of that instinctive love of fair play which is not lost in other low stages of civilization.

Nor was the exhibition of feeling, on this occasion, altogether on one side. The North, which for five and twenty years had, at the same time, obeyed the injunction of, and given an example to, the South, of suppressing all Anti-Slavery agitation by appealing to Lynch Law, were moved to indignation and horror, that the fair head of a Northern Senator, distinguished for his urbanity, his culture, and the gentleness of his character, should be made the mark of the brutal blows of a half-drunken, Pro-Slavery ruffian, and a life of so much value, perhaps sacrificed, perhaps rendered useless by the base rage of a plantation overseer. It marks an era that this feeling was so wide-spread; but it was not universal. There were many men, who, to use the delicate term of the Rev. Dr. DEWEY, could not approve of the "reprisal" made by BROOKS, though they condemned what they were pleased to call the provocation given by Mr. SUMNER. There were others, and especially in Massachusetts, who had been the leading political men there, and were still in the highest social position, who either tacitly or openly applauded the penalty which had followed a course for which they had never had anything but the heartiest detestation. But these fortunately were the few. The many, the common people were filled with sympathy and indignation, the fruits of which were visible in the subsequent Presidential election. But this feeling was not fitly represented in the Northern Congressional Delegation.

Had its members, particularly from Massachusetts, either respected themselves, or cherished the honor of their State, they would never have consented, for a moment, to sit as the associates of a man whose relation to the law should rather have been through the Penitentiary than the Legislative Hall. But they not merely condescended to sit with him; they consented to submit the question as to whether he had offended or not, to a majority vote; and when that was decided against them, and BROOKS, notwithstanding, resigned his seat, and, appealing to his constituents, was returned by their unanimous and triumphant suffrages, the Massachusetts representatives, instead of resigning in a body, and throwing themselves upon the country, sat down quietly under this double insult. And more than this—they submitted with a patience, which, however admirable it would have been in saints, was only base in men who affirm the right of self-defence, to the imputation of being mere braggarts in speech, but poltroons in action, which BROOKS urged against them, in his defence, before the House, with the most ingenious aggravation of terms and unrestrained contumely. One of their number, Mr. DE WITT, was even unreprieved when, in obedience to the requisition of BROOKS, he held up his own walking-stick, in the House, to illustrate the size of the bludgeon used by that ruffian in his assault upon Mr. SUMNER. So far as it appears from any manly spirit manifested by the "Honorable Gentleman" and his associates, he would have submitted his head to a test of the same sort, without any objection from either him or them.

That this, however, was not the temper of the Northern people generally, is clear from the fact that the most popular man in the political campaign which soon followed, was Mr. BURLINGAME of Massachusetts, who permitted himself to be driven, at last, into avowing his readiness to accept the challenge which BROOKS had pressed upon so many of the Northern Delegation, but which his own cowardly instincts compelled him to shrink from the moment he found a man who was ready to meet him. And hardly less was the applause which waited upon Mr. WILSON, Mr. SUMNER's colleague, who would explain nothing, and retract nothing of his indignant and bitter condemnation of the assault, but who refused to submit himself to the barbarous test of the duel, while at the same time he avowed his determination to defend himself against

all assailants. It is said, and we believe there is no doubt of the fact, that a body of determined and well-armed men repaired to Washington from Massachusetts, to be in readiness to sustain their remaining Senator, in case of an outbreak. The precaution was a sufficient guaranty of the tranquil forbearance of Southern gentlemen.

Mr. SUMNER has never fully recovered from the effect of the blows inflicted upon him, and has been in his seat in the Senate for only a day or two at the late session of Congress. BROOKS has since died. The office of Northern eulogist of this Southern Champion was given, not to the Rev. MARK TRAFTON, but to Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, who was Chairman, a few months before, of the Committee that recommended his expulsion from the House. Mr. TRAFTON was only on the committee of arrangements for his funeral. Those obsequies were conducted with unusual splendor. They were attended by both Houses of Congress, by the President and his Cabinet, and the President elect. A year before, he was a man unknown, except in the sparsely populated and semi-civilized district of South Carolina that sent him to Congress, and in the bar-rooms of Washington; and even now, of his private virtues the world knew nothing, except that Mr. KEITT had vouched for their existence, and especially that "he was in friendship *delicious*." But these honors were paid to his public virtues, or rather virtue, for he had displayed but one—the nearly murdering an Anti-Slavery Senator on the floor of the Senate, when incapable of resistance, defence or escape.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

On the 2d of June last, the Convention of the Democratic party met at Cincinnati to nominate their candidate for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. In addition to the "Baltimore Platform," which is the standing declaration of principles of the party, a list of resolutions was reported by BENJAMIN F. HALLETT, of Boston, and adopted. Those referring to the subject of Slavery, directly and indirectly, were as follows:—

Resolved, That we reiterate, with renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declaration of former Conventions upon the sectional issue of domestic Slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States—

1. That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of Slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

2. That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace the whole subject of Slavery agitation in Congress; and, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures, settled by the Congress of 1850: "the Act for Reclaiming Fugitives from service or labor," included; which Act, being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

3. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

4. That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature, in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on Slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North and South, to the Constitution and the Union:—

1. *Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the coöperation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue—and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic Slavery, which seek to embroil the States, and to incite treason and armed resistance to law in the territories; and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion—the American democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the "Slavery question," upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—**NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

2. That this was the basis of the Compromises of 1850—confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in National

Conventions—ratified by the people in the election of 1852—and rightly applied to the organization of territories in 1854.

3. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic Slavery, as they may elect—the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact—the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate—and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a Republican form of government.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution with or without Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

Resolved, finally, That in view of the condition of popular institutions in the Old World (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship, in our own land)—a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the Constitution, which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

1. *Resolved*, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country, which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progress of free trade throughout the world, and by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

2. *Resolved*, That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine: their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction: they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

3. *Resolved*, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the States most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, constitutes one of the most important achievements

realized by the spirit of modern times, and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be offered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our government and the governments of the States within whose dominions it lies. We can, under no circumstances, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

4. *Resolved*, That, in view of so commanding an interest, the people of the United States cannot but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America to regenerate that portion of the continent which covers the passage across the inter-oceanic Isthmus.

5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will expect of the next Administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlets through which are emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil, and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our Western valleys, and of the Union at large.

The candidates for the Presidency before the Convention were four: BUCHANAN, PIERCE, DOUGLAS and CASS. The name of President PIERCE was withdrawn by his friends, when, on the fifteenth ballot, the votes for him had dwindled down to three. The presentation of CASS's name, at any time, was an empty compliment, as he did not, on any ballot, receive more than a half dozen votes. DOUGLAS's name was withdrawn by his friends, at the sixteenth ballot, it being then evident that BUCHANAN was the choice of a majority of the Convention, and he accordingly received the nomination. JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, was nominated for the Vice-Presidency.

A day or two later, a Democratic Club of Philadelphia waited upon Mr. BUCHANAN at his residence at Lancaster, to acquaint him with the result of the proceedings of the Cincinnati Convention. He said, in a brief speech: "I congratulate you upon my nomination.

. . . I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and which can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic Party, and not simply JAMES BUCHANAN, I must square my conduct according to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it." Such a declaration would have caused the nomination to be received with enthusiasm, had there been no other reason for it. It showed how

clearly Mr. BUCHANAN understood his position, and on what ground he accepted it. The Democratic Party does not vote for men, but the representatives of a policy. What that is, we all know. It is the policy of the Slave Power.

An avowal from Mr. BUCHANAN, that he was the faithful servant of that power, was not required of him, except as a matter of form. Had there been any room for doubt on that point, he would never have received the nomination. In a long life spent in public service, there was but a single act of disloyalty to the South; thirty-six years before, he had signed a call for a meeting to protest against the admission of Missouri as a Slave State. If the fault was remembered, it was forgiven, and held as atoned for by his subsequent services. These are some of them:—

In 1836, he supported in the United States Senate the bill to prohibit the transmission of Anti-Slavery documents through the mail.

He proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas as a Slave State.

He denounced in 1836-7, and voted to reject, petitions for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

He invariably voted in subsequent years against the consideration of Anti-Slavery petitions of any sort whatever.

In 1844-5, he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.

He sustained the war with Mexico.

He proposed and urged, in 1850, the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean; but he approved, six years later, of the entire repeal of that Compromise, and had given his whole influence in favor of making Kansas a Slave State.

He sustained the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850; and in 1854, he remonstrated against an Act of the Pennsylvania Legislature, to protect her own citizens from being kidnapped, lest it should throw some obstacles in the way of Slave-catching in that State.

He signed the Ostend Manifesto, and advocated the acquisition of Cuba by purchase, or by force, if needful.

In short, he was never found anywhere, in his long political life, but on the side of Slavery, and had never been guilty of a single act, except the unimportant one just alluded to, opposed to the interest of the Slaveholders. Such services earned him, as they deserved to do, the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. If DOUGLAS was as devoted a servant of the Slave Power, his term

of service had been shorter, and he could wait for a longer trial. One election had already been lost under the leadership of CASS. PIERCE was a tool who had already served his purpose.

The nomination was a purely Southern one, and was certain of the undivided support of all the Slaveholding States. It needed only a fractional portion of the electoral vote of the North to be successful. The party counted with certainty upon gaining that, and in the canvass of the five subsequent months, of unprecedented excitement and activity, its confidence and its courage never forsook it.

This powerful political organization, which had held almost uninterrupted possession of the Government, from the adoption of the Constitution, stood forth more unequivocally than it had ever ventured to do before, as the Southern Pro-Slavery party. On the other hand, the growing Anti-Slavery feeling of the North had marshalled a powerful political opposition. The dragging of Slaves back into bondage under the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; the despotic proceedings of a United States District Judge in the case of PASSMORE WILLIAMSON; the violence and bloodshed committed by the Border Ruffians in Kansas; the recent outrage upon Mr. SUMNER in the Senate; the insolence, the threats, the many acts of aggression on the part of the Slaveholders, in Congress, and throughout the Southern States; and the continued and all-powerful influence of Anti-Slavery newspapers, Anti-Slavery books, Anti-Slavery Societies and Anti-Slavery lecturers, which have made the never-ceasing Anti-Slavery agitation of the last five and twenty years, had aroused the North to a point of resistance. This opposition was organized in the Republican party.

On the 17th of June, a National Convention of this party met at Philadelphia to nominate its candidates for the ensuing Presidential election. All the Free States were represented, and there were a few delegates from Virginia, Kentucky and Maryland, who, however, represented very few beside themselves. The two prominent candidates for the Presidency were Judge McLEAN and JOHN C. FREMONT. That portion of the Convention which represented the old Whig party were in favor of Judge McLEAN, as an old member of that party, and as the man most likely to carry the State of Pennsylvania, without which, it was conceded on all hands, it would be impossible to elect their candidate. The younger men, and those who saw most clearly that the issue at stake was the question of

Slavery, were enthusiastic in the support of Mr. FREMONT. Senator SEWARD and Governor CHASE were not without their friends, but their names were soon withdrawn, as it was evident, that, in the opinion of the Convention, MCLEAN and FREMONT were the only "available" men. It was to the credit of a Convention professing Anti-Slavery principles, to a certain degree, and representing the present Anti-Slavery feeling of the North, that it should reject as its Presidential candidate a man who had not a single antecedent which could identify him with any sort of opposition to Slavery, but who had, in both his official and his private life, shown himself to be a loyal subject of the Slave-Power. Little, indeed, could be urged on behalf of Mr. FREMONT, in proof of his sympathy with the Anti-Slavery movement. When a citizen of California, he exercised his influence to make her a Free State, and it was known that he was desirous of prohibiting Slavery in Kansas. The record of his public life went no further than this; but it was said by those who knew him best, that he was by moral conviction opposed to Slavery, that he thoroughly understood its aggressive spirit, and that he would administer the government, if entrusted with it, strictly in accordance with the wishes of a Northern party, which contended for no more than the Constitution, rightfully interpreted, would give to it. Underlying this calm confidence in him as an honorable and able statesman, was a warm and enthusiastic admiration of him as a man of tried courage, of gallant conduct under the most trying circumstances, of qualities fitting him for command, and capable of holding the reins of government with a steady hand in times of difficulty and danger. He was nominated at the first ballot, the following platform having been first adopted as the basis on which the new party stood:—

This Convention of Delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—to the policy of the present Administration—to the extension of Slavery into free territory; in favor of the admission of Kansas as a Free State—of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and for the purpose of presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President, do—

Resolve, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution, are essential to the preservation of our Republican

Institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

Resolved, That, with our Republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government is, to grant these rights to all persons under its exclusive jurisdiction. That, as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished Slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution, against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing Slavery in the Territories of the United States by positive legislation, prohibiting its existence or extension therein. That we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power, it is both the right and the imperative duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and Slavery.

Resolved, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," and contains ample provisions for the protection of the life, liberty and property of every citizen, the dearest constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them :

Their Territory has been invaded by an armed force ;

Spurious and pretended legislative, judicial and executive officers have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the Government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced ;

The right of the people to keep and bear arms has been infringed ; test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding office ;

The right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied ;

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, has been violated ;

They have been deprived of life, liberty and property, without due process of law ;

Freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged ;

The right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect ;

Murders, robberies and arsons have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished ;

That all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction and procurement of the present national Administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union and humanity, we arraign that Administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists and accessories, either *before* or *after* the fact, before the country and before the world ; and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages, and their accomplices, to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

Resolved, That Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State of this Union, with her present free Constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory.

Resolved, That the highwayman's plea, that might makes right, embodied in the Ostend Circular, was in every respect unworthy of American Diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

Resolved, That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean, by the most central practical route, is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and sufficient aid in its construction, and as an auxiliary thereto, to the immediate construction of an emigrant road on the line of the railroad.

Resolved, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors of a national character required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligations of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

Resolved, That we invite the affiliation and coöperation of men of all parties, however differing from us in other respects, in support of the principles herein declared ; and believing that the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantees liberty of conscience and equality of rights among citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security.

Mr. DAYTON, of New Jersey, who received the nomination as Vice-President, had a claim upon the suffrages of the Republican party, as he had lost a re-election to the United States Senate for his opposition to the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. It was, however, the hope that an old Whig leader, and a man respected by all parties, would carry his own State, and have a favor-

able influence in Pennsylvania, which secured to him the vote of the Convention.

It is the first time in our history that the country has been divided into strictly sectional parties—a Northern and a Southern, a Pro-Slavery and an Anti-Slavery party. The fact marks an era in our cause, and gives interest and importance to the Republican movement. To divide the country—which has hitherto been in unity—upon the momentous question of Slavery; to make that sectional which has hitherto been national; to bring the North to be as completely, as zealously, and as faithfully opposed to Slavery, as the South is in its favor, is the purpose to which our lives have been devoted. Any movement which tends in the same direction is a movement toward Abolition or Disunion. We have faith and hope in it, according as we believe it will do as much as, or more, or less than it proposes and promises.

The Republican party did not propose or promise a great deal. Its general proposition was to restore “the action of the Federal Government to the principles of WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON,” which Heaven forefend! for had they not begun as they did, we should not have ended as we have. Its particular proposition was, “the admission of Kansas as a Free State of the Union with her Free Constitution.” These were set off and adorned with certain “glittering generalities,” which meant, with those who acceded to them, more, perhaps, than they usually do in political platforms, and with certain vague contingencies which might mean much or nothing, according to the exigencies which would arise, either in success or defeat.

To say that we heartily sympathized with the Republicans in their one idea, is only to say that men who are striving for a whole rejoice in a promise of securing a part. They who seek for the extinction of an evil are glad of its prohibition anywhere. But there was a difference between us not to be lost sight of. The Republicans opposed merely the extension of Slavery; the Abolitionists strike at its existence. Those would prohibit it only on some disputed ground where it is not already; these would exterminate it utterly and forever from the face of the earth. Here was a very broad distinction. We rejoiced that a political party had arisen with the will, possibly with the power, to meet a necessity that had been created within two years; but that did not change the relation which we had maintained, as the only true one, for a quarter

of a century, to our great national sin. They had our heartiest good wishes for their success, though they had no such blessing to give us in return.

Nor was it merely because we were not to be diverted from our great purpose by a mere side issue, and which, moreover, would assuredly be accomplished with our success, as the greater includes the less, that we were not Republicans in the party sense. They, as a party, acted under a Constitution which we repudiate; they believe in the possibility of a pure administration of a government which we are persuaded, in the very nature of the case, and from inevitable necessity, must always be, as it always has been, hopelessly corrupt; they rallied to the salvation of a Union which we abhor as a curse to the Slave; they were striving to correct a partial evil by a political reformation, which should still leave the source of that evil untouched, and even hold it sacred, while we labor for a Revolution which would utterly eradicate and destroy the monstrous wrong from which these lesser evils are continually springing.

Still they had our best wishes. As between a party which rallied to its support the whole of the Slave States, without exception, and a small minority of the baser sort of so-called Democrats of the North, and a party which proposed to make a stand against the Slave-Power, even on a single issue, it was not difficult to make a choice. But the choice was one merely of comparative, and not of positive approbation.

It was hardly strange that, in the quadrennial madness of a Presidential election, the position of the Abolitionists, which ought by this time to be plain enough to all the world, should be misapprehended, both by friends and enemies. There were some among us who, carried away by the popular excitement and enthusiasm, thought they best served the cause by laying aside, for the moment, the distinctive principles of this Society, and giving their influence and efforts to the Republican movement. They failed to perceive that a course which befitted one was right for all, and that a general compliance with their example would be an entire abandonment of our own organization, to be absorbed by one which distinctly denied our principles and purposes. "Only this once" was the ready plea which always comes with the temptation to swerve from a high resolve, and which is so often only the first step needed to a rapid descent, and not the last one where descent is stayed. Others there

were, the very antipodes of these, who, failing to see that a political Anti-Slavery party was a necessary and legitimate result of the growth of the Anti-Slavery idea, a transition condition through which a political people must inevitably pass in their progress from hostility or indifference to faith and zeal, denounced Republicanism as the deadliest enemy the cause had yet encountered. The error of both had the same origin; the first in mistaking the Republican movement for the Anti-Slavery cause; the last in supposing that it had, or made any pretence to be so.

There were the corresponding classes to both these extremes among the Republicans. There were many so short-sighted, or so incapable of comprehending the principle in which lies the strength of the Anti-Slavery movement, the tenacious hold, the uncompromising fidelity to the one idea of the emancipation of the Slaves, that they would not and could not understand why the consistent Abolitionist would not see, in the Republican party, the fruition of all his labors. They could not forgive him for obstinately refusing to vote, and gave him credit for neither conscience nor common sense in declining to sacrifice his own long-cherished views of right for what another considered a tangible good. Another class dreaded nothing so much as any appearance of identity of purpose or spirit between the Republicans and the Abolitionists. The sensibilities of a large portion of such persons were shocked at the epithets of "Woolly Head," "Black Republican," "Nigger Worshipper," and the like, in which the sarcastic humor and delicate wit of their opponents exhausted itself. There was no affectation in their sensitiveness, for they really dreaded, for its own sake, the thing imputed to them, and were as far as their accusers from having any fixed and intelligent Anti-Slavery principles. Others, because of these prejudices of their weaker brethren, were clamorous in their denial of any sympathy between Republicans and Abolitionists. Precisely how far they agreed, and precisely where they were at variance, these persons understood perfectly well; but they seemed to think, as they could not easily make this distinction clear to others, and appeal to their intelligence, that it was justifiable for the sake of their votes, to appeal to their prejudices, and intensify their hatred and contempt of any radical opposition to Slavery. A striking illustration of this spirit was given in the course of the *New York Tribune*, one of the most widely circulated, the most influential, and the ablest of all the organs of Republicanism in the country. This paper has never

forgiven, and never ceased to reproach the Abolitionists as responsible for the annexation of Texas, because, in 1844, they refused to vote for HENRY CLAY, the Whig candidate for President. It pleased that paper, at that time, to assert that the Whig party was an Anti-Slavery party. It pleased it, in the late election, to assume that the Republican party was not an Anti-Slavery party in any such sense, that it could command the approval of the Abolitionists proper, and that they were not only opposed to the election of Mr. FREMONT, but in favor of that of Mr. BUCHANAN; and it attempted to sustain this assertion by extracts from the speeches of Mr. PHILLIPS, and the editorials of Mr. GARRISON, so garbled as to conceal the real meaning of those gentlemen, and to convey one which it better suited that influential journal to have believed. Its assumption in 1856 was as untrue as it was in 1844. To elect Mr. CLAY in 1844, it was necessary that the Whigs should carry the State of New York, where the Abolitionists held the balance of power; and the *Tribune* has never pardoned them that they would neither be coaxed nor frightened into giving him their votes. To elect Mr. FREMONT in 1856, it was necessary that his party should carry the State of Pennsylvania, where the Anti-Slavery influence is very small, and its votes not worth counting, and where the strongest arguments that could be addressed to a stupid and ignorant people, in favor of the Republicans, was that they were not Abolitionists. It was worth while, in one case, to show that a Pro-Slavery party was Anti-Slavery, for the sake of Anti-Slavery votes. In the other, it was worth while, for the sake of Pro-Slavery votes, to show that a party, in a certain sense Anti-Slavery, was, if not positively Pro-Slavery, at least so far from the opposite character, that Pro-Slavery men need not fear or hesitate to support it. The *Tribune* was equal to both occasions.

The credit of this sort of political warfare, however, does not belong exclusively to that paper. A central junta of the Democratic party sat at Washington, and expended a large sum of money in spreading all over the country an immense quantity of campaign documents, made to suit the wants of different localities. In some of these, the radical opinions of Mr. PHILLIPS were made to do service as sound Republican doctrine, and were, without doubt, of great use in those regions of Pennsylvania, where it was believed that Mrs. FREMONT was a black woman. It is hardly worth while to discuss so merely speculative a question

as whether the success or defeat of the Republican party would have been most beneficial to the Anti-Slavery cause. We could no more compass the one, or prevent the other, than we could direct the whirlwind. But that its campaign of last summer was productive of great good, there can be no doubt. It did a work of agitation unparalleled hitherto in the labors of years. True, it did not do our special work in our special way; it did not see the evil as we see it, or point out the remedy that we propose; and many of its leading men who spouted for "FREMONT and Freedom," meant only FREMONT, and merely admitted the pleasant alliteration of Freedom, as a harmless concession to the enthusiasm of weak minds. But, however low and personal the motives may have been which governed such men, unquestionably an honest purpose and a zealous spirit of hostility to Slavery created and animated the party. It was, moreover, a Northern party — a party strictly sectional on the great question at issue between the North and the South. In fifteen States of the Union, the man who openly avowed his approval of it did so at the risk of his life, and in most of them, with the certainty of death or banishment. It brought forth an unequivocal expression of how deep and bitter are Southern contempt and hatred of everything Northern. It learned from Southern lips and Southern pens that we are a divided people; that there is, and can be, no real union where there is such complete hostility of spirit, such radical difference of character, so wide a disparity in civilization, in institutions, in habits, and thought. And while the farmers, and the mechanics, the great middle class of the North, who made up the Republican party, were learning from their own orators and journals the only lesson they had to teach, and the only one that was listened to with any enthusiasm, or even patience — that of opposition to Slavery; the South, herself, was enforcing the same lesson in a different way, with an emphasis and force that will not permit it to be forgotten, and the fruits of which we shall see in future stages.

It is not easy always to repress our impatience at what seems so great a waste of zeal and strength, and good intention, for the mere temporary success of a political party which, even if it fulfilled the most sanguine hopes that its best promises could suggest, would only check for a brief season the aggressions of the Slave power, while leaving it in quiet possession of its past gains, and in the unchecked perpetration of all its crimes. We cannot

escape the reflection, how near we should be to the settlement of the great question if the North could say, NO MORE SLAVERY ANYWHERE, with even as much earnestness, and as near an approach to unanimity, as she now says, "no Slavery in Kansas." But in the moral, as in the natural world, there must be the blossom before the fruit. There is a necessity which we cannot escape from, and therefore need not deplore, for our passage through these various dispensations, from the first Whig device to cajole and cozen the Abolitionists, sixteen or eighteen years ago, down to this last demonstration for FREMONT and Freedom. Each, however, is the sign of Anti-Slavery progress, as each is an accurate gauge of the estimate which the shrewd political leaders have made of the pressure of popular opinion on the subject of Slavery, precisely where it may be met, and how far it may be resisted. These parties which have professed hostility to Slavery, in a greater or less degree, have always been the parties in the opposition and in the minority. They may sometimes be in the minority, because, they are, in some measure, Anti-Slavery; they are certainly always Anti-Slavery, because they are in a minority; and in endeavoring to attract to themselves all the popular sentiment of the North upon the subject, they, probably always, promise something more than they can perform.

The strength of our cause lies in its thorough honesty, and in its steadfast and persistent adherence to the radical and only remedy by which the independence of the North can be recovered, and the emancipation of the Slaves be secured. It proposes and demands no more and no less than it seeks, and means, if it gets anything, to accomplish. Our demand for disunion is not a threat, nor even merely an alternative. We seek the total Abolition of Slavery; and in proof of our earnestness, and in accordance with the principles on which it is based, we repudiate now, and at once, all political relations with Slaveholders which involve us in any recognition of their peculiar system as right in itself, or as having any legal claim upon us. We wish to bring the Northern people up to precisely this position; and while we recognize and rejoice at their gradual approaches to it, it is our part to be faithful in pointing out their short-comings, and to urge them forward to the only ground on which an effectual resistance can be made to the common enemy.

KANSAS.

The struggle between Slavery and Freedom in Kansas still goes on with undiminished earnestness. The past year has witnessed a series of atrocities perpetrated in that territory, by agents of the Slave Power,—not without connivance of the Federal Government, and the aid of its officials,—resembling more the horrors of savage warfare than the deeds of men claiming to be civilized. Hordes of armed marauders from Missouri, South Carolina, and other Slave States, have ranged over the territory, plundering, burning, and murdering, committing almost every outrage of which man or woman can be the victim; with the avowed purpose of driving out or compelling to submission all opposers of the scheme of making Kansas a Slave State. Varying their method as occasion might require, they were sometimes scattered in small, roving bands, without acknowledged leaders, or led by the most ferocious of their own number, claiming no higher warrant than bowie-knife and rifle; at other times embodied in larger masses, under the imposing name of “Territorial Militia,” with officers, from “Generals” downward, commissioned by authority emanating from Washington; or yet again, bearing the less warlike appellation of “*posse comitatus*,” and following at the heels of a United States Marshal, or sham Sheriff, the handiwork and tool of the usurping Territorial Legislature; but, however diverse in style, ever the same in character and purpose; at all times and everywhere equally prompt for mischief—so it could be *safely* done;—equally reckless of right, humanity, and decency; equally brutal, insolent, rapacious, and cruel towards the weak, unarmed, and helpless; equally cowardly when met by resolute armed resistance. Though unsuccessful in their main design, they succeeded eminently well in giving to the country and the world a most impressive illustration of what Slavery is in principle and spirit, and what it does as an educator for those who receive its training.

In the latter part of May, some hundreds of these brigands, commanded for the occasion by United States Marshal DONALDSON and sham-sheriff JONES, and acting in pursuance of a mandate, illegal as unjust, from LECOMPTE, the facile judicial instrument of the Slave power, attacked the town of Lawrence, ostensibly to abate as nuisances—so declared to be by the Grand Jury—the hotel and

printing offices of that infant town. The citizens, unprepared for such an onset, were passive lookers-on, while JONES and his outside barbarians, meeting no resistance but that of solid masonry and heavy metal, demolished the offending buildings and printing presses, and scattered the types, all unconscious of what sort of seed they were sowing; and having thus performed the task assigned them by sapient jurors, and most upright judge, volunteered a work of meritorious supererogation, by burning Governor ROBINSON'S house, furniture and library; scenting treason in books, perhaps, as well as in types. This done, they sought requital for their toil, in the pleasant sport of general plunder; breaking open stores and dwelling houses, and carrying off money, goods, clothing, whatever portable articles of value they could lay their hands upon.

The work of mid-day burglary, arson and robbery, so prosperously inaugurated at Lawrence, went on during the succeeding months, diversified with murder and other crimes. A Missouri paper, giving the testimony of disinterested eye-witnesses, thus describes the territory a few weeks after the sack of Lawrence:—

“Kansas, a few months ago a smiling, fresh and prolific land, with abundant sustenance for all who might seek there a home, is now a picture of desolation. The capture of Lawrence deepened and intensified the deadly animosity which had all along existed between the Pro-Slavery and Free State parties, and was the finishing stroke to a series of events which turned a silent but watchful hatred into open conflict.”

Accounts substantially like this were given by men of all parties, throughout the greater part of the summer and fall. Particular facts abound, too, in confirmation of these general statements. Once and again, Lawrence was menaced; Ossawatimie was plundered and burned, after its few but brave defenders had been driven out by overwhelmingly superior numbers; Franklin was repeatedly the scene of deadly strife; the Free State citizens of Leavenworth were summarily banished, or, attempting to resist, were butchered in their homes; blood was flowing everywhere, not alone in mutual conflicts of armed antagonists, but from the death wounds also, of unarmed, unresisting men, including even invalids and cripples, whose only crime to provoke the murderous blow was holding Anti-Slavery opinions, or perhaps the simple fact of migration from the North.

It is not to be supposed that these atrocities were long endured by the Free State party, without resistance. Finding themselves

unprotected by the Government, whether Territorial or Federal, regarded by both as little better than outlaws, they armed and organized for self-protection, and taught the invaders to respect their prowess, if not their rights. But no sooner was it plain to even Border Ruffian comprehension, that they would and could defend themselves, than the Government officials became sensible of the necessity of "preserving the peace." Of course, in doing this important duty, they showed much more anxiety to keep the Free State people out of mischief, than to restrain the ruffian hordes of **ATCHISON** and **BUFORD**. If once or twice, or a few times, perhaps, the United States troops were employed to check the movements of these bands,—as when they threatened an attack on Lawrence in September,—these seem rather cases of exception; and even in these cases, the marauders were permitted to retire with all their arms and munitions of war, ready for future operations; whereas the Free State men, when only suspected of intent to use their weapons, though but in self-defence, were in repeated instances required to give them up, and were themselves sometimes detained as prisoners. Nor were those found under arms alone imprisoned. To have been active in the measures taken for organizing a State Government under the Constitution framed at Topeka, and adopted by a majority of all the rightful voters then in Kansas, though with no intent to give it full effect till ratified by Congress; to have accepted office under that Constitution, or done any act deriving a warrant from it, was held to be treason, or usurpation of office; and on one or other of these convenient pretexts, numbers of the most peaceable and worthy citizens, including Governor **ROBINSON** and other men of note, were indicted, seized, and kept confined for weeks and months in tents on the open prairie, or in miserable sheds, guarded by United States soldiers, and awaiting the convenience of the Pro-Slavery Court to try them. One group of prisoners were marched in chains, under a burning sun, for thirty miles, in a hot summer day, without food; though nothing could be found against the most of them, which even **CATO**, willing tool of Slavery as he is, could construe into cause for their detention, and therefore all but two were discharged, upon examination. These two, as members of the Topeka Legislature, were held for trial under a charge of treason.

The dispersion of the Topeka Legislature, on the 5th of July, by Colonel **SUMNER** and his dragoons, was another of those acts of

illegal force designed to "crush out" the Free State enterprise. It is true the President disclaimed it afterwards, alleging that it was authorized by no instructions given to any military officer. But Col. SUMNER's evident belief that he had no discretion in the matter, and his explicit language, "I am called upon to perform the most disagreeable duty of my life, under the authority of the President's Proclamation, * * * * according to my orders, I command you to disperse," will justify some question as to the accuracy of the President's—memory; and, at all events, will leave him under the imputation of having given orders liable to be construed by an intelligent officer loth to receive them in that sense, as imperatively requiring the despotic deed.

In view of facts like these, indefinitely multiplied, the friends of freedom in and out of Kansas have complained, with much apparent reason, that the General Government has been all along the most effective ally of disorder and misrule; and have often said that had it only left the "actual settlers" to protect themselves without its help or hindrance, they would have kept the peace far better than it has been kept, and would have brought the question which disturbs it much nearer than it now is to a final settlement. Their earnest persuasives would have made the attractions of "sweet home" resistless to the robber gangs, and Kansas would now have a Territorial Government truly representing the great majority of its inhabitants; or perhaps ere this would have become a State, as free as any State can be in this Slaveholding Union.

While the events of which we have spoken were passing in the Territory, the people of the States were by no means idle spectators. All over the North, systematic exertions were made, by organized societies and otherwise, to raise money, and supply food and clothing and other necessaries, together with the means of self-defence, to the suffering and imperilled, yet resolute upholders of the Free State cause. A stream of emigration from every Northern State was setting towards the territory; and even from the Slave States came some accessions to the ranks of freedom, out of the better portion of the Non-Slaveholding class, who, having felt in their own depressed condition the sad effects of Slavery, would gladly save their new home from its blight. On the other hand the South, with equal zeal but less effectively, contributed to support the aggressive bands, and increase the numerical strength of the Pro-Slavery party. A correspondent of a St. Louis paper, writing from the capital of

Missouri, charges the Governor of that State with having sent twelve cannon and twenty-two boxes of muskets to STRINGFELLOW, to assist in conquering Kansas. In several of the Slave States, associations were formed, in imitation of the Northern Emigrant Aid Societies, to organize, equip and forward companies of emigrants, so called: but, unlike their Northern rivals, supplied much more abundantly with implements of war than with those of peaceful industry. The comparative weakness of the South, in a competition of peaceful emigration, was from the first so evident, that if she could properly be said to have tried that plan at all, it had been soon abandoned for that of armed invasion. It was ere long apparent that this, too, must fail, if a free course were open to both parties to send in reinforcements. Small foresight was sufficient to perceive that if the issue were to turn on superior efficiency in peopling new and distant regions, or even in maintaining virtual warfare on a field remote from home, the North was sure to win.

To the important advantages manifest at the outset, of a denser, more enterprising and more industrious population, and consequently greater surplus for migration, and greater material wealth, the event of the first earnest encounters of arms revealed that she could add, what evidently her adversaries had never reckoned on, and were somewhat amazed at meeting, a cool and steady courage, a valor resolute as calm, far more effective than the blustering ferocity of BUFORD'S vagrant cut-throats, and ATCHISON'S pot-valiant bullies.

But these advantages were offset by one upon the other side so great that, for a time, it almost seemed enough to turn the scale against them all. The road to the disputed territory lay across Missouri, traversing the whole breadth of that State. The Free State emigrants must go through what had now become in effect an enemy's country, and must travel on the Missouri River steamboats, manned and officered by partizans of Slavery, or at least, by those who would not choose to imperil themselves or their pecuniary interests by a friendly or even an impartial bearing towards their Northern passengers. The policy of the Pro-Slavery party then was obvious. It was to muster overwhelming numbers at a few points where the boats would touch, blockade the river, and cut off all succor of men and arms, munitions and provisions from the devoted friends of freedom in the territory. That law, and Constitution, and the rights of peaceful travellers would all be violated by

this shutting up of a national highway against two-thirds of the people of the country, was nothing to the Slave Power, which knows no right but its own interest, no law but its own will. The plan was tried. Large bodies of Missourians, many of them, it is said, armed with United States muskets, beset the river at convenient points, planted cannon to command the landing places, intercepted companies and single persons from the North, robbed them of arms and sometimes other property, and held them captive till the returning boats had landed them in Illinois. Men of all classes in Western Missouri lent their aid to these high-handed outrages. For a time the mob ruled all the boats above Lexington, and all the river towns announced their determination to allow no emigrant from the North to enter Kansas by that route. A most respectable Committee sent from the North to ascertain the state of things, "learned at St. Louis," as their report avers, "that no Anti-Slavery man who scorned to deny or conceal his name and sentiments, could attempt to enter Kansas by the Missouri River, without great risk of being insulted, abused and turned back. Men going quietly about their business, not proclaiming Anti-Slavery sentiments," were not exempt from molestation, if they "had strong convictions, and would not deny them when called for. * * * To a system of espionage which apes the Austrian, was added a system of brigandage which excels the Neapolitan."

But the Northern immigrants were too much in earnest to be defeated by these obstacles. By a long circuit through Iowa and Nebraska, they pursued their way, the several companies and scattered groups gradually uniting into larger bands, and after many days of patient toil, at length arrived upon the Northern border of Kansas. Meanwhile a rumor reached the East, that the Missourians, anticipating their advance, had thrown a formidable force between them and the settlements, to intercept their march; and that the settlers, now hemmed in on every side, cut off from all supplies from without, and unable in the general disorder to provide the means of sustenance at home, were in imminent danger of actual starvation, should they escape the weapons of their enemies. While the keenest solicitude and no slight alarm were felt throughout the North by reason of these reports, the next intelligence received here was that the settlers having rallied to repel the Missourian raid, SLANNON, instead of using the military force at his disposal to drive back the invaders, had straightway hastened, in a sort of panic—or it might

have been a drunken frenzy—to proclaim the territory in a state of insurrection, and call on all law-abiding citizens to aid the authorities in preserving the peace and protecting the people's rights, [as if "the authorities" were not themselves the worst enemies "the people" had to fear,] and denouncing the parties approaching the Northern border, as bands of lawless men, coming in arms to aid the insurgent movements in the territory. Remembering that SHANNON'S "law-abiding citizens," except a small minority of actual residents in Kansas, were the rabble of Missouri Borderers whose intrusions, whether as illegal voters, or as "Territorial Militia," had been the chief disturbance from the first, this proclamation needed no interpreter to make it understood as an official invitation to fresh deeds of violence, by the same heretofore too willing hands, and especially to a general onset upon the advancing companies which it denounced. But for some reason, possibly because the temper of the Northern steel had been already tested to their satisfaction, no adequate response appears to have been made by "the law-abiding" to this call; and SHANNON not long after giving place to GEARY, a dispensation in some measure new was inaugurated under the new dynasty. The Missourians were "disbanded," (not disarmed, however,) shortly after this, and the territorial militia was composed of those who had a right to form it.

But the new Governor took care to impress upon the people that a change of measures did not imply a change of purpose. The "laws,"—including in that term the huge atrocities enacted into statute form by that lawless conclave, calling itself the Territorial Legislature,—must be obeyed; and that illegal body must be recognized as what it claimed to be. With much fair speech, and doubtless more of good intention than of clear perception, the Governor commenced his brief career; imagining, apparently, that he could reconcile the ultimate designs of his superiors at Washington with a decent regard for the rights of the people whom he ruled; an error which had seemed passing strange, with even his own estimate of his abilities, had not the course of his administration shown his ignorance of both elements of the problem. He evidently neither knew what he had been sent to do, nor understood the position and relative rights of those he had come to govern; but seems to have supposed that all the talk of his employers about popular sovereignty had really a meaning, not quite the opposite of what was said, and that his duty was to see it measurably put in practice; and also that

the people of the territory, though they might have reason to complain of some particular enactments of the so-called Legislature, had yet no right to treat the whole code as invalid through lack of legal power in its enactors. So, while he speaks of "changes of the laws" which he "may deem desirable," he "would invoke the utmost forbearance from citizens who deem themselves aggrieved by recent legislation,"—as if the "legislation," not the Legislature, were the real grievance,—and while coolly counseling them, as "a sure and peaceable remedy," to "ask the next Legislature to revise any and all laws," he calls upon them "to refrain from violation of the present statutes;" most innocently unconscious, or affecting so to be, that those very statutes had already foreordained "the next Legislature" to be a perfect antitype of its usurping predecessor. It took some time to unlearn his false notions, and his policy, meanwhile, though a more decent one than SHANNON'S, was in effect no less Pro-Slavery. It was more politic to uphold "the Territorial Government" without a Border Ruffian militia, and use the United States troops, instead of BUFORD'S brigands, in disarming the Free State immigrants now coming in upon the Northern border. It had a rather better look, and was less likely also to provoke resistance; as the Free State men had never questioned the authority of the Federal Government and its immediate agents.

But whatever might have been GEARY'S views or expectations at the outset of his career, he doubtless grew in wisdom with its progress, and was not long in learning that the work expected at Washington, of a Governor of Kansas, required more nerve and less conscience than had fallen to his share. Baffled by LECOMPTÉ in his attempt to bring notorious murderers to justice; deceived and disappointed by the President's neglect to redeem the pledges on which he had accepted his commission; convinced that the Free State men of Kansas were not the turbulent, rebellious faction which the lying organs of the Government described them, that the truth outwent the rumor of their wrongs endured from Slavery's emissaries, and that protection or redress for them was not the purpose of the higher powers; he resigned in hardly six months after taking it, an office which he was not thorough slave enough of party acceptably to fill. The duties of the office then devolved on Secretary WOODSON, a man who at an earlier day had signalized his zeal for enslaving Kansas, by abusing his official power to stimulate and sanction one of the Missourian inroads. The new President,

BUCHANAN, has since appointed to the post, ROBERT J. WALKER, well known for his services to the cause of Slavery-Extension, particularly in promoting the annexation of Texas—a sufficient presage, doubtless, of his future policy as Governor of Kansas.

The attitude of the Federal Executive through all these scenes of turmoil may be readily inferred from what has been related. But we are not left to inference alone. Soon after GEARY had succeeded SHANNON, the National Kansas Committee appealed directly to the President, with possibly some hope of moving him to justice, but probably expecting little more than to learn from his own lips, and so be able to make known authentically, how far he had approved and would sustain the course of his subordinates. This latter end was gained, indeed, but the appeal drew forth, as must have been expected, small consolation for the sufferers in Kansas, and small encouragement to the cause of Freedom there.

The President accused the Kansas Aid Societies of stirring up rebellion, and said the sufferings of the settlers were of their own seeking; [as those of all men are who stand for right against power;] that doubtless each side was to blame, but he could not determine between them; that he must be guided by official reports, and these were very different from the statements which had gone abroad; that no armed invasion need be apprehended, but if there should be one, it would be repelled, come whence it might; [the inroads of the "militia" from Missouri of course were not "invasions;"] that the business of the troops in Kansas was not to prevent or correct outrages, unless amounting to invasion or insurrection; [and resistance to the usurping Territorial authorities being "insurrection," while incursions of Missouri borderers at the call of SHANNON, WOODSON or their underlings is not "invasion," the troops must crush the former, but not oppose the latter;] that application for redress of wrongs should be made to the civil power; [itself the foremost wrong, and parent or guardian of nearly all the rest;] the courts were open to all classes without distinction; [to work wickedness under the forms of law, and give oppression a judicial warrant;] that no authentic information had reached the Executive, of any one who had sought redress at the hands of the civil power in Kansas, and failed to obtain it; [the wolves had not officially reported any case of neglect on their part to attend to the lambs' complaints;] if one such case had been presented, he would have removed the offending official; [witness notorious murderers kept in office;] that

if the majority of the people of Kansas had wanted peace, [it is then "a *majority*" who will not have peace on his terms,] they could have had it, and the way to get it was for the settlers to frown down all agitation growing out of difference of opinion about their local institutions; [that is, sit quiet, and let Slavery be introduced without opposition or remonstrance;] that the affair at Lawrence had given him great anxiety, and the outrages there were not done by authority; [save of that "civil power," and of those "courts" to which the President would send the victims for redress;] that he admitted mistakes had been made, as is evident in his removing SHANNON, but an impartial man has now gone out, who will see justice done to both parties; [and for trying so to do will receive such treatment from the President, that in six months or less he will be driven to resign in sheer despair of doing any good against the combined hostility of Pro-Slavery ruffianism in the Territory, and Pro-Slavery politics at Washington;] that the people have a constitutional right to bear arms, and the Government has no right to disarm them; [and so the Southern gangs of marauders must be allowed to keep the weapons they have used in a savage and aggressive warfare, and only Free State "rebels" be deprived of arms employed in self-defense;] and, to crown all, that the civil power of the Territory, [set up by fraud and lawless force, without a shadow of right, and scarcely a shadow of legality,] must be maintained, and no change in the policy of the Administration, [the policy of upholding with bayonets a government based on audacious usurpation,] is to be expected, of course. Nobody who knows the vassalage of the Administration to the Slave-Power ever did expect its policy to change, unless from bad to worse. What hope has Freedom from an Administration created and controlled by Slavery? We have now, it is true, another President, but no reason, therefore, to anticipate a better policy; for he, too, like his predecessor, is a creature of the Slave-Power, and will not be permitted, even if he desires, to thwart its purposes. His Inaugural Address has indeed some fair-seeming words about "Popular Sovereignty;" declaring that

"It is the imperative and indispensable duty of the Government of the United States to secure to *every resident inhabitant* the free and independent expression of his opinion by his vote. This *sacred right of each individual* must be preserved. This being accomplished, nothing can be fairer than to leave the People of a Territory free from all foreign interference to decide their own

destiny for themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

But we hear of no measure which he has taken to make good his words, nor did we ever suppose he would take any such. That complete embodiment of "foreign interference," the Border Ruffian Government, he recognizes as legal and rightful, and its enactments he treats as binding laws. The infamous LECOMPTÉ, whom even PIERCE attempted to remove, still holds the judicial seat which he has prostituted to the aid of usurpation and the abetting of open crime. Murderers and robbers still retain important offices in the Territory, and, under the shadow of Executive favor, plot fresh outrages upon its inhabitants. Everything indicates that Slavery still sits in the Executive, though in the person of another minister of its will.

In another department of the General Government, the rule of Slavery was not so undisputed. The House of Representatives, having in large part been chosen at the first white heat of excitement caused by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise Restriction, contained a small majority against the policy of Slavery-Extension. To this was due the appointment of a Committee early in last Spring, to go to Kansas, and investigate the frauds in the previous elections there. On the first day of July, the Report of that Committee was presented to the House, with the voluminous evidence sustaining its conclusions. It has been truly said that "such another record of political villany and ruffian violence can scarcely be found in all history." Though the main fact it brings to view was mentioned in our last Report, and has been often incidentally alluded to in this, yet as upon it hinge the merits of the whole subsequent controversy on the Kansas question, we give in full the summing up of the Committee's Report.

"Your Committee report the following facts and conclusions, as established by the testimony:—

First: That each election in the Territory held under the organic or alleged Territorial law has been carried by organized invasions from the State of Missouri, by which the people of the Territory have been prevented from exercising the rights secured to them by the organic law.

Second: That the alleged Territorial Legislature was an illegally constituted body, and had no power to pass valid laws, and their enactments are, therefore, null and void.

Third: That these alleged laws have not, as a general thing, been used to protect persons and property, and to punish wrong, but for unlawful purposes.

Fourth: That the election under which the sitting Delegate, JOHN W. WHITFIELD, holds his seat was not held in pursuance of any valid law, and that it should be regarded only as the expression of the choice of those resident citizens who voted for him.

Fifth: That the election under which the contesting Delegate, ANDREW H. REEDER, claims his seat was not held in pursuance of law, and that it should be regarded only as the expression of the choice of the resident citizens who voted for him.

Sixth: That ANDREW H. REEDER received a greater number of votes of resident citizens than JOHN W. WHITFIELD, for Delegate.

Seventh: That in the present condition of the Territory, a fair election cannot be held without a new census, a stringent and well guarded election law, the selection of impartial Judges, and the presence of United States troops at every place of election.

Eighth: That the various elections held by the people of the Territory, preliminary to the formation of the State Government, have been as regular as the disturbed condition of the Territory would allow; and that the Constitution passed by the Convention, held in pursuance of said elections, embodies the will of a majority of the people."

On the third of July, the House of Representatives passed a bill admitting Kansas to the Union as a Free State, under the Topeka Constitution. On the 29th, it passed a bill forbidding prosecutions for violations of the so-called Territorial laws of Kansas, and commanding the immediate dismissal of all prosecutions already commenced, and the immediate release of all persons under arrest for such alleged offence; also restoring the Missouri Compromise Restriction, and repealing all the enactments of the pretended Legislature of Kansas; but virtually permitting Slavery in the Territory till the first of January, 1858. Both these bills were of course rejected by the strong Pro-Slavery majority of the Senate, and consequently were of no avail, except as testimonies by the body passing them, in favor of the just demands of the people of Kansas. To little else amounted the rejection of the claim of WHITFIELD, elected by the Border Ruffian party, to the seat of Delegate to Congress. The like claim of REEDER, chosen by the Free State party, was rejected also, on the ground of informality in the election, although it was admitted that he had a majority of the votes cast by actual citizens of the Territory. For several weeks the House and

Senate struggled over the appropriation bills, the former inserting, and the latter striking out, amendments forbidding the employment of the army to enforce the so-called Territorial laws. As both stood firm to the end of the regular session, it closed without the passage of those bills; but an extra session was immediately called, and after holding out for eight or nine days longer, the House at last gave way, and the Slave-Power, as its custom is, prevailed.

The last move thus far, in the Kansas game, is the taking of preliminary steps, by the Ruffian Legislature and its subordinates, for holding a Convention to frame a State Constitution. Of course, especial care is taken to ensure a majority of Pro-Slavery delegates, even if the Free State party should take part in the election; which, however, they have wisely resolved not to do. The census to form a basis for apportionment of delegates is taken by the usurping Sheriffs or Judges of Probate; the latter are sole arbiters of all disputes as to the correctness of the lists of voters, and are to appoint the judges of election and the places of voting. The Governor is to apportion the delegates to the several districts. None but inhabitants of the Territory on the first of April are to vote, and the election is to be governed by "the Statutes," that is, the enactments of the usurpers. No provision is made for submitting the Constitution to the people. In view of all these shrewd precautions, it may be written down as a foregone conclusion, that the Convention will be Pro-Slavery, will frame a Constitution fastening Slavery on the infant State, and will send it straight to Congress, without so much as "by your leave," to the people of the Territory. It will come before a Congress less favorable even than the last to impartial Freedom.

OREGON.

While thus pushing its demands in Kansas, the Slave-Power has not been unmindful of its interests elsewhere. There is evidence which seems to leave no room for doubt, that the project is seriously entertained of making Oregon a Slave State. A correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, writing from that Territory, says, "the real, earnest advocates of Slavery, not only in the abstract, but in the actual, and its immediate introduction here, are a far more

numerous and influential class than has been commonly supposed, and their capability for mischief should not be sneeringly depreciated." Another writer testifies that only one of the six political papers in the Territory has spoken out in favor of making Oregon a Free State, and adds; "the other five have chosen to avoid all discussion of this question. Even of those who admit that Slavery would be a curse to Oregon, a good many, it is said, are disposed to legalize it, merely to spite the 'Black Republicans;' while the trading politicians, who are not less numerous in Oregon than elsewhere, hope by such a manœuvre to recommend themselves to Slaveholding favor and Presidential patronage. Oregon, during the last two years, has been flooded with South-side speeches and documents, franked thither from Washington, while no corresponding effort has been made to counteract their poisonous influence. Thus, while Kansas is carried off from us by force, we are in not less danger of losing Oregon by stealth." And a correspondent of the *National Era*, who says he has been "for many years a dweller on the shores of the Pacific," speaks of allusions in the Eastern papers "to the expected *denouément* of the long and undisturbed plot of Missouri Democracy on the Pacific shores, in the silent development of a State Constitution favorable to Slavery in Oregon;" and says, "I trust you will not pass them by as premature and unreasonable fears. They are actual and imminent facts, and deserve your serious consideration. And deriving importance from the New Era proclaimed from the United States Supreme Bench, and inaugurated with Mr. BUCHANAN, they should receive the attention of every reflecting lover of Freedom. I have seen the close but gradual preparation of the minds of the Oregon people, under the leadership of their Democratic Slave Propagandists, for this sequel in a State Constitution."

It is easy to say that this alarm is groundless. We wish it may be, and perhaps it is; but, we cannot forget that fifteen years ago the annexation of Texas was regarded at the North as a most improbable, if not an impossible event; that ten years later nobody dreamed of danger to the Missouri Compromise Restriction, or believed that any sane politician would ever propose in earnest the acquisition of Cuba; yet Texas has been for a dozen years a member of the Union, the compact of 1820 was perfidiously repudiated almost three years ago, and the author of the Ostend Manifesto now sits in the Presidential Chair. It can do no harm

to keep in mind the familiar maxim about the price of Liberty. Even over-watchfulness is better than unwarranted security.

FOREIGN SLAVE-TRADE.

Another danger begins to loom up in the distance, if indeed it is still distant. An assault has already been proposed, if not commenced, upon the laws which forbid the foreign Slave-trade. The Slave-consuming States, impatient of that restriction which compels them to pay, for their human chattels, to the Slave-selling States, five or ten times the cost of similar commodities in Africa, are beginning to call for free trade in men. Governor ADAMS, of South Carolina, in his message to the Legislature of that State, urges the measure with much emphasis, and such show of argument as the nature of the case admits. He says, that "to maintain our position we must have cheap labor," which "can be obtained in but one way,—by re-opening the African Slave-trade." The feeling "which starts back at the idea of legalizing the Slave-trade," he thinks "is a diseased sentimentality;" and "the belief that Slavery is wrong" is due to "a canting philanthropy," and Southern opinion has been so changed by investigation, that "we now regard it as the most safe and stable basis for free institutions." The closing of the Slave-trade destroyed "the equilibrium between the North and the South," and of course it must be opened, to restore that equilibrium. Moreover, if Slaves in plenty cannot be had, there will be a supply of another kind of labor, "antagonistic to our institutions;" and "the introduction of a population alien to us by birth, training, and education, must lead to that conflict between capital and labor which makes it so difficult to maintain free institutions in all wealthy and highly civilized nations," unblessed with the conservative influence of Slavery. Moreover, honor as well as interest is at stake. "The act of Congress, declaring the Slave-trade piracy, is a brand upon us;" for "if the trade be piracy, the Slave must be plunder." The Governor's logic is sound here, at least. He feels it a duty to urge the Legislature "to withdraw" its "assent to an act which is a direct condemnation of *our* institutions." Of course, Carolina has only to "withdraw her assent," and the act becomes void. His argument concludes thus:—

“To us have been committed the fortunes of this peculiar form of society, resulting from the union of unequal races. It has vindicated its claim to the approbation of an enlightened humanity. It has civilized and Christianized the African. It has exalted the white race itself to higher hopes and purposes, and it is, perhaps, of the most sacred obligation that we should give it the means of expansion, and that we should press it forward to a perpetuity of progress.”

The *Richmond Enquirer*, as might be expected of a leading organ of a Slave-selling State, opposes the Carolina project;—not, however, as being unjust or inhuman, but solely as being impolitic, and likely to increase the difficulty of maintaining Slavery itself, against the growing numbers and power of its assailants. It says, “In logic and in morals, Governor ADAMS is perfectly consistent when he declares that if the Slave-trade be piracy, Slave property is plunder. We frankly acknowledge that the laws which condemn the Slave-trade imply an aspersion upon the character of the South. Still, we maintain that it is not wise or expedient in the South to attempt to reëstablish the traffic. * * * * *

* * * The States of the South are not yet prepared to defy the public opinion and to provoke the positive hostility of the foremost powers of Christendom; and the attempt to re-open the traffic in African negroes would inevitably draw this penalty upon us. * * * * * It is idle to deny that Slavery is condemned by the public opinion of the world. The States of the South are cut off from the sympathies of the most despotic as well as the most popular Governments of Europe. Is it the policy of the South still further to embarrass its position, still more scornfully to defy the opinion of the world—to inflame the zeal and multiply the number of its enemies?”

Another number of the same paper, speaking of “what Abolition has effected,” says, “it was wonderfully successful, in procuring laws to punish the African Slave-trade as piracy, in taking it out of the hands of honest, law-abiding men, who carried it on under the regulations of law, and with an approach to humanity. * * * * * Had WILBERFORCE and his compeers been wise, prudent, and practical men, sound philosophers and statesmen, they would have thrown more of legal regulation around this trade, not have attempted to ‘expel nature’ by arresting it. This was the first great exploit of rose-water.

philanthropy. It preached a visionary and impracticable humanity, and forged chains, and begat crime, and groans, and tears, and blood."

The Charleston, (S.C.) *Standard* complains that the position of the South has hitherto been too much one of defence and apology, and adds :—

"To the end of changing our attitude in the contest, and of planting our standard right in the very faces of our adversaries, we propose, as a leading principle of Southern policy, to reöpen and legitimate the Slave-trade."

It goes on, in a series of ably written articles, to argue at length the rightfulness and expediency of that measure, expanding and elaborately enforcing the following propositions, viz :—

"That equality of States is necessary to equality of power in the Senate of the Union; that equality of population is necessary to equality of power in the House of Representatives; that we cannot expand our labor into Territories without decreasing it in the States; and what is gained upon the frontier is lost at the centres of the institution; that pauper white labor will not come to competition with our Slaves, and if it did, that it would not increase the integrity and strength of Slavery, and that, therefore, to the equality of influence in the Federal Legislature, there is the necessity for the Slave-trade."

The objection drawn from the cruelty and horrors of the traffic it meets by affirming, and for aught we can see, pretty fairly proving that these are no greater, if not even less, in the foreign than in the domestic Slave-trade; and the two being identical in principle, that none who uphold the latter can consistently object on the ground of morality or humanity to the former. It contends, with a soundness of logic in which we see no flaw, that "so long as Slavery is right, and it is right to buy and sell Slaves, there is no wrong in the foreign Slave-trade; but if it be wrong—if it have no validity and no inheritance, but is to be tolerated only until it can be laid aside—then every act of sale or purchase is a wrong." It anticipates, also, or at least demands as a right, the aid of the "Democratic party" in effecting its purpose; declaring that "the South contains all that is vital in that party, and is the main trunk of the national structure which gives to Northern majorities the opportunity of nestling

among its branches ; and as well from the recollection of present obligations as the hopes of that success which the South can always give to the party that may be true to her, is this party bound to consider for us, and to adopt the measure necessary to the strength and integrity of Southern institutions. * * * * * If she has to bear onward the Democratic party, and the traditions and glories of the Union, she must be legitimated, and called to the recognition of an enlightened world. If she is not to do this, she has, at least, the trusts of her own form of society, and it is incumbent upon her to legitimate herself. If the Democratic party, therefore, would rest upon the South, or if it would preserve the South, in permanent connection with the other section of this Union, it must come, and come speedily, to this act of justice."

That the moral standing of the party is not a whit too high for this appeal to be successful, no careful observer of its course for years past need be told. What may be thought as to the policy of heeding it, is less easy to foretell, and time only can reveal what will be the issue of this impudent scheme. Certain it is that there are Northern men, and perhaps no inconsiderable number of them, who would have no scruples of conscience about engaging in the traffic, were it permitted by law ; and of course would second the Southern movement for re-opening it, if no considerations of interest or reputation held them back. For, even without legal permission, northern men, wealthy capitalists, substantial citizens, men of business enterprise, more than enough are found ready to engage in it for the sake of its enormous profits, at whatever risks are consequent upon its legal prohibition. It is notorious that Slavers are not unfrequently fitted out at New York for the African coast, and generally make successful and exceedingly lucrative voyages ; seldom if ever meeting effectual hindrance from the legal authorities. Now and then an arrest is made, but only, for the most part, to furnish illustrations of the unscrupulous ingenuity with which legal quibbles can be used to defeat the ends alike of law and justice.

" Few of our readers are aware," said the *Journal of Commerce*, a few months ago, " of the extent to which this infernal traffic is carried on, by vessels clearing from New York, and in close alliance with our legitimate trade ; and that down-town merchants of wealth and respectability are extensively engaged in buying and selling African Negroes, and have been, with comparatively little interruption, for an indefinite number of years. The fact that such a traffic

exists in connection with this port is well established, yet, with few exceptions, all the means employed to secure conviction of the guilty fail of their object. We are informed by the Deputy United States Marshal, that at least fifteen Slave vessels sailed from this port within the last twelve months. Last year there were but five prosecutions and one conviction. The British Consul General in Cuba says, "Almost all the Slave expeditions for some time past have been fitted out in the United States, chiefly in New York."

That so little should be done by the United States Government to execute its own, or rather its predecessors' laws against the foreign Slave-trade, is the most natural consequence conceivable of its complicity with Slavholding and Slavery-extension, and its servility to the Slave-Power. It can seem strange to those only who expect grapes of thorns, and figs of thistles; but to none who know that in political morality, as in everything else, the product must accord in quality with what it grows from. Having such a government to deal with, and such a party to invoke for aid as the Government now represents, it is no wonder that those Slaveholders who think it for their interest to re-open the foreign Slave-trade should believe the enterprise quite practicable. The action of Congress on the subject last winter, can hardly have been regarded by sanguine spirits committed to the scheme as very discouraging to their hopes. No less than fifty-seven representatives, out of two hundred and nine, voted against a resolution "That this House regard all propositions for a revival of the Slave-trade, as shocking to the moral sentiments of the enlightened portion of mankind; or any act, on the part of Congress, legalizing or conniving at the legalizing of that horrid and inhuman traffic, would justly subject the United States to the reproach and execration of all civilized and Christian people throughout the world."

This, for a beginning, is certainly more favorable to the barbarous project than the first essay of many an enterprise which has at last succeeded. It is true, another resolution, comparatively tame and pointless, declaring the repeal of the laws against the Slave-trade to be inexpedient, unwise, and contrary to the settled policy of the United States, was adopted with only eight dissenting votes, to a hundred and eighty-three assenting. But the Slave-Power is well aware that, in a controversy like this, an opposition based on policy alone, is of small account compared with one

based on principle ; and will count as the really formidable enemies of its schemes, those only who regard them as "shocking to moral sentiment," and worthy of "the execration of all civilized and Christian people."

THE DRED SCOTT CASE.

The boldest forward stride of the Slave-Power, during the past year, was taken in the action of the Supreme Court in the case of DRED SCOTT ; nominally the case of an alleged Slave claiming his Freedom ; -- really that of the old, long established, and till lately unquestioned principles of law and constitution, against the novel and atrocious theories of modern Pro-Slavery ultraism ; or of the friends of freedom and justice against the champions of Slavery-extension and Slaveholding supremacy. The decision, if so it may be called, was doubtless made up months before it was publicly announced ; and was held back during the Presidential canvass, lest it should injure the prospects of the Slaveholders' candidate. But, when the election was over, and a fresh triumph of Slavery was sealed by the choice and inauguration of its favorite, as President, it was deemed safe to tell the lieges what new debasement had been ordained for them ; -- what new concessions to the grasping despotism of the Oligarchs had been signed and sealed, ready to be delivered. The newly chosen President hastened, in the very moment of assuming his office, to commit himself beforehand to the forthcoming decision, with transparent affectation of ignorance of its tenor ; and to bespeak for it universal respect and obedience, as the judgment of a tribunal worthy of submissive reverence. That he knew well enough what it was to be ; that, indeed, he was a prominent party to the base conspiracy of which it was to form a potent engine, for the formal and authoritative nationalizing of human chattelism, and annihilation of State sovereignty ; only the most unsophisticated simplicity could sincerely doubt.

The case afforded just what the extremists of the Slaveholding interest desired ; an opportunity to deny and denounce, from the highest judicial seat in the land, those legal doctrines touching Slavery and its limitations, which had been held ever since the nation began to be ; which had been endorsed by the Judiciary ;

the Legislature and Executive of North and South; affirmed as emphatically by Louisiana and Missouri, and other Slave States, as by New York or Massachusetts. Nor was the opportunity to pass for want of hands to seize it. As the hour had come, so had the man—the men. And not by any marvellous coincidence, but through a long continued and generally unsuspected use of means appropriate to this very end. For years the Slave-Power had been silently shaping the national judiciary to its purpose; availing itself of a grossly unequal division of circuits and apportionment of judges, to its own unfair advantage; and increasing its preponderance whenever a vacancy occurred, by managing to have it filled with a zealous partizan or a pliant tool of its own; till now the Court has become little better than the willing register of *its* behests. If it had slightly erred in permitting the presence of a McLEAN and a CURTIS on the bench, these mistakes, after all, did little discredit to its sagacity; for the antecedents and general conduct of the men had seemed to justify its choice or acquiescence, although the event has proved that there are depths of subserviency to Slavery, lower than they are willing to fathom. But they are only two of nine; the Pro-Slavery majority is ample without them. Constituted as the Court is; with five judges from the Slave States, most if not all of them actual Slaveholders; and two of the four from the Free States evidently born at the North by mistake; its judgment, on any question involving the interests of Slavery, is in effect a judgment rendered by a party to the suit. To say nothing of sectional feeling, and the spirit of clanship among the Slaveholders; and looking only at the mere dollar-and-cent aspect of the case; it is not easy to feel assurance of the impartiality of men who are sitting to determine whether their own chattels shall be recognized as property, and be guaranteed security as such over all the country, or whether they can be so regarded in one section only; since the answer given with authority to this question must affect materially the market price of such chattels; and the judge in giving it is virtually thereby putting money in, or taking money out of his own pocket. These are considerations important to be borne in mind, in estimating the judicial value of the DRED SCOTT decision.

The facts of the case are so generally known that the briefest summary of them will suffice for our purpose. DRED SCOTT had been

held as a Slave in Missouri, and was taken thence by his master into Illinois, and subsequently into the Territory, north of Missouri, in which Slavery was forbidden by the Missouri Compromise Act. Afterwards being taken back to Missouri, he brought suit for his freedom, on the ground that his removal by his master to a Free State and Territory had emancipated him; and once free, he could not be enslaved by being brought into a Slave State. Verdict and judgment were given in his favor, in accordance with the uniform current of precedents up to that time in the Missouri Courts, as well as with the prevailing course of decisions in the whole South. On a Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of the State, the judgment of the Lower Court was reversed by two judges, against the opinion of the Chief Justice, who said :—

“I regard the question as conclusively settled by repeated adjudications of this Court. * * * * In this State, it has been recognized from the beginning of the Government, as a correct position in law, that the master who takes his Slave to reside in a State or Territory where Slavery is prohibited, thereby emancipates his Slave.”

Besides citing copiously from the Missouri Reports in proof of this statement, he examined the decisions in the other Slaveholding States, showing them to accord with those of Missouri. His two associates, in coming to a different judgment, did not deny that the precedents were against them, or that the law had before been rightly construed. Their own declared reason for setting at nought the judicial authority of all their predecessors, was, the excitement against Slavery in the Free States! A potent reason, truly, to influence grave judges in a matter so important, and to an innovation so startling and pernicious! We may gather from its avowal, how much their opinion is worth as a legal authority.

Defeated thus in the State Courts, SCOTT brought his action next before the Circuit Court of the United States. Here he was met by a plea to the jurisdiction of the Court, on the ground that, as a descendant of Africans imported and held as Slaves, he could not be a citizen of the United States, and consequently could not sue in a United States Court. This point was decided in his favor; but on the merits of the case, judgment was given against him. He appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The case was argued at the December term in 1855, and instead of being

decided then, was ordered to be re-argued at the December term of the next year. After the second argument, the Court still delayed, till the President's Inauguration had given him an occasion, promptly used, as we have already mentioned, to endorse the judgment in advance; and then was sent out to the world the now notorious DRED SCOTT decision. In calling it a decision, however, we do not speak with legal accuracy; for, in common with able lawyers, we hold that it lacks the essential characteristics and legal authority of a judicial decision, and is rather to be regarded as an expression of personal opinions, by some half dozen or so of warm political partizans,—and not the most likely of their class to think wisely and rightly,—on certain sharply disputed questions of party politics. For the majority of the Court, in deciding at the outset that SCOTT had no right to bring his case before them, had, in effect, declared it not legally within their judicial cognizance; and therefore, as Judge CURTIS justly argued, had clearly no authority, as a Court, to pass upon its merits. Hence their so-called decision, being extra-judicial, was, properly speaking, *no* decision. But whatever we, or the ablest lawyers of the country, may think on this head, it cannot be denied that the “powers that be” in the nation just now, have resolved to treat the decision as an authoritative exposition of the law, and to exact respect and obedience to it as such. And say what we may about living under a government of laws, the truth is but too manifest, that we are ruled, not so much by law, as by the will of selfish demagogues, who, having somehow wriggled themselves into high places, are using their ill-gotten power to substitute their own unscrupulous interpretations, no matter how absurd and false, for the true intent of law and constitution.

The first question decided was, of course, that of jurisdiction, involving, as presented in the pleadings, that of colored citizenship. It seems to be generally supposed that a majority of the Court decided against the capacity of colored persons to be citizens. An examination of the separate opinions of the several judges will show that such is not the fact. A majority, five of the nine, (two dissenting, and two giving no opinion on that point,) did indeed deny the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court; but only three of these, TANEY, WAYNE and DANIEL, denied that colored men can be citizens. Four Judges, CAMPBELL, CATRON, NELSON and GRIER, were silent on the question of citizenship; though

CAMPBELL and GRIER concurred in the denial of jurisdiction, but on the ground that the record showed SCOTT to be a Slave, and for *that* reason not qualified to sue in the Federal Courts. McLEAN and CURTIS ably and conclusively, so far as facts and argument can go, maintained the right of colored men to citizenship, and exposed, as plainly as courtesy to their associates would permit, the sophistry and falsehood employed to support the opposite opinion. To Chief Justice TANEY belongs the bad eminence of having elaborately falsified history, misconstrued law, and outraged justice and humanity, through more than twenty pages of his extended opinion, in the vain attempt to prove that colored persons are not, never were, and never could be, citizens of the United States; that when the Union was formed, and "for more than a century before," they "had been regarded as unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior, that they had *no rights* which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to Slavery for his benefit; that this opinion was, at that time, fixed and *universal* in the civilized portion of the white race, was regarded as an *axiom* in morals, as well as politics, which *no one* thought of disputing, or *supposed to be open to dispute*;" and of course, that this inferior, degraded race were then left, and still continue, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, in the same rightless condition, incapable of asking of the Federal Courts redress for any wrong, and consequently destitute of the legal recognition of any right. Considering how feeble, helpless and already deeply injured are the objects of this assault, it is hard to say whether injustice, meanness or cruelty, unblushing falsehood, or sophistical misinterpretation of facts and law, is its most marked characteristic.

The judge does not pretend that any clause or word of the Constitution expressly debar black men from citizenship, or even hints at color or race as a test of civil rights; or that the States, before they entered the present Union, had generally set up, in terms, any such distinction as is contended for. The sum of his argument is, that "the white race" cannot be supposed to have recognized as citizens a race which they so looked down upon. He cites freely from the early legislation of Congress and the States to prove the social degradation of the blacks, and thence *infers* their want of civil rights. But, unfortunately for his pur-

pose, this inference is flatly contradicted by the well-established fact, that the Federal Government has repeatedly naturalized colored aliens, and given passports to colored men, describing them as citizens of the United States; and, in one instance, if not more, has officially complained of an act of British aggression upon a colored American seaman, as having been committed upon a "native citizen of the United States." It is contradicted no less decisively by the fact referred to by Judge CURTIS, in his dissenting opinion, that in several of the States, (he might have said all but two, if we mistake not,) before the adoption of the Constitution, colored men, "descended from African Slaves," were citizens of those States, and had the elective franchise "on equal terms with other citizens." Chancellor KENT, in his Commentaries, says "it is certain that the Constitution and Statute law of New York speak of men of color as being citizens;" and that "if a Slave be born in the United States, and lawfully discharged from bondage, or if a black man be born free in the United States, he becomes thenceforward a citizen." The Supreme Court of North Carolina has decided that Slaves born in that State, and manumitted there, "are citizens of North Carolina, and all free persons born within the State are born citizens of the State;" and has declared it "a matter of universal notoriety," that free men of color had and used the right of voting, under the old Constitution of that State. In Massachusetts and some other States, it is equally notorious, they have it still, and have never been without it; and in those where they have it not, the use of the word "white," in prescribing the qualifications of voters, was necessary to take it from them. That they were regarded as citizens in the old Confederation is proved conclusively by the fact, that a motion to limit the privileges of general citizenship to white persons was expressly voted down in the Congress, eight States opposing and only two supporting it, while the vote of one was divided.

There was no need of citing Statutes to prove that the colored people have all along been the objects of prejudice and contempt. Nobody denies it. But this, so far from disproving their citizenship, rather strengthens the direct proof in its favor, drawn from the facts abovementioned. For the more degraded and despised they were, the less likely is it that they were tolerated in any position to which they had no right, and especially in one so important as that of co-sovereigns of the Commonwealth; and con-

sequently, the stronger is the evidence afforded by their voting, that they were recognized as citizens.

Judge TANEY endeavors to evade the force of the proof of citizenship from the fact of voting, by saying that "a person may be entitled to vote by the law of the State, who is not a citizen of the State itself;" and instances "foreigners not naturalized," as being "allowed to vote in some of the States." Whether they are not, by such allowance, made citizens of those States, or whether admission to share in the sovereignty is not *of course* admission to citizenship, may perhaps be reasonably questioned; but conceding this point, for the sake of the argument, it must still be borne in mind that when—or *if*—"persons not citizens" are allowed to vote, 't is by some *special* provision of law on their particular behalf; and as no such special provision existed in regard to the colored people, it follows that their voting was on the common ground of the general right of citizenship.

The judge, in his eagerness to make out a case, has grossly overstated the sentiment of the period in question, in regard to the colored people. The *truth* as to the general feeling toward them is bad enough, but he goes very far beyond the truth, in affirming that "the opinion was universal in the civilized portion of the white race," and "disputed by no one," that the negro might be justly enslaved for the white man's benefit, and had no rights which the white man was bound to respect. If not guilty of wilful falsehood, he betrays an ignorance most astonishing in the chief judicial officer of the nation.

Did he really know nothing of the emphatic voice which literature, law, philanthropy and religion, among "the civilized portion of the white race," had uttered at and before the time referred to, in behalf of the black man's rights, and against his enslavement? Was he not aware that the practice which he says was then *universally* thought to be just, had been denounced within the time he specifies, by COWPER, as "human nature's broadest, foulest blot;" by WESLEY, as "the sum of all villainies;" by PALFY, as a "crime" and "wickedness;" by the historian ROBERTSON, as "repugnant to the feelings of humanity," and "to the principles of religion;" by Bishop WARBURTON, as "infamous," and "directly infringing both Divine and human law;" and by many other writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,—poets, moralists, and divines, political

economists, statesmen, jurists, and others—as “unjust, inhuman, unchristian-like;” “contrary to all the laws of humanity;” “a criminal and outrageous violation of the natural rights of mankind;” “this enormity, this aggravated iniquity;” “a practice which spurns at all the principles of both natural and revealed religion;” “a horrid practice, an injustice and barbarity which, so sure as there is vengeance in Heaven for the worst of crimes, will sometime be the destruction of all who allow or encourage it;” and, in a word, as deserving only abhorrence and reprobation?—that it called forth MONTESQUIEU’S often quoted sarcasm, “We must not allow the negroes to be men, or it will begin to be believed that we ourselves are not Christians;” and the Abbé RAYNAL’S declaration, that “he who supports the system of Slavery is the enemy of the whole human race;” and BAXTER’S denunciation of Slave-traders as “the worst of robbers,” and of “those who buy and use the poor Africans as mere beasts for their own convenience, regardless of their spiritual welfare,” as “fitter to be called demons than Christians”?

Did he never hear of CLARKSON and WILBERFORCE, and the “multitude of others,” (to use CLARKSON’S own words,) who labored so zealously in the latter half of the eighteenth century for the Abolition of the Slave-trade? or of the suggestion of the celebrated NECKER, in 1784, that the nations of Europe should form a general compact to abolish that traffic? or of the persevering and successful exertions of GRANVILLE SHARP, from 1765 to 1772, to procure an authoritative exposition of British law against Slavery on British soil? Had he never learned, in the course of his legal studies, that full sixteen years before the American Federal Constitution was adopted, a decision of the highest Law Court in Great Britain, pronounced by one of the ablest jurists of that age, and after thorough argument and long deliberation, declared Slavery, whether of black men or of white, to be unlawful in that country, as a violation of natural right, contrary to Common Law principles, and so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law? or that a few years later, but still before the framing of the Constitution, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts applied to Negro Slaves the declaration in the State Bill of Rights, that “all men have an unalienable right to enjoy Liberty,” and thus abolished Slavery in that State?

Did he not know that in nearly every State of the old Confederation, (and of the new Union, when it was formed,) were Societies for promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and protecting the rights of the free colored people, and that among their members and officers were many of the best, and some of the most illustrious men of that day? that the judicial seat he occupies was first filled by the President of an Abolition Society, JOHN JAY? that to the same Society the first Secretary of the Treasury, ALEXANDER HAMILTON, belonged? that BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was President of an Abolition Society, incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and that its Constitution called "all the children of men, members of the same family, however diversified by *color*, situation," or otherwise; and declared it "more especially the duty of those who profess to maintain for themselves the rights of human nature, to use such means as are in their power to extend the blessings of freedom to every part of the human race"?

Had he never seen, among the proceedings of public bodies just before the Revolution, that the people of Fairfax County, Virginia, GEORGE WASHINGTON presiding, pronounced the African Slave Trade "wicked, cruel and unnatural"? that the Freeholders of Hanover County, Virginia, called it "most dangerous to virtue and the welfare of this county"? that the Virginia Convention in 1774 complained of the King for using his negative to defeat the attempts of the Colony to stop that trade, and for "preferring the advantages of a few *African corsairs* to the *rights of human nature*, deeply wounded by this infamous practice"? that an agreement was formed by that Convention, by the North Carolina Convention, by the Continental Congress, and by the Georgia Provincial Congress, not to import Slaves, or buy those imported by others? that the Committee representing the people of Darien, Georgia, claiming to be "influenced by a general philanthropy for all mankind, of whatever climate, language or *complexion*," expressed their "abhorrence of the unnatural practice of Slavery in America, a practice founded in injustice and cruelty, debasing part of our fellow-creatures below men, and corrupting the virtue and morals of the rest"? or any of the numerous similar testimonies of that period, and especially that introduced by JEFFERSON into the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, calling the Slave-trade an "execrable commerce," and denouncing the King

of Great Britain as having, by his course in regard to it, "waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights in the persons of a distant people, carrying them into Slavery in another hemisphere"?

Could he be ignorant that in the very Convention which framed the Constitution he professes to expound, Negro Slavery and the African Slave Trade were denounced in the strongest terms by distinguished men, Northern and Southern; that GOVERNEUR MORRIS said "domestic Slavery is a nefarious institution;" that MADISON called it "the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man," and thought it "wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men;" that MASON, of Virginia, styled the Slave Trade "nefarious" and "infernal," and "held it essential, in every point of view, that the General Government should have power to prevent the increase of Slavery;" that ROGER SHERMAN was "against acknowledging men to be property," and "regarded the Slave Trade as iniquitous;" that LUTHER MARTIN, of Maryland, considered it "unjustifiable in its nature, and contrary to the rights of mankind," and "justly exposing us to the vengeance of Him who is equally Lord of all, and who views with equal eye the poor African Slave and his American Master;" that in the Conventions, North and South, which ratified the Constitution, the Slave Trade was condemned with equal emphasis, being characterized by prominent speakers in the Virginia Convention as "detestable" and "nefarious;" and in that of North Carolina, as "abominable," "inhuman," "utterly inconsistent with the rights of humanity," and "probably reprobated by all the members" of the Federal Convention; while, in that of South Carolina, General PINCKNEY, who had been a member of the Federal Convention, testified that, on the Slave question, the South Carolina delegates there "had to contend with the religious and political prejudices of the Eastern and Middle States," whose people "reprobate as an unpardonable moral and political evil, the dominion they [of the South] hold over a part of the human race"?

Judge TANEY has the effrontery to cite even the Declaration of Independence in support of his atrocious argument. He admits, indeed, that its language "would seem to embrace the whole human family, and, if used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood;" but denies that it was *then* understood

to include "the enslaved African race," because, if it had been, "the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration would have been flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted,"—a thing he assumes to be clearly impossible; for they were "incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting." Indeed! Let us hear a little of their own testimony about that.

To what does the Judge think JEFFERSON alluded,—the very man who drafted the Declaration, and put into it originally that denunciation of the Slave Trade which we have just quoted,—when he exclaimed at the incomprehensibility of man, who can endure so much for his own liberty, "and the next moment, deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, inflict on his fellow-men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose"? LUTHER MARTIN says it was urged in the Federal Convention, against the concessions made to Slavery in the Constitution, "that our opposition to Great Britain was grounded upon the preservation of rights to which God and nature entitled us, *not in particular, but in common with all the rest of mankind.*" PATRICK HENRY, writing in 1779, confesses that, in holding Slaves, his "conduct was inconsistent with the principles" he "asserted," and adds, "I will not, cannot justify it. I will so far pay my devoir to Virtue, as to own the rectitude of her precepts, and lament my want of conformity to them." WILLIAM PINCKNEY, in 1788, pronounces Slavery "oppressive, unjust and inconsistent with the great groundwork of the late Revolution." The Legislature of Pennsylvania, in 1780, in the Act abolishing Slavery in that State, speaks of "negro slaves" as "deprived of the common blessings that they were by nature entitled to;" and avows among the reasons for the Act, that "we conceive ourselves at *this particular period extraordinarily* called upon, by the blessings we have received, to manifest the *sincerity of our professions;*" and then proceeds, "in justice to persons so unhappily circumstanced, and in grateful commemoration of our own happy deliverance" from British tyranny, to enact the gradual abolition of Slavery in Pennsylvania. In 1788, in a Report on a petition "in favor of the distressed Africans and their descendants," a Legislative Committee in the same State quoted from the Declaration of Independence the affirmation of the unalienable rights of all

men, adding that "if it is founded in truth, the petitioners speak but the Divine Will in requesting that this evil [Slavery] be done away from the land." Many pages might be filled with similar testimonies, showing that the Declaration *was* understood, in that day, to assert the rights of the "whole human family," without distinction of race or color, and that the "flagrant inconsistency" therewith of holding Slaves and supporting Slavery was then also seen and acknowledged. Indeed, it was the very time of the framing of the Constitution, which WILLIAM PINCKNEY called "this enlightened period" at which "we need not labor to prove" Slavery disgraceful, "and a scandal to human nature."

Thus it is abundantly evident, not only that Judge TANEY's conclusion is unwarranted by his premises, but that his premises are gross exaggerations or utter falsehoods, and consequently that his attempt to prove colored men incapable of citizenship is a complete failure.

The next question discussed was whether the Court could go into the merits of the case, after deciding against the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court;—an important point, because upon it depends the binding force of the whole decision on every question raised, except the first. And here, also, as well as in relation to colored citizenship, the Chief Justice was in a minority. Contrary to what seems to be the general opinion, the majority of the Court did *not* affirm its competency to examine the merits, after deciding negatively the question of jurisdiction. Only three of the nine judges, TANEY, WAYNE and DANIEL, held it competent to do so; NELSON and CAMPBELL avoided the point; CATRON, McLEAN and CURTIS went into the merits on the ground that the Circuit Court *had* jurisdiction; and GRIER, on the ground that "the record showed a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction." Judge CURTIS denied, with particular emphasis, the competency of the majority of the Court, in dismissing the case for want of jurisdiction, to pass upon any question raised by a plea to the merits, adding, "I do not hold any opinion of this court or any court binding, when expressed on a question not legitimately before it." This certainly looks like a common sense view of the matter, and if not expressly affirmed, is not denied, and so may be considered as tacitly admitted by the majority of the Court to be legally correct. For, with the evidently strong Pro-Slavery bias of most of the judges, it is hardly supposable that, had they agreed with the Chief Justice on this point, they would have

been silent upon it, and sought other ways of reaching the pre-determined end. If this inference is just, we have six judges virtually conceding that the opinion of the Court is not binding in such a case as five judges—a majority—distinctly decided this to be. Though this does not help poor SCOTT, as it leaves him to the tender mercies of the Missouri Court, which had already doomed him to bondage, yet it is important in relation to the *general* bearings of the decision, since in effect it leaves the Governments and people of the States at liberty to treat it as legally a nullity, without incurring the imputation of disrespect to the legitimate authority of the Federal Courts.

Next came the question of the power of Congress over the Territories; involving that of the validity of the Act ratifying the Ordinance of '87, of the prohibition of Slavery North and West of Missouri, and in a word, of all the past legislation of Congress restricting the spread of Slavery. This, with its consequences, as everybody knows, was the real matter in controversy. To obtain such a decision of it as would help the scheme of Slavery-extension, was the main purpose with which the partisans of the Slave Power urged the case to final adjudication; and to decide it so as to meet their wishes was, we doubt not, equally the main purpose of the majority of the Court, in seizing the occasion offered by SCOTT'S appeal. Six judges reached the conclusion that the Missouri Compromise prohibition is void; two, MCLEAN and CURTIS, that it is valid; and one, NELSON, gave no opinion on it. Of the six, CATRON held it void, as being in conflict with the treaty by which the Louisiana Territory was acquired; GRIER, as being unconstitutional, but without saying on what ground; while TANNEY, WAYNE, DANIEL and CAMPBELL held that the power conferred by the Constitution upon Congress, "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory," &c. of the United States, is confined to the Territory then belonging to the United States, and is not, even there, a "power of general legislation," but, in Judge CAMPBELL'S words, "is restricted to such administrative and conservatory acts as are needful for the preservation of the public domain, and its preparation for sale or disposition." Hence they infer that Congress cannot prohibit Slavery in any part of the Louisiana Territory, as that region is not included in its grant of power; nor in any other, because the grant is only of power to regulate the public domain as

property, "held for the common and equal benefit" of all parts of the country.

As pretty a specimen of quibbling and hair-splitting as one could wish to see, is the wordy and elaborate argument of Judge TANEY in defence of these propositions. But the necessity of the case compelled him to admissions which enhanced the difficulty of his task, not to say made all his labor futile. Obviously somewhere must exist a right to legislate over the Territory acquired since the adoption of the Constitution. It could be nowhere but in Congress; therefore, as the Judge admits, it must be there as a necessary consequence of the power and fact of acquisition. If, as he says, "it was not only within the scope of its powers, but was its duty to pass such laws and establish such a government" as would secure the objects of the acquisition, the inference is plainly inevitable that, by the same necessity out of which this power and duty are assumed to come, it must determine, in its open discretion, what laws will best attain the end proposed. If, therefore, it believes the prohibition of Slavery in the Territory to be needful or conducive to this end, its power of prohibition would seem clearly to follow from Judge TANEY'S own admission. So, too, of the Territory to which he would confine the constitutional grant of power "to make all needful rules and regulations." Conceding for the moment that this power is limited, as he and his three Slaveholding associates contend, to the regulation of the Territory as property; then, if Congress, (in view of the contrast, say, between Virginia and Pennsylvania, or Kentucky and Ohio,) believes that the exclusion of Slavery is a regulation "needful" to preserve the value of the public lands, and promote their early settlement and cultivation; why has it not the same right to make such a regulation as to "protect the lands from trespass and waste,"—one of the legitimate objects specified by Judge CAMPBELL for the exercise of its power?

That in its exercise the rights of person and property, as Judge TANEY insists, must be respected, nobody disputes. Legislative discretion, be its range wide or narrow, should always be conscientiously exercised, that is, should always aim to embody justice as well as sound policy in statute law; and for this very reason we affirm that Congress may, and ought to, forbid Slavery where it alone has,—whether by grant of the Constitution, or from the necessity of the case,—the right to legislate. Since, therefore, in

the language of Judge MARSHALL, quoted with approving emphasis by Judge TANEY, "whichever may be the source whence the power [of Congress, to govern the Territories] is derived, the possession of it is unquestioned;" and since none exists elsewhere to put justice and good policy into the form of law in the Territories, the simple fact that Slavery is unjust and pernicious establishes at once the right and the duty of Congress to exclude it thence. This would not invade the rights of person, but would prevent in the Territories that grossest invasion of personal rights, the claim, by one man, of property in the person of another;—nor the rights of property, for as property in man can exist "only by positive law," as Lord MANSFIELD said, and not by right, no right is invaded when the law, undoing its own wrong, forbids what without and against right it permitted.

But to this view Judge TANEY and his four Southern associates interpose the assumption, that "the Constitution distinctly affirms the right of property in a Slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and any other property owned by a citizen," and that "the only power conferred" on Congress in regard to it "is the power *coupled with the duty* of guarding and protecting the owner's rights." Thence they infer that Slaves may be carried to and held in the Territories, in spite of any prohibition by Congress, and that the transfer of such "property" from a Slave State to a Territory, even where Slavery has been prohibited, does not, as has heretofore been held, emancipate the Slave. This inference is too modest by far. If the doctrine of the Slaveholding Judges is sound, much more than this legitimately follows from it. Carried out consistently, it would authorize the taking of Slaves into the States also; to be held there, not merely during transit, according to Judge KANE's decision in the case of PASSMORE WILLIAMSON, but for life, if so the master chooses. For what right has a State, any more than Congress, to take from an owner property, his right to which "is expressly affirmed" by what the States all accept as the supreme law of the land? Or what difference can it make in the owner's right to his property, whether he is passing through a State, or has come to reside in it? A Virginian migrating to Ohio to settle there, has an undoubted right to take with him and keep in his new home his household goods, implements of labor, cattle, horses, and the like; and nobody pretends that Ohio could rightfully deprive him of them. Now if, as Judge TANEY teaches,

there is no "difference between property in a Slave and other property," and no "different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution," has not the Virginian settler in Ohio plainly the same right to take thither and permanently hold there his Slaves, as to take and hold any other property? Has not any Slaveholder who chooses, as good a right to plant Slavery, as to plant corn or potatoes, in any State of the Union? If the five Southern Judges rightly expound the Constitution, every State of the Union is already, for aught we can see, a Slave State, so far as the recognized supreme law is concerned; and waits but the will of the Slave Power to use its legal rights, in order to become such in fact as well as law.

We do not suppose that Northern public sentiment would tolerate, or Slaveholding arrogance would risk, as yet, an attempt to carry out the principles of the decision to their full extent; but if the application already made of them is acquiesced in, who can say how long it will be before such an attempt *will* be made, and will succeed? The corrupting influence of complicity with Slaveholding, and the debasing power of acquiescence in the assumptions of a despotic oligarchy, have been too amply illustrated in our nation's history thus far, to leave room for doubt of their fearful efficiency in the time to come, if suffered to continue. This very decision, so widely at variance with law and right, so audacious in its assumptions, so aggressive in its bearing, would never have been pronounced, even by a bench of Pro-Slavery Judges, had not the way been prepared for it by many a tame concession, and many an iniquitous act in aid of Slavery on the part of the North. Nay, the North would never have had to look to a bench of Pro-Slavery Judges for interpretations of law and Constitution, if she had not struck hands with oppressors, and become partner in their iniquities. It is well to denounce the DRED SCOTT decision and its authors; but so long as they who denounce, keep up an alliance with those who demand such outrages, what guarantee can they have against the recurrence of the like, or worse? If Slaveholders are to be in the Union, they must be admitted to share its posts of honor and influence—to help enact, expound and administer its laws:—and will use the power thus acquired, to extend and strengthen Slavery. If shut out from such posts, they will complain that it is no equal Union; just as they now complain that it is no equal Union, unless they can go with their peculiar property all over the country, and

have it everywhere regarded sacred. To us it seems that every valid argument against conceding what they ask, is no less valid against those concessions which, for the sake of Union, the Constitution has indubitably made; or, indeed, against such as *must* be made, in order to a union with Slaveholders purposing to continue such. For the basis of such argument is the wrongfulness of Slavery; and therefore it condemns, as also wrong, whatever gives the system countenance. Once grant that Slaves are property by right, as well as by what claims the name of law, and how can TANEY's sophistry be met, or his false conclusions be rebutted? But refusing to grant this, how can any measure of complicity with Slaveholding be justified? "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS" is the moral, then, which we draw from the DRED SCOTT decision.

Though few agree with us in this, yet the decision is far from being generally received in a submissive spirit at the North. Press and platform and pulpit have warmly reprobated it, and a determination to deny it the authority of law, and refuse it obedience and respect, has been widely manifested, and in several States has taken shape in legislative action. The Legislature of New York has hinted its estimate of the Court's opinion on colored citizenship, by proposing an amendment to the Constitution of that State, enabling colored men to vote on equal terms with others; and has given, in the following resolutions, its judgment on the doctrine of "no difference between property in Slaves and any other property," and on the character and effect of the Court's position considered generally:

Resolved, That this State will not allow Slavery within her borders, under any pretence, or for any time, however short.

Resolved, That the Supreme Court of the United States, by reason of a majority of the Judges thereof having identified it with a sectional and aggressive party, has impaired the confidence and respect of the people of this State."

The House of Representatives also passed an Act, declaring that—

"Neither descent, near or remote, from an African, whether such African is, or may have been, a Slave or not, nor color of skin, shall disqualify any person from becoming a citizen of this State, or deprive such person of the rights and privileges of a citizen thereof; that every Slave who shall come, or be brought, or be in this State, with the consent of his or her master or mistress, or who shall come

or be brought, or be involuntarily in this State, shall be free; and that every person who shall hold, or attempt to hold, in this State, in Slavery or as a Slave, any person mentioned as a Slave in the second section of this Act, or any free person of color, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any time, however short, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be confined in the State Prison, at hard labor, for a term not less than two nor more than ten years."

But, coming to the Senate late in the session, that body, greatly to its own discredit, refused to consider the bill, and it failed to become a law.

Maine has enacted that—

"Any Slave voluntarily brought into this State by his master, or with his knowledge or consent, shall thereby become free; and any attempt by any person to restrain such Slave of his liberty, or to exercise the authority of master over him, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year."

Ohio has in like manner declared that "if any person shall bring into this State any other person with intent to hold him as a Slave, or shall so hold or aid in holding any person within that State, he shall be punished by imprisonment not less than three nor more than nine months, and by fine not less than two hundred nor more than five hundred dollars;" and that "every person coming within this State otherwise than as a person held to service in another State under the laws thereof, and escaping into this State, shall be deemed and held in all courts as absolutely free."

With these may be properly associated other recent legislative acts, which, though not expressly relating to questions raised in the decision we have been considering, are probably due, in part at least, to the spirit it has awakened; and have the same general, if not the same specific purpose as those already quoted. Such are the Act of Maine, providing for the legal defence, at the State's cost, of persons claimed within its bounds as fugitive Slaves;—the Act of Ohio, forbidding the use of the prisons in that State, for the confinement of alleged fugitives from Slavery, and the giving of aid by its citizens, (except as officers of the Federal Government,) in arresting any person on pretence that he is a fugitive Slave, or in removing such person from the State to be elsewhere held as a

Slave;—the Act of Wisconsin, which prohibits the enforcing of any judgment against any person within that State, for violation of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850;—and the resolutions of the Ohio Legislature, declaring it a duty to use all power, consistent with the national compact, to prevent the increase of Slavery, to mitigate and finally eradicate it; that the Ordinance of '87, so far as it relates to Slavery, should be extended to all the Territories; and that the Senators and Representatives from Ohio be requested to vote against the admission of any State, unless Slavery is forbidden by its Constitution.

If all this does not come fully up to the demands of the occasion, still it is not without encouraging significance, as proving that the forms of law, and the outward show of even highest authority, are not to pass unquestioned, when, perverted to defeat the very purposes of their institution, they are employed to fetter Freemen, that the holding of Slaves may be rendered easier and more secure, and allowed a wider range.

SLAVE INSURRECTIONS.

The past year has revealed afresh the perils which, concealed or manifest, are ever incident to Slavery; and that disquieting sense of insecurity which lurks in the oppressor's bosom, scarce acknowledged to himself while all is tranquil on the surface of his social state, but ready to break out in wild alarm at the first appearance or definite suspicion of danger. About the beginning of last November, the whole South was startled by intelligence of a plan of insurrection, discovered just before it was ripe for execution, among the Slaves employed at the Cumberland Iron Works in Tennessee. Then followed those atrocities which tyrants, mad with fear, are prompt to perpetrate upon their subjects guilty or suspected of a purpose to assert their rights. Patrols and Vigilance Committees were on the alert, Lynch Law with its summary process supplanted Statute and Common Law, and the tardy action of regular tribunals; torture procured the needed evidence, and scourging and hanging were the order of the day. One account, purporting to come from a person present when a number of the suspected Slaves were "examined," speaks of some of them as "taking five or six hundred lashes before they would tell the tale"

required of them; and adds that "one of the negroes at the forge died from whipping that night, several hours after the operation." Whether innocent or guilty of the alleged offence, could be known of course to Omniscience only; but what of that? He was black, and a Slave, and that was enough to justify suspicion and "examination;" and then the hardy heroism with which he bore the murderous torture, rather than disclose the plot if he knew of any, or invent a lie to suit the purpose of his tormentors, if he did not, was proof sufficient of his guilt; for it revealed a manhood too noble to be content in bondage. Another statement says, that "more than sixty Slaves in the Iron Works were implicated, and nine were hung, four by the decision of a Court, and five by a mob." In another account we read that "six negroes were hung at Dover, by the infuriated citizens," and in yet another and later one, that "eight more had been hung at Dover, making nineteen in all. *No overt act had been committed*, but the proof against them of insurrectionary designs, it is said, was conclusive." We are told, also, of "a white man named TAYLOR," who "was hung at Dover, on *presumptive* evidence of having been engaged in exciting the Slaves to revolt;" that citizens of Dover were in pursuit of two other white men suspected of the same offence; and that one white man had been "deliberately murdered by a mob, after he had been acquitted." What other, and how many, kindred horrors were enacted, we can but guess from being told that "the insurrectionary movement in Tennessee obtained more headway than is known to the public, important facts being suppressed in order to check the spread of the contagion, and prevent the true condition of affairs from being understood elsewhere." The alarm and its bloody consequences were not confined to Tennessee. At Cadiz, in Kentucky, several Free colored men were arrested, and one, if no more, "was hung after a trial by the Vigilance Committee." A white man was hung not long before, for denouncing the cruelty of the frightened despots, and another was whipped for showing sympathy with its victims.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* says:—

"All at once, in Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas, it is discovered that the Slaves are meditating schemes of insurrection. These are not the wild and visionary projects with which negroes may be disposed to amuse themselves in the most quiet communities, but the maturely prepared, and in

some instances the partially executed plans of a deliberate and wide-spread purpose of revolt."

In the *Missouri Democrat*, of December 4th, we read :

"For the past month, the journals from different Southern States have been filled with numberless alarms respecting contemplated risings of the negro population. In Tennessee, in Missouri, in Virginia, and in Alabama, so imminent has been deemed the danger, that the most severe measures have been adopted to prevent their congregating or visiting after night, to suppress their customary attendance at neighborhood preachings, and to keep a vigilant watch upon all their movements, by an efficient patrolling system. This is assuredly a most lamentable condition for the Slave States, for nothing causes such terror upon the plantations as the bare suspicion of these insurrections."

A Baltimore (Md.) paper speaks of "another prepared plan of insurrection just detected and defeated in South Carolina," and adds, "occurring at the same time in so many separate localities, these discoveries suggest the suspicion of a very general spirit of insubordination among the negro population."

Louisiana papers mention the putting to death of two white men in Southern Arkansas, accused of exciting the Slaves to insurrection, in that region and Northern Louisiana. The *New York Evening Post*, after publishing numerous reports of plots detected or suspected in many parts of the South, continues thus : —

"How far the extent and formidable character of the meditated revolt of the Slaves may have been exaggerated by the distrust of their masters, and by the alarm which is apt to attend every danger that is imperfectly disclosed, we cannot say; but this, at least, is certain, that over a tract of country, including a part at least of six or seven States of the Union, the whites live in a state of real or fancied insecurity, on account of the supposed enmity of the black race, who dwell as menial servants in their houses, and who cultivate their fields. In the meantime, it is sought to strike terror into the blacks by public whippings of the accused without conviction. Over a vast extent of country the patrols, by which the Slaves are watched at night, and kept from holding dangerous communications with each other, are more active and vigilant than ever. No white man in that region lays his head on his pillow with perfect confidence that he will not be awakened before morning by a black hand at his throat, or by the blaze of his dwelling fired by his own work people."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, but these will suffice to show on what a mine of explosive elements the Southern social fabric rests. The moral of the tale is all the same, whether the late alarm was wholly warranted by discovered facts, or whether these supposed discoveries were in large measure due to the natural exaggerations of panic fear. For the *reality* of so great a danger as would justify this wide-spread terror, and impel to these bloody deeds, is scarcely a stronger proof of the dislocation of the social organism, and the falsehood of existing relations between the different classes — rather castes — at the South, than is the possibility of such a panic uncaused by real imminence of danger.

THE CHURCH.

Of the attitude of the American Church in regard to the Slave Question, we have still to reiterate our former testimony. Some progress has, we think, been made toward a better position than it hitherto has held, but so little that, as a whole, it still remains what it was long ago justly styled by JAMES G. BIRNEY, "The Bulwark of American Slavery." All the great, leading sects, and nearly all others, we believe, still have in their communion — or hold religious fellowship with such as have — those who claim men as property, who buy and sell for gain the "members of Christ's body;" who "use their neighbors' service without wages," and deny mental culture and social and domestic rights to acknowledged children of a common Father, acknowledged sharers in a common redemption. They brand, as heretic or infidel, dissenters from their abstract dogmas of theology; but extol as orthodox and eminently pious, and crown with their highest ecclesiastical honors, men who quote Scripture in defence of Slavery, uphold it as a just and Christian system, "in harmony with natural and revealed religion," and charge God himself with "trafficking in Slaves." With some exceptions, their places of religious worship are closed against the public, foreknown utterance of Anti-Slavery truth, whether by rejecters or receivers of their creeds. In their ecclesiastical assemblages of whatever name, the discussion of Slavery and their own relation to it, though sometimes borne with as inevitable in these days of general agitation of the question, is far enough from meeting general favor, but is rather deemed an evil to be shunned if

possible. They still give countenance and support to those great associations and semi-ecclesiastical corporations, which claim to be at work evangelizing the world, and which yet are silent or worse than silent in regard to Slavery, even when meeting it on the very track of their legitimate operations, and compelled to grapple with it, or turn aside from their accustomed course of policy touching other far less flagrant violations of Gospel principles.

It is true, no doubt, that some members, in most if not all of the religious sects, dislike their attitude in regard to Slavery, and desire a change. Hence comes it, that discussions of the unwelcome question will arise, and "capping the volcano," as certain reverend conservatives of the New School Presbyterian body once congratulated themselves that they had succeeded in doing, will not keep down forever the unruly fires. But the discovery of this truth has taught conservatism a shrewder policy; and, instead of aiming at complete repression, it opens vents for the disturbing element; now yielding and now holding back, in such proportions as, if possible, to soothe the troubled consciences, yet not disquiet those who are at ease in Zion, or alienate the doers of the wrong complained of. Take, for example, the action of the sect just named, which, after careful and elaborate analysis, an accurate Anti-Slavery writer thus sums up:—

"Their ministers and church members hold Slaves and defend Slavery; their churches allow these things, and their Synods allow them, without remonstrance; but their General Assembly, whose object it is to retain quietly in the connection at once the defenders of Slavery, the objectors to it, and the far larger number of persons totally indifferent on that subject, trims between three parties, and publishes, every two or three years, a manifesto containing the following discordant elements:—

1. Denunciation of Slavery.
2. Permission of it for the present.
3. Justification of it.
4. Sympathy with those who practise it.
5. Censure of those who oppose it."

The notorious Dr. Ross, who holds "that Slavery is ordained of God, as a good to the master, to the slave and to the community," tells Dr. BARNES, who has attempted to make out an Anti-Slavery character for the New School Presbyterian Church,—

"I agree with you, that the Presbyterian Church, both before

and since its division, has testified, *after a fashion*, against Slavery. But some of its action has been very curious testimony."

Then, after citing facts to show his meaning, and, among the rest, alluding to the General Assembly's "testimony" at Detroit, as "so admirably worded, that both Southern men and Northern men might vote for it with clear consciences," he says:—

"I admit that after this sort you have the stultified abstractions of the New School Presbyterian Church, while I have its common sense. *You have its Delphic words. I have its ACTIONS.*"

The Doctor's claim is certainly not discountenanced by such statements as this below, published last summer in the *New York Independent*:—

"In the church in Madison Square, New York, members of the New School General Assembly openly avowed themselves Slaveholders from *choice*, and declared their full acceptance of the system of Slavery as it exists; and then sat down at the table of Christ to commemorate his death, as *the* Presbyterian Church of the United States."

For the Congregational Churches of the North, exemption from the charge of being Pro-Slavery, either in character or in position, is often strenuously claimed, in part because they have no organic union with churches having Slaveholding members, and in part because of declarations they, or some of them, have made condemnatory of Slavery. But against this claim it may be urged, that their declarations have not always been so clear and pointed as the case demands; or, if so, have too often been much more than neutralized in practice; that in various ways they recognize the Christian standing of Slaveholding Churches; as by interchange of sacramental privileges, of pulpit services, of delegations to Assembly and Association, and the like; that they co-operate with such churches, in virtually Pro-Slavery Tract Societies and Mission Boards; that they treat the teaching of Pro-Slavery heresies by preacher, college president and theological professor as no way incompatible with soundest Christian Orthodoxy: and for these, and other reasons, the claim cannot be yet allowed. We do not mean to say that *none* among them have a right to that exemption; but that such as have are cases of exception, and we are dealing with the general fact.

At the Annual Meeting of the General Association of Massachusetts, last June, Resolutions were adopted, somewhat tamely disapproving the silence of the Tract Society "on the enormous and admitted evils of Slavery;" declaring that "the time *will* come, *if* it has not already," [there is much virtue in an *if*,] when not to be against so evil and dangerous a system, will be to be for it, and "therefore the Society should" [not take at once, but] "*be ready* to take the position to which the Providence of God and the demands of the age summon it, and exert its powerful influence against the sins of Slavery, as against other sins;" and expressing gratification "with the action of the Society at its recent meeting, in appointing a Committee of Investigation," as "a wise and timely measure, evincing a willingness to reconsider," [and delay *doing*, for another year,] "its duty on the subject of Slavery." And so the Association waits another year, while this Committee "investigates" to find out whether man-stealing, woman-scourging, labor-robbing, marriage-abrogating, soul-smothering, perpetrated on the largest scale, should be rebuked as sharply as dancing, and the like enormities. "The encroachments of Slavery" evoked a resolution "that the crisis calls for" [not energetic action against Slavery, but] "special prayer for the nation, and redoubled efforts to diffuse" [not to *apply* to the specific "enormous evil" in question,] "the spirit of the Gospel," and requires us to be "firm in defence of the interests of Freedom *and the Union*," [with those who practise the enormous evils, and make upon us the encroachments, we denounce,] and to "seek to promote them in lawful, wise and Christian methods." For practical comment, by the Association itself, on these Resolutions, we have what follows.

The question of continuing fraternal relations with the Presbyterian General Assemblies, Old School and New, was discussed; and action on it was *postponed* to another year. The Presbyterian delegates to the Association, while asserting their right, as Christians, to hold Slaves, and their determination to hold them, "felt that they had the sympathy and respect of a majority of the members;" a feeling warranted by the language even of those members who dissented from their views of Slavery.

A careful examination of the proceedings of corresponding ecclesiastical bodies in the other New England States,—the General Conference of Maine, the General Convention in Vermont, the General Association of Connecticut, and the Evangelical Consociation in Rhode Island,—

discovers the same tender and cautious handling of the subject, and abundant corroboration of our theory respecting the cause of adopting that mode of treatment. Of the inherent sinfulness of Slavery they say little or nothing, but certain abuses connected with it, and its "encroachments," particularly in Kansas, which attract so largely the attention of the public, they are bold to condemn, and in view of them to counsel, after long debate, such prompt and daring measures as—to pray and wait. Not, however, to pray too indiscriminately. In the Connecticut Association, a proposal to include, among the occasions of prayer, the malign influence of the Slave-Power on the Southern Churches, was withdrawn *by general request*. We find no fault with the advice to pray, so it has fit accompaniment. But "prayer is the soul's sincere desire," and desire impels to *action* to attain its object; so, it would seem, some earnest work might give appropriate emphasis to this advice. Not such exactly, as the Rhode Island Consociation did, when it invited two of the most pertinacious defenders of Slavery from the Bible, Dr. RICE, of the Old School, and Rev. Mr. POOR, of the New School General Assembly, to assist in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; or such as may be looked for from the ministers and churches of Vermont, if Rev. SAMUEL DAY, their delegate to the Rhode Island Consociation, spoke truly in declaring that they were "willing Slavery should exist where it is already, though unwilling it should be extended to territory now free."

The Western Unitarian Conference, at its last meeting, held in Chicago, refused to pass resolutions condemning the outrages on Freedom in Kansas and Washington, though the objectors all *individually* approved the sentiments of the resolutions, and avowed—and who should know it better?—their own Anti-Slavery fidelity and boldness of speech at home, and in their own pulpits. But "it would disturb the harmony of the Conference," to say all together what each said separately; and would "injure the cause of Unitarianism" to show a collective abhorrence of the barbarism which each man singly abhorred with his whole soul. "In short," says the *Christian Inquirer*, the Unitarian organ in New York, "it was all the old, oily, lukewarm, doughy, cottony talk, heard any time in the last ten years in conferences, caucuses, pulpits, and the corners of the streets; a part of the great, weak policy of do-nothing, say-nothing, stand-aside-and-let-alone acqui-

escence and compromise, under which Slavery has grown so strong, rampant and aggressive, and Liberty so emasculate and paralyzed; a part of the miserable Atheism which excludes God from the government of the world, drives religion out of politics, and divorces Christianity from life, puts popularity above principle, peace above righteousness, the interests of a sect above the interests of humanity."

In the Methodist Episcopal Church an animated contest over the Slave question is going on, not without promise of happy results at last, though the time of fulfilment is not yet. One party urgently demands, and another as strenuously opposes, such changes in the Discipline as will make it unequivocally Anti-Slavery. The former party includes many of the ablest men in the denomination, and has already the majority in several of the Annual Conferences. At the last meeting of the General Conference, held last May and June at Indianapolis, the subject had a large share of attention, and elicited a warm debate, "the strongest arguments for Slavery coming," we are told, "from Northern men." The Bishops, we infer, from the tone of their official address, are of the party which opposes change. They express strong doubts of the constitutional power of the General Conference to make the changes sought, "without the concurrence of the Annual Conferences." After stating that "we have six annual Conferences wholly or in part in Slave territory;" estimating their members at more than 150,000, including Slaves; and the attendants on their ministry at about two-thirds of a million; and extolling the "intelligence, piety, and attachment to Methodist Discipline and economy," of "the white membership in these Conferences;" they give their "judgment" that "the existence of these Conferences and Churches, under their present circumstances, does not tend to extend or perpetuate Slavery." To justify this judgment, they refer to the character of the discipline as it relates to Slavery, and make it out, by their own showing, a sort of moral pendulum, swinging this way and that, with its clauses condemnatory and its clauses qualifying, its requirements and exceptions, its prohibitions and their limitations, its ifs and wheres and whereins; leaving ample space within the range of its vibrations for all the Pro-Slavery preaching and Slaveholding practice which are well known to exist there.

The Conference referred the subject to a large committee, which,

failing to agree, produced a majority and a minority report. The former claims, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, that it "has ever maintained an unmistakable Anti-Slavery position," that "it has never ceased to bear its testimony openly against the sin [of Slavery,] and to exercise its disciplinary powers, to the end that its members might be kept unspotted from criminal connection with the system, and that the evil itself be removed from among men;" that it "has done more to diffuse Anti-Slavery sentiments, and to mitigate and abolish" Slavery, "than any other organization, political, social or religious;" and "that the administrators of its Discipline, in Slave Territory, have faithfully done all that, under the circumstances, they have conscientiously judged to be in their power, to answer the ends of the Discipline in extenuating that great evil." The Report goes on to say, that the book of Discipline does not "state clearly and definitely our true position and our real sentiments," and that the time has come when the church ought to make it do so, because conscience and God, the signs of the times, and a large majority of those whom the Conference represents, demand the change. It states, as "what is, has always been, and ever should be the position of our Church in respect to Slavery," that buying, selling, and by inference holding a human being as property is a sin against God and man; that *the legal relation* of master and Slave may in some circumstances *subsist innocently*; and that connection with Slavery is *prima facie* evidence of guilt, and throws upon the accused the burden of disproof. It then concludes with a resolution, recommending the Annual Conferences so to amend the General Rule on Slavery as to make it forbid the buying, selling or *holding* of a human being as property; and another, proposing that the General Conference change the answer, in the discipline, to the question, "What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of Slavery?"—so that it shall avow unabated conviction of the great evil of Slavery; affirm the equal right, by nature, of all men to freedom; deny the moral right to hold a fellow-being as property; make Slaveholders ineligible to membership hereafter, where emancipation can be effected without injury to the Slave; but provide that persons brought into the legal relation involuntarily, or voluntarily by buying Slaves to free them, shall not for that be excluded from fellowship; direct that, when a member becomes owner of a Slave, a Committee shall investigate the case, and fix

a time when the Slave shall be free, and refusal to abide by its decision shall be dealt with as an immorality; and enjoin on members who sustain the legal relation of Slaveholder, to teach their Slaves to read the Bible, allow them to attend public worship regularly, protect them in the duties of the conjugal and parental relations, give them a compensation just and equal under the circumstances, prevent as far as legally practicable their passing into perpetual Slavery, and treat them every way as the law of love requires.

To intelligent and thorough Abolitionists, the defects of this report will be obvious enough. Though doubtless it takes higher ground than the Methodist Church now holds, yet its tolerance of "the legal relation" of Slave and "owner," its attempts to reconcile therewith the conjugal and parental relations, its proposing any time but *now* for Slaves to go free, and trying to engraft the law of love upon the Slave code, and put Slaveholding "in some circumstances" under the guardianship, not the ban, of the Church, go far to countervail the truth it speaks, and the right measures it suggests. The credit given to the Church, moreover, of "unmistakable Anti-Slavery position" and "unceasing testimony against the sin" of Slavery, accords but ill with its past history. If once deserved, it long since ceased to be. Change after change has made the Discipline less and less stringent touching Slavery, till now, as is well known, some thousands of Slaveholders can sit easy under it. A history of the Discipline, published by the Church itself, says "all that related to Slaveholding among private members was struck out in 1808;" so that, for almost fifty years, the Church has not called Slavery a sin, or else has let its private members sin on unforbidden by its law.

The Minority Report urges, against the measures recommended by the other, that they conflict with the Constitution of the Church; the Discipline is as strongly Anti-Slavery "as the circumstances will allow;" the Church is accepted as opposed to Slavery, yet as regarding the State's authority; its practice under the Discipline is faithful and fruitful of good; increased stringency on Slavery would weaken the Church in the Slave States and on the border; this would retard emancipation, and endanger the Slaves' welfare; and it would not be expedient or just to force farther measures upon the border brethren, who went with the North in 1848, on the ground of the Discipline as it is.

The first recommendation of the Majority Report was lost for want of a two-thirds majority, having 121 of 216 votes. The remainder was rejected by 123 to 92. So the Conference refused to take a step toward a real "Anti-Slavery position."

At Auburn, New York, is published *The Northern Christian Advocate*, one of those weekly organs of which the Methodist Church has several in the country. For the last eight years it has been edited with marked ability by Rev. WILLIAM HOSMER, a zealous champion of reform in the Discipline. The General Conference appoints the editors of all the local organs, but the usage is to ratify the choice made by the delegates of each Annual Conference for its own paper. At the last General Conference, HOSMER was chosen almost or quite unanimously by the delegates of his Annual Conference, but his plainness of speech on Slavery had given offence in high places, and — it was said, by secret management, certainly somehow — a tame conservative was put into his place, and hurrying to Auburn, took the editorial chair in time to prevent his publishing the usual valedictory of a retiring editor. This caused intense excitement. A new paper promptly took the field, under the appropriate title of *Northern Independent*, with HOSMER for its editor, and has already achieved a cheering measure of success, and done good service in exposing the complicity of the Methodist Church North with Slavery. Its mere existence, constant memento of the occasion which gave it being, is an emphatic testimony, and not by any means the only one it bears, against the Anti-Slavery pretensions of that Church.

To give at once a notion of its tone, and a portion of the many facts which show the actual position of the Church, we quote some extracts from it. Alluding to the distinction in the Discipline between Slaveholding by private, and by official members, it declares that "as the Discipline now stands, Slaveholding in the ministry is the rule, Non-Slaveholding the exception. We let all preachers hold Slaves, if they will consent to be local and unordained. We will consent to ordain them, and let them travel, Slaveholders though they be, if wicked Slaveholders are disposed to make a law forbidding emancipation. * * * * There is nothing in the Discipline to prevent great numbers of ministers engaging in this abominable practice; or in the history of the Church to show that preachers have not availed themselves of the

absence of a statute against this sin. It is a well-known fact that many of our local preachers are Slaveholders. There never has been any objection to local preachers holding Slaves."

Again, "we have taken to ourselves quite too much credit for keeping Slaveholding out of the ministry. Had we, as a denomination, even succeeded in this thing, in some respectable degree, which we have not, the success would have been a standing reproach. * * * * * The distinction itself is a burlesque. We might just as well divide drunkenness into lay and clerical, prohibiting the latter and allowing the former. What if we were to deny our travelling ministers the right to steal—and so specify it in the book of Discipline! Such a prohibition would be ridiculous, nay monstrous, but not one whit more so than is our rule forbidding 'travelling preachers,' and them only, to hold Slaves. This act of prohibition shows what estimate we place upon the practice; we treat it as inexpedient, not as immoral."

The Baltimore Conference, perhaps the most influential one in the Methodist Church North, on the 18th of March, 1857, resolved, by 220 to 3, "That we highly deprecate the agitation of the Slavery question, which has already resulted to the great detriment of the political and religious interests of the country;" and by 197 to 14, "That, as heretofore, we will oppose with zeal any aggression which shall be attempted by the abolition agitators of the country."

The *Northern Christian Advocate*, under its new editor, published the Resolutions without a word of condemnation. The *Northern Independent* says, "We hope our brethren who have had the simplicity to believe that the Baltimore Conference is Anti-Slavery, will now cease from that delusion. It is, and has long been our conviction, that there is no class of men, South of Mason and Dixon's line, more ardently or hopelessly attached to Slavery than Methodist preachers. If other evidences in confirmation of this opinion were wanting, we might cite the fact, that in all political contests between Freedom and Slavery, they are invariably found on the side of Slavery. The clergy of that region never fail to go with the Slaveholding and Slavery-loving masses; they may be found, to a dead certainty, in the front rank of the enemies of Freedom." Yet for this they are none the less ministers in regular standing in the Methodist Church North,

and none the less entitled to recognition as such, and to all the privileges of their office, wherever, within the bounds of that Church, their lot may be cast. The Eastern New York Conference, which, at its last meeting, almost unanimously resolved that it "regards Slavery as a great moral and social evil, a violation of the natural rights of man, and opposed to the spirit and progress of the Christian religion; and will use all means that may with propriety be used by Christian ministers to effect its extirpation from the world;" and other Northern Conferences which have said the same in substance, must still accept this Baltimore Conference, with its Pro-Slavery clergy and Slaveholding membership, as, no less than themselves, a constituent portion of their Church. So that their Resolutions, such as that just quoted, have the force, without the merit, of confessions that the Church is in a false position on this question; for, without frankly saying so, they leave no room for any other conclusion. What may hereafter come of the effort now in progress to change this position for a better, time will show; but, till the change has actually been made, whatever credit may be due to individual members for their Anti-Slavery zeal and energy, we must continue to pronounce the Methodist Episcopal Church North, as a body, an important part of the great ecclesiastical "bulwark of Slavery."

Before closing our record of the action of the Churches, we gladly insert, as in marked contrast with its prevailing tenor, the substance of the Resolutions adopted by the Reformed Presbyterians, (Old School Covenanters,) at the meeting of their Synod, last June, in Philadelphia. They declare, "that Slavery is a sin against God, of the blackest character, to be held in utmost abhorrence; that nothing but the absolute impossibility of emancipation can rid Slaveholding of guilt; that the Constitution of the United States is one of the strongholds of Slavery, which, having gained a foothold in its compromises, has thereby elevated itself to its present place, as the paramount object of governmental protection and regard; that the only way to keep our skirts clear of this iniquity is to withhold all active support from the Constitution, and seek the formation of fundamental civil arrangements in accordance with God's Word and the rights of man; that this sin lies at the door of such Churches as admit Slaveholders to their pulpits and communion tables; that no Church is entirely free from it, which does not forbid its members

to give active support, by voting, holding office, or otherwise, to a Slaveholding Constitution; and that the ministry which refuses to exhibit the sin of Slaveholding, to warn Slaveholders, and testify against constitutions and laws favoring Slavery, is recreant to its trust, and hostile to human rights and religious liberty."

We also give, as indicating the position of a few of the smaller ecclesiastical bodies scattered over the North, the testimony borne by the Geauga County, (Ohio,) Baptist Convention—comprising ten churches—at its Annual Meeting, last September:—

"As followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, in our individual and church capacity, we declare that we will wash our hands from all guilt arising from a participation in this crime, [Slavery,] *by separating ourselves from all religious organizations and associations, who, morally, politically or religiously fraternize with Slaveholders, or their abettors, as Christians*, and would earnestly request the Churches of this Association not to receive any Church or individual, unless they occupy the same position with regard to Slavery that we do."

"We prove by the Scriptures that *Slavery* is a sin against God, and a wrong done to our neighbor, which calls for the action of the Church in a way of *having no fellowship* with this sum of all villanies, *nor with those ministers, Churches and missionary organizations who maintain an undignified silence* in regard to this overflowing evil, which is perverting the Gospel of Christ, and contradicting the *Fundamental Law* of Jesus."

MASSACHUSETTS DISUNION CONVENTION.

Among the noteworthy events of the past year was the holding of a State Convention in Massachusetts, under the following call:

We, the undersigned, citizens of Worcester, believing the result of the recent Presidential Election to involve four years more of Pro-Slavery Government, and a rapid increase in the hostility between the two sections of the Union:—

Believing this hostility to be the offspring, not of party excitement, but of a fundamental difference in education, habits and laws:—

Believing the existing Union to be a failure, as being a hopeless attempt to unite under one government two antagonistic systems of society, which diverge more widely with every year:—

And believing it to be the duty of intelligent and conscientious men to meet these facts with wisdom and firmness:—

Respectfully invite our fellow-citizens of Massachusetts to meet in Convention at Worcester, on Thursday, January 15, to consider the practicability, probability, and expediency of a Separation between the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

As was to have been expected, the Convention was made up mostly of those who, acting with the American Anti-Slavery Society or its auxiliaries, were already committed to the measure it was summoned to discuss; but with these came a few others, willing—in the words of one of them—to enroll themselves “among those who go for the Abolition of Slavery at the price of dissolution, if need be;” and bold or wise enough to defy or despise the obloquy which such a step would provoke. After three sessions spent in able and eloquent discussion of the subject, mostly but not wholly by the tried veterans of the Anti-Slavery cause, the following Resolutions were adopted; a State Committee, ordered in one of the Resolutions, was appointed, consisting of Rev. T. W. HIGGINSON, of Worcester, Hon. FRANCIS W. BIRD, of Walpole, and seven others; and the Convention adjourned.

Resolved, That the meeting of a State Disunion Convention, attended by men of various parties and affinities, gives occasion for a new statement of principles, and a new platform of action.

Resolved, That the cardinal American principle is now, as always, liberty; while the prominent fact is now, as always, Slavery.

Resolved, That the conflict between this principle of liberty and this fact of Slavery has been the whole history of the nation for fifty years; while the only result of this conflict has thus far been to strengthen both parties, and prepare the way for a yet more desperate struggle.

Resolved, That in this emergency, we can expect little or nothing from the South itself, because it is sinking deeper into barbarism every year;

Nor from a Supreme Court, which is always ready to invent new securities for Slaveholders;

Nor from a President, elected almost solely by Southern voters;

Nor from a Senate, which is permanently controlled by the Slave-Power;

Nor from a new House of Representatives, which, in spite of our agitation, will be more Pro-Slavery than the present one;

though the present one has at length granted all which Slavery asked ;

Nor from *political action*, as now conducted ; for the Republican leaders and presses freely admitted, in public and private, that the election of FREMONT was, politically speaking, "the last hope of Freedom." And even could the North cast a united vote in 1860, the South has before it four years of annexation previous to that time.

Resolved, That the fundamental difference between mere political action and the action we propose is this ; that the one requires the acquiescence of the Slave-Power, and the other only its opposition.

Resolved, That the necessity of disunion is written in the whole existing character and conditions of the two sections of the country—in their social organization, education, habits and laws—in the dangers of our white citizens in Kansas, and of our colored ones in Boston—in the wounds of CHARLES SUMNER, and the laurels of his assailant—and no government on earth was ever strong enough to hold together such opposing forces.

Resolved, That this movement does not seek merely disunion, but the more perfect union of the Free States, by the expulsion of the Slave States from the confederation, in which they have ever been an element of discord, danger and disgrace.

Resolved, That it is not probable that the ultimate severance of the Union will be an act of deliberation or discussion—but that a long period of deliberation and discussion must precede it ; and this we meet to begin.

Resolved, That henceforward, instead of regarding it as an objection to any system of policy, that it will lead to the separation of the States, we will proclaim that to be the highest of all recommendations, and the greatest proof of statesmanship ; and we will support, politically or otherwise, such men and measures as appear to tend most to this result.

Resolved, That by the repeated confession of Northern and Southern statesmen, "the existence of the Union is the chief guaranty of Slavery ;" and that the despots of the whole world have everything to fear, and the Slaves of the whole world everything to hope, from its destruction, and the rise of a free, Northern Republic.

Resolved, That the sooner the separation takes place, the more peaceful it will be ; but that peace or war is a *secondary consideration*, in view of our present perils. Slavery must be conquered, "peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must."

Resolved, That a State Committee of seven be appointed, whose duty it shall be, by means of conventions, tracts, newspapers and political or other organizations, public and private, to secure the efficient propagation of the doctrine and policy which this Convention proclaims.

Resolved, That we especially recommend the calling of a general Convention of the Free States during the current year.

Resolved, That the State Committee be instructed to prepare and issue, as soon as possible, an address to the people in behalf of our principles.

During the progress of the Convention, letters from prominent citizens of Massachusetts and other States, members of Congress, distinguished clergymen and others, in reply to invitations to be present, were read, entire or in part, and were subsequently published with the proceedings. Though all but one, (from FRANCIS JACKSON,) avowed continued adherence to the Union, yet all, with not more than one exception, treated the movement and its authors with such respect and courtesy, as, judged by the "Union-saving" standard, must amount to "moral treason," at the very least, not to say, must augur deadly peril to a Union whose value, we are told, it is so dangerous to "calculate." Indeed, in most of them were affirmations or admissions, of which the logical sequence would come little short of fully justifying the Disunionists. We copy some brief extracts.

AMASA WALKER, formerly Secretary of State of Massachusetts, says, "I am sick of so much cant about 'the Union.' I know perfectly well it is feigned and false; that those who indulge in it do so lest they should be themselves damned as 'Disunionists.' * * * * It is high time that this hypocritical bluster was silenced. * * * * The people of Massachusetts, I have the best reason to know, are quite ready to take the ground, *practically*, that they will have *Liberty and Union*, or no Union whatever. * * * * No one thing is so threatening to all our great interests as the blind idolatry which the press of the country pays to 'the Union;' nothing is so calculated to enslave the people, stupify the public conscience, and destroy all true manhood. * * * * The Union is a *means*, and not an *end*. * * * * The moment it ceases to promote the interests of Freedom, or becomes an engine of oppression, it should be at once and forever repudiated. I am a Union man, with all my heart and soul, and desire most anxiously that all the States of our Confederacy should remain together, provided the great ideas of the Declaration of Independence can be realized by it, *but certainly not otherwise*. How this can be done seems now, after all the demonstrations we

have had, more than problematical. Slavery and Freedom are irreconcilable antagonisms, that cannot, by any human possibility, co-exist. * * * * I am right glad somebody has had the courage to move in this matter. The spell must be broken, and those who have the hardihood to engage in such a work are the men to do it. * * * * Under the banner of Freedom I have hitherto fought, and under that banner, whether inscribed with Union or Disunion, I intend to fight to the last."

JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS says, "Amid all which has been said upon Slavery for the last five years, and the action of the Federal Government for its extension, it were impossible that reflecting men should have failed to consider the propriety of continuing the Union between our Free and Slave States; nor can we disguise the fact that Slavery and Freedom are opposites, and cannot well exist together." He recites the declaration of "our Republican fathers," that the people have a right to abolish any form of government, when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted; affirms, and brings facts to prove, that such is the character of the Federal Government; says that "even the Union formed by our fathers was long since abandoned, and a new Union formed with foreign Slaveholders, for the avowed purpose of extending and perpetuating Slavery," [by the annexation of Texas;] that "the people now hold the indisputable right to abolish this government, and that the further maintenance of it is purely a question of *policy*, not of duty." He thinks "we should remain in the Union, for the purpose of upholding and extending, not Slavery, but *Liberty*;" "maintain the Union *as it is*," and refuse "to form a new Union with the polygamists of Utah, or the Slaveholders of Cuba;" and endeavor "to restore the government to its original position in favor of Freedom." [But is not this "Union as it is," which he would have us maintain, the very "Union formed with foreign Slaveholders, to extend and perpetuate Slavery"? And if we maintain^o this now, what assurance can we have or give, that we shall not maintain also the *next* new Union which shall be formed, with a still larger infusion of the Slavery element in it?] He concludes with "thanks for the honor" of an invitation to the Convention.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, in a long letter, courteously argues against the policy of Disunion, but recognizes its advocates as fellow-workers in the common cause of freedom, "whose individual

character and purity of motive command" his "esteem;" and trusts that he has "said nothing in an offensive spirit, or which will render" him "liable to be misunderstood. This cause will never be aided by strife among its sincere upholders. There is room for all to work, even though they may not all join in one direction."

EDWARD WADE, member of Congress from Ohio, writes, "I do not admit that the Constitution, rightly and *honestly* construed, furnishes any guaranty for the existence, much less the extension of Slavery; but I do admit that the concession of such a power in the Constitution leaves us of the Free States no alternative but secession, or submission to Slaveholding domination. * * * * It requires but the patriotic unity of the Free States to rescue the Constitution from the hands of its violators. But this unity, it is said by croakers, will dissolve the Union. *Well, if so, then so be it;* for it is certain that the moral and physical necessities of free and Slave institutions do constitute irreconcilable contradictions. * * * * The institutions of the two sections must become homogeneous, or a separation is inevitable. * * * * I can concur with your assertion, that 'the existing Union is a failure.' * * * * I believe the agitation of active measures for a dissolution of the Union is, at best, premature. * * * * The agitation of the Slave question is needful, and, in my opinion, better for the cause, taking human nature as it is, than to attempt a step so startling as a proposition to dissolve the Union. * * * * *Still, no one can say how soon this step may be needed, to save us all from the dishonor and crime of sustaining Slavery. For rather than give the strength, moral and political, of the people of the Free States to the extension and perpetuity of Slavery, let the Union perish.*"

GEORGE R. RUSSELL does "not think the time has come for the North to formally propose a dissolution of the Union," * * * believing "elements are in operation which will crumble Slavery into dust, and better they should work silently, than that their action should be anticipated by extraneous influences." But he adds, "if I am wrong in this supposition, if there is no other hope for the overthrow of that infernal tyranny, than an utter dissolution of the compact which holds these States in confederacy, the sooner it is resorted to, the better it will be for us and our children. * * * * Whether this is, or is not, the time for the North to agitate the question of separation, it certainly has abundant reason to justify itself in so doing. While I have strong doubts as to the present expediency of

the measure, I honor those who, feeling the necessity, come forward as pioneers. That many will keep aloof, who secretly exult in the movement, may be expected from the experience of all past time. That others will condemn, with the accustomed routine of holy horror, which is always expended on proposed reforms, is as natural as the disney of true believers at the desecration of their idol. * * * * It is not surprising that some should think it time to weigh the value of the Union, * * * * when the whole land is governed by a petty band of Slaveholders, who are turning what should be a great and glorious nation into a disgraceful and appalling despotism. * * * * Those who whine about the Union, and assure us that in no possible event can there be a separation of the States, mistake the signs of the times, or are deplorably ignorant of the character of their countrymen. * * * * When the Union becomes hopelessly worthless, involving us in constant shame and degradation, it can be, ought to be, and will be broken up."

O. W. ALBEE, member of the Massachusetts Senate, says, "Respecting as I do all men who act up to their convictions of duty, however they may differ from my own, it would give me pleasure to be present at your discussions. * * * * If the Union cannot stand the practical working of the truths enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, it seems to me its value has been calculated." He does not "believe the triumph of freedom requires the dissolution of the Union," but adds, "whether it does or not, * * * * let freedom be preserved to Kansas, at all hazards." [And why "freedom to Kansas," more than a clear conscience, and hands unsoiled with the Slave's blood, to Massachusetts and the whole North?]

REV. HENRY M. DEXTER, of Boston, looks forward "to a separation of the Free from the Slave States as an event that is very possible, and that ought to be consented to by all good men, in preference to perpetual subjection to the Slave Power;" but does "not see that the time has come to despair of a delivery from those grievous evils which now exist, without a resort to that last remedy."

REV. DR. BELLOWS, of New York, "respectfully declines" the invitation of the Convention; calls the Disunionists "a conscientious and intelligent body," but differs from them in opinion; is "far from advocating separation," but maintains "the duty of resisting the extension of Slavery, be the consequences to the Union what they

will; * * * * thinking Disunion, if forced upon us by the withdrawal of the South, a more supportable calamity than" it has been represented; and believes this "to be the safe, Christian, patriotic Union-saving ground."

Professor STOWE, reflecting "that the deterrained, aggressive Slaveholders are probably less than 150,000 against more than 20,000,000 of people;" seeing the "wonderful progress made in the last twenty-five years in enlightening our citizens in regard to Slavery and its aggressions;" and expecting "the next five years to do more than all the past twenty-five;" thinks it wise "to hold on and vote, and help the 20,000,000 turn the 150,000 with their corruptions out of the house, (which they had no business ever to occupy,) and not allow the 150,000 to turn out the 20,000,000, to whom the whole belongs. One or the other," he adds, "I admit, *must be done*, and that soon."

Of all the letters received, the only one expressing regret at the call of the Convention, or predicting evil from it, was Senator WILSON'S. His regret, he says, was "sincere and profound," and he declares, in a somewhat *ex-cathedra* tone, that "this movement can only be productive of evil." With the American people, "the preservation of the Union is a duty imposed alike by interest and patriotism." He has "no sympathy and can have no connection with any movement which contemplates a dissolution of the Union. The logic of the head and the logic of the heart teach" him "to regard all such movements in the North or the South as *crimes* against liberty." All which, with more of kindred character, we will not call, in WALKER'S words of manly scorn, "cant about the Union, indulged in for fear of being damned as a Disunionist;" or, in the language of RUSSELL, "the accustomed routine of holy horror always expended on proposed reforms," and "as natural as the dismay of true believers at the desecration of their idol;" nor will we say that the super-serviceable zeal for the Union, displayed in the letter, or its *rather* strong denunciation of an honest use of free thought and free speech in a particular direction, is due to its being dated in the United States Senate Chamber. Remarkable coincidences have happened before now, and may happen again. But we do not feel bound to forget that Senator WILSON, when contending, in his electioneering speeches, that the triumph of his party will not drive the South into dissolving the Union, argues that the Union is a safeguard to Slavery, and that without its aid and protection the

system could not be long sustained. How it should be a "crime against liberty" to seek the overthrow of a strong defence of Slavery, perhaps he can explain,—to his own satisfaction, if not to ours.

As to the results of the Convention, if they amount to no more than calling out, from such men as we have named, the public avowals we have quoted; and giving, as it evidently has done, fresh stimulus to that agitation which is so essential to the progress of reform; the labor, expense and opprobrium incurred in holding it, have by no means been incurred in vain.

HUMBOLDT'S PROTEST.

We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of recording here a recent Anti-Slavery testimony from one whose name is as profoundly revered as it is widely known,—the venerable patriarch of science, Baron HUMBOLDT. In 1826, he published an essay on Cuba, devoting one chapter to the Slavery of that Island. In 1856, an American, named THRASHER, translated the work into English, omitting the chapter on Slavery. Against this mutilation, HUMBOLDT, on hearing of it, promptly protested.

"I owe it," he says, "to a moral feeling which is as lively in me now as it was in 1826, publicly to complain that, in a work which bears my name, the entire seventh chapter, with which my essay ended, has been arbitrarily omitted. To this very portion of my work, *I attach more importance* than to any astronomical observations, experiments of magnetic intensity, or statistical statements. It is the duty of the traveller who has been an eye-witness of all the torments inflicted by a system which degrades human nature, to cause the complaints of the unfortunate victims to reach those whose duty it is to relieve them. I have repeated, in this treatise, the fact, that the ancient legislation of Spain, on the subject of Slavery, was less inhuman and atrocious than that of the Slave States on the American continent, north or south of the equator.

"Steady advocate, as I am, of the most unfettered expression of opinion, in speech or writing, I should never have thought of complaining, if I had been attacked on account of my statements; but I do think I am entitled to demand that, in the Free States of the continent of America, the people should be allowed to read what has been permitted to circulate, from the first year of its appearance, in a Spanish translation."

OBITUARY.

Since its last meeting, this Society has suffered a serious loss, by the death of one of its former Presidents, and most faithful and useful members, LINDLEY COATES, of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, who died on the 3d of June, 1856. He was one of the earliest, ablest, most devoted friends of Freedom in Pennsylvania. As early as 1827, he repudiated gradualism, and began to advocate immediate emancipation as the Slave's right and the master's duty, maintaining earnestly and persistently the doctrine of the essential, inherent immorality of Slaveholding. In 1829, he prepared a petition for the immediate Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, and obtained from a thousand to fifteen hundred signatures to it. In the fall of 1832, more than a year before the formation of this Society, he aided in organizing the Clarkson Anti-Slavery Society, made up of residents of the adjacent borders of Lancaster and Chester Counties, and, ever since its formation, one of the most efficient local Anti-Slavery associations of the country. For several years, he was accustomed, in company with his warm personal friend and every way worthy associate, THOMAS WHITSON, to hold public debates with the adversaries of our cause in that region; and, though encountered often by men much superior to them in opportunities for intellectual culture, men of the "learned professions," and others, they achieved such a uniform series of victories as at length drove all opponents from the field, and constrained them, so far as that mode of warfare is concerned, to "sheathe their swords for lack of argument." In 1837, he yielded to the urgent solicitation of his fellow-citizens, and permitted them to put him into the Convention which in that year framed a new Constitution for Pennsylvania; and, of course, was one—and among the most determined—of the minority which manfully resisted the base, unjust, despotic act, whereby the colored citizens of that Commonwealth were robbed of their political rights. This, we believe, was his last participation in political life. He early accepted, firmly held and ably defended the sentiments promulgated by this Society, in regard to political action under a Pro-Slavery Constitution, and membership in a Pro-Slavery Union.

He was a man of great simplicity of character, sterling integrity,

a sedate temper, and quiet, unassuming manners; alike modest, firm, and self-possessed; a model of equanimity, and, if less demonstrative than many, yet of deep and earnest feelings, and a steady, equable, genial warmth of heart; strong in his attachments, a faithful friend, an instructive and agreeable companion, amiable and exemplary in all the relations of private life. His mind was of unusual vigor and strictest logical accuracy; his views, on all the great questions of the day, clear and decided; he was quick to see, and prompt to embrace, the truth; and few had more skill than he in detecting and exposing the fallacies of error. Though his educational advantages and literary attainments were limited, he was moderately well read, and more than commonly well informed; and, without being a fluent speaker, his high order of reasoning powers gave him great strength in debate, which made him—as will have been inferred from what we have related above—a formidable opponent; and secured him an enviable distinction among the early champions of the Anti-Slavery cause.

His house was ever a shelter for fugitives from bondage, and the resort of Abolitionists in general, and Anti-Slavery lecturers in particular, whom he took great pleasure in entertaining and conferring with, and assisting in their work. His memory will be warmly cherished in grateful hearts, by those whose field of labor included his abode, and brought them within reach of his cordial hospitality and prompt and generous coöperation.

His reputation was not confined to his native State; but he was known and appreciated by the friends of the cause throughout the country. In 1840, when the "New Organization" schism took place in New York, he was chosen President of this Society, and filled the office creditably and satisfactorily till, upon his resignation, the present incumbent was elected to take his place.

He died as he lived, a true friend of Freedom, and his name will be preserved in the history of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, as that of one of its most worthy and efficient champions.

NOTE.—The completion of this Report having been unexpectedly delayed beyond the close of the succeeding year, it has been deemed best to put into one Statement the details of the Society's operations;—Lectures of Agents, Tract publication, &c.—for both years. They will accordingly be found at the close of the Report for 1857-8.

REPORT FOR 1857-8.

[The close of another year calls on the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society for its Annual Statement of the Society's operations, together with a brief sketch of the general Anti-Slavery history of the year.]

KANSAS.

The affairs of Kansas continue to claim a prominent place in the history of the Anti-Slavery cause. Our last Report mentioned the appointment of ROBERT J. WALKER, as Governor of the Territory. Though it was accepted in the latter part of March, he did not enter on its duties till near the end of May, his Secretary, STANTON, (like himself, a Southern man,) acting for him in the mean time. His Inaugural Address, delivered on the 27th of May, and his speeches at Topeka and other places, made promises as fair as could well be coupled with the assumption, as a matter of course, that the Border Ruffian government and legislation were legitimate; but that assumption, by putting him at once on the side of the wrong-doers, and embodying in his policy the very essence of the wronged one, rendered it impossible for him to be thoroughly impartial and just.

The first important measure, under his administration, was the election, June 15th, of delegates to the Convention ordered by the Ruffian Legislature, for framing a State Constitution. The Governor and his Secretary did their utmost to induce the Free State

met to vote at that election, but they firmly adhered to their deliberate resolution not to do so; knowing that, as had been expected, the preliminaries had all been carefully arranged to ensure their defeat, and that their voting would be hailed as an endorsement of the authority by which the Convention was called, and as committing them beforehand to its action, whatever that should be. The manner in which the Registry of voters had been made out, may be understood from such facts as these, attested by a Kansas correspondent of the New York press:—"When the Registry was completed, it was notorious that a large majority of the names on it were those of Pro-Slavery men, while *not one-sixth* of the Free State men were registered! The strongest and most populous Free State districts had no Registry at all. The new town of Quindaro was not visited by a bogus census-taker, but the citizens made up and certified a list of one hundred and sixty-one legal electors, sending the names, three of whom were Buchanan and Walker men. *Those three were inscribed on the Registry, and all the rest omitted!* And it was very much like this throughout Kansas." No census-taker was seen in the majority of the Free State settlements, while in others only a fraction of the Free State men were enrolled. No delegates were even apportioned to a majority of the Free State Counties. "Two-thirds of the delegates were allotted to that one-third of the population among whom the Pro-Slavery party expected, by means of its fraudulent Registry, and its entire control of the ballot boxes, to prevail." Having, thus, no shadow of inducement to commit the folly and inconsistency of practically admitting the legitimacy of the proposed Convention, if the Free State men had been beguiled by WALKER and STANTON into such a trap without bait, as was openly set for them, they would truly have justified some doubt of their fitness for self-government. But their quiet refusal to be so caught, forced the Pro-Slavery party to expose its own weakness, and reveal anew the truth that Kansas was governed not by its own people, but by Federal bayonets, supporting a most flagrant usurpation. Though even the defective Registry of the usurpers showed a list of nine thousand voters, and a census taken a few weeks later under direction of the Free State Legislature made the number more than twenty thousand, yet less than two thousand votes were cast at the election, and three hundred of these, it is said, came from Missouri. Of course, the Convention chosen under such circum-

stances was unanimously Pro-Slavery, but that was deemed a small matter compared with the overwhelming demonstration that it did not represent the people of the Territory.

On the 15th and 16th of July, a Free State Convention was held at Topeka, "the largest and most earnest ever held," up to that time, in the Territory. It resolved "that the Topeka Constitution and the State Government originated in a public necessity; that subsequent events had proved the wisdom and justice of the movement; that Congress would consult the wishes of a large majority of the inhabitants of Kansas, by immediately admitting her as a State under the Topeka Constitution; that the Free State men of Kansas deny the validity of the Territorial Legislature and its enactments, and recognize it as the creature of fraud and violence; that the recent vote for Delegates to a Constitutional Convention has demonstrated to the world that the Pro-Slavery faction is a 'miserable minority' of the people of Kansas; that an attempt to frame a Constitution by delegates thus elected would be a gross outrage upon the people, and that the admission of Kansas under a Constitution so framed, unless first submitted to a fair vote of the *bona fide* residents, would be an act of injustice and despotism so flagrant and alarming, as to justify her people in a resort to the extremest measures for the protection of their rights."

It voted to re-submit the Topeka Constitution to the people, on the first Monday in August, and nominated a candidate to be voted for on the same day for Representative in Congress under the State organization. It took preliminary steps also for participation, by the Free State men, in the next *Territorial* election; reciting Governor WALKER'S repeated public declaration that "in October next, *not* under the act of the late Territorial Legislature, but under the laws of Congress, you, the *whole people* of Kansas, have a right to elect a Delegate to Congress, and to elect a Territorial Legislature," and claiming that "under this decision, 'the whole people of Kansas' may participate in an election for Delegate to Congress, and for members of the Territorial Legislature, without recognizing the validity of a Bogus Legislature imposed upon them by fraud and force."

At the August election provided for by this Convention, the Topeka Constitution was ratified by more than ten thousand votes, though none voted who had been less than six months in the Territory. As the other party did not vote, not recognizing the elec-

tion as legal, the Free State candidate for Congress was of course unanimously chosen.

Meanwhile, Lawrence had been for some weeks undergoing a sort of siege by the United States troops, under the Governor's command; and had been declared in a state of open rebellion, because it had organized a City Government on a charter of its own framing, instead of accepting that enacted for it by the Ruffian Legislature. As, however, the citizens only laughed at the Governor's military demonstration, and kept quietly about their business as if it had not been made, he at length grew tired of the folly, and found some pretext for withdrawing the troops; and the "rebellious" City Government continued to discharge its functions, unmolested. About the same time, the Free State men were temporarily annoyed by a renewal of persecution under the forms of law;—indictments and arrests for treason, and the like. More than a hundred indictments, it is said, were found by the sham Grand Jury, against men living in and near Lawrence, and many arrests were made; the proceedings being conducted with an evident design to provoke the people to some outbreak which might be made the pretext for yet grosser outrages. But the prudence of the Free State men baffled the design, and the prosecutions accomplished nothing but a brief vexation. On the 18th of August, Governor ROBINSON was brought to trial for usurpation of office, and on the 26th, the telegraph brought news of his acquittal. The *New York Tribune* says, "It is evident, from the account which our correspondent gives of the trial, that every out-door arrangement in the way of packing a jury and otherwise—the jury being composed entirely of Lecompton men—had been made to secure a conviction, on which, as is evident from the whole atrocious course of his ruling, Judge CATO had set his heart. Nevertheless, as we have learned by telegraph, Governor ROBINSON was acquitted."

This seems to have been due to the fact, that to convict him of usurping office would have been an admission of the existence of such an office as he claimed to hold,—that of Governor of the *State of Kansas*;—and to admit this would be to concede the illegality of the Territorial Government. Hence the jury, however desirous to convict, chose rather to acquit, than by conviction to deny their own authority to try the case, as well as the legality of the government under which they acted.

In September, the Pro-Slavery Convention for framing a Constitution met at Lecompton, and, after organizing, adjourned to await the result of the October Territorial Election, which, it was manifest, would be resolutely contested by the Free State party. On both sides diligent preparation was making for the contest. The Free State men, besides nominating candidates and conducting a spirited canvass, organized the militia, to protect the polls, in case of another armed invasion. The Pro-Slavery party sought success by their accustomed means, fraudulent votes on their own side and disfranchisement of rightful voters on the other. They insisted that the "Territorial Law" should govern the election, and to evade WALKER'S promise, on which the Free State men relied, their organs interpolated an important word, making it read, "not ONLY under the Act of the late Territorial Legislature but under the laws of Congress." They claimed, and published a written opinion of their ready tool, Judge CATO, to support the claim, that "payment of a Territorial Tax" was "an indispensable pre-requisite to the right to vote" at the approaching election; well knowing that the Free State men would not pay the tax lest it should be construed to imply a recognition of the Government imposing it. A most shamelessly unjust apportionment of Representatives among the several districts was made, giving *three* Representatives to nineteen Counties almost wholly peopled by Free State men, and containing nearly half the population of the Territory; and *thirty-six* to fourteen Counties which contained the chief Pro-Slavery strength, and, bordering on Missouri, were open to easy intrusion from that State.

Governor WALKER and his Secretary were severely, and we think justly, blamed for this gross iniquity. The duty of apportioning the Representatives had been assigned to them by the Territorial Statute, with a proviso that, if they failed to do it, it should be done by the presiding officers of the two branches of the "Territorial Legislature." Designedly or otherwise, culpably in either case, they *did* neglect the duty, and it fell into the hands of the Border Ruffian officials, who performed it exactly as was to have been expected.

However, in the face of all these difficulties, the Free State men went into the election, and triumphed. As in voting for Delegate to Congress, the whole Territory was but one district, and local frauds could not materially affect the result, the majority for their candidate was too strong to be even questioned. But the choice of

the Territorial Legislature gave scope for Border Ruffian tactics, and a desperate attempt was made to secure, by false returns, a majority which even fraudulent voting failed to obtain. The unfair apportionment had made it possible for the vote of Johnson County, shrewdly manipulated, to turn the scale; and by making a majority there, large enough to overbalance the strong Free State majority of Douglas County, (joined with it to form one district,) the Ruffians could control the Legislature. The Free State majority of Douglas County was nearly fifteen hundred, while Johnson County had less than two hundred legal voters in all, and Missouri sent over hardly more than enough *volunteer* electors to double that number; but Pro-Slavery audacity was adequate to the occasion. The poll-book was filled with names gathered wherever they could be most readily found, whole pages of the Cincinnati Directory being copied into it bodily, the names of SALMON P. CHASE, HORACE GREELEY, and other distinguished Republicans, figuring as voters for the Pro-Slavery candidates; and a so-called "official return" was made, giving those candidates more than sixteen hundred majority, in the single precinct of Oxford, in which there were but sixty or seventy legal voters, at most. The returns from M'Gee County were but little less atrocious. Other frauds, but less audacious, were perpetrated in other border counties; some, it is said, with the connivance of WALKER himself. At Kickapoo, where he was present on the day of election, it was known that many Missourians had come to vote, and WALKER was applied to, to prevent them. He not only failed to do so, but, it is stated, he told the United States soldiers who were there, to vote; which they did, "in violation of a law of Congress;" and a Pro-Slavery majority of five hundred was obtained, in a town of about two hundred legal voters. But the Oxford and M'Gee frauds were too glaring and monstrous to be safely tolerated. At the earnest protest of prominent citizens of Kansas, the false returns were rejected and certificates of election were given to the Free State candidates. This act of justice would entitle the Governor to more credit, if his course in other instances had proved that principle, not policy, prompted it. But, apparently to keep the Free State Legislative majority below two-thirds, and so within control by his veto, we find him giving the election in Lynn County to the Pro-Slavery candidates, in the face of a Free State majority of legitimate votes, by rejecting the return of the strongest Free State precinct in that county, on account of some trifling irregularity

in the proceedings of the Pro-Slavery judges of election ; while he received and sanctioned the return of a notoriously fraudulent Pro-Slavery majority in Marshall County, though—besides the fraud—it was “as irregular on its face as any return sent to the Secretary’s office.” But all his services to the Slave Power could not atone for his interference to defeat the Oxford villany ; and from this time it was evident that he had lost favor at Washington, and that his official life would be of short continuance.

Having lost command of the Territorial Legislature, the Ruffians now rested their hopes on their Constitutional Convention. It met in the latter part of October, and finally adjourned in November ; having finished its work in a manner deserving the warmest approval of the master it served. With the coolest effrontery it assumed to represent and act for the people of Kansas, who had so often, so emphatically, and in so many ways denied its legitimacy, and shown their abhorrence of its character and purposes. It framed a Constitution which declares that “the right of property is before and higher than any Constitutional sanction, and the right of the owner of a Slave to such Slave and its increase is the same and as inviolable as the right to any property whatever ;” thus *assuming* that Slavery is right and legal, at the outset, instead of needing to be made so ; and adopting, in its most odious form, and to its utmost extreme, the impious doctrine of property in man. It provides that the Legislature shall have no power to emancipate Slaves without their owner’s consent, or the payment of a full equivalent for them in advance ; and no power to prevent emigrants from bringing with them their Slave property, except such Slaves as have committed high crimes in other States or Territories ; but it may permit owners of Slaves to emancipate them, saving rights of creditors, and preventing them from becoming a public charge ; and may oblige owners to treat their Slaves with humanity, feed and clothe them properly, and abstain from injuries to them extending to life or limb ; and for neglect to comply with such requirements may have the Slaves sold for the owner’s benefit. It provides that Slaves prosecuted for crimes higher than petit larceny shall have a jury trial ; and that malicious dismemberment or killing of a Slave shall be punished as would be that of a free white person, except in case of insurrection by such Slave. As first reported, it limited the elective franchise, in terms, to “white citizens,” but “white” was stricken out, on the ground of

the DRED SCOTT decision, that there can be no colored citizens of the United States. It re-enacts all the Pro-Slavery laws of the usurping Legislature, and provides for the immediate displacing of the Territorial Government, establishing in its stead a "Provisional Government" to be administered by the President of the Convention, as "Regent;" and for superseding the lately chosen Free State Territorial Legislature by a *State* Legislature to be elected on the 4th of January, 1858, under the auspices of the "Regent," CALHOUN; who was to appoint the receivers of votes, count them, decide who are elected, and give them their credentials.

The Convention refused to submit the Constitution to the people for their acceptance or rejection, but made a false show of submitting the provision in regard to Slavery, in such a way, however, that every vote upon it, whether for or against the provision, must be a vote for the Constitution. The voting was to be done on the 21st of December, with ballots inscribed, "The Constitution with Slavery," or "The Constitution without Slavery." And voting the latter does not exclude Slavery;—at most only leaves the Legislature free to forbid the bringing in of more Slaves, while those already in the Territory, and their natural increase, are guaranteed to their "owners" by another provision, which must be accepted even by the vote for "The Constitution without Slavery." And finally, to make sure of time enough for Slavery to be firmly rooted in the soil, it was provided that the Constitution should not be altered for seven years.

The Free State men, intensely excited, took prompt measures of counteraction. They urged the Governor, and when, soon after, he left the Territory, they pressed the Secretary, acting in his stead, to call a session of the Territorial Legislature, to act as the emergency required. A written request, signed by a majority of the members of both branches of the Legislature, pledging themselves to confine their action at the called session to the defeating of the Lecompton villany, seconded the popular demand. The Secretary, after some hesitation, complied, convinced that refusal would endanger the public peace, and the Legislature was summoned to meet on the 7th of December. Meanwhile, on the 3d of December, a Convention of Free State delegates, larger than any of its predecessors, met at Lawrence, and passed Resolutions "utterly repudiating the Lecompton Constitution," and pledging themselves "NEVER to permit it, so framed, and NOT SUBMITTED,"

to be the organic law of Kansas;" denouncing the proposed elections under it as crimes against the peace of the Territory; declaring the Legislature chosen in October to be the only legitimate Territorial law-making body ever elected in Kansas, and not to be superseded by any Constitution till a fair vote shall be taken thereon; reindorsing the Topeka Constitution as expressing the wishes of a majority of the people; and asking the Territorial Legislature to frame, at its approaching extra session, an impartial election law, and, under it, submit the Topeka and Lecompton Constitutions to a vote of the people, and provide that the one which shall receive a majority of legal votes shall become the fundamental law of the State of Kansas.

The course of the Lecompton Convention set Governor WALKER at open antagonism with the ultra Pro-Slavery party, and brought to a crisis his alienation from the President. He had all along advocated the submission of the Constitution to the people; had, indeed, as he affirms, accepted his office, (at the President's urgent solicitation,) on the express condition that he should do so; was pledged to the people to use his influence to attain that end; and had said, in his inaugural address, "I cannot doubt that the Convention, after having framed a State Constitution, will submit it for ratification or rejection by a majority of the then actual, *bona fide* resident settlers of Kansas." The Convention had not only acted in contempt of his declared wishes and urgent representations, but had attempted to set him entirely aside by the creation of its despotic "Regency." Turning to the President, he found his hope of support, in that quarter, disappointed, and the promises on which it rested, worthless. The President, it is said, originally intended to sustain him, and, in a letter to him, said, "*Let Georgia and Alabama and Mississippi howl, I will stand by you;*" but, in the event, the howling was too terrible for the Presidential nerves, and his first policy was abandoned. So when WALKER went to Washington, denouncing the Lecompton scheme as "an outrage on the people of Kansas, and a shameless violation of all the principles of free government;" and declaring that the attempt to force the abhorred Constitution upon Kansas would produce rebellion and civil war; he found the President already gone over to the Ruffians, approving the course of their Convention, and insisting that he was bound to sustain its action. Finding himself thus deserted, WALKER, on the fifteenth of December, resigned his office, adding another name to

the list of victims sacrificed in the vain endeavors of the Slave Power to match the hardihood of its agents with the atrocity of its work. STANTON, the acting Governor in WALKER'S absence, had sealed his own doom, by the unpardonable sin of calling together the Territorial Legislature, to oppose the schemes of the usurpers, and soon suffered the penalty of removal. But his removal could not invalidate his previous official act. The Legislature had been duly summoned, and on the day appointed it met; when, for the first time in Kansas, all the forms of law were joined with the substance of right in legislative proceedings. An act was passed, submitting the Leecompton Constitution to a vote of the people, to be given on the fourth of January, 1858; and another—after the popular judgment had been rendered—forbidding, on pain of death, the attempt to put that Constitution in force; also, an act taking the militia from the control of the Governor, and an act providing for the holding of a Convention to frame a new Constitution.

On the assembling of Congress, in December, the President, in his Message, fully endorsed the action of the Leecompton Convention; admitting, however, that he had expected the Constitution to be submitted entire to the people, but contending that the Kansas-Nebraska Act *required* nothing, except the Slavery question, to be so submitted, and therefore the Convention had done all that law or justice demands, in submitting that. The election (of Dec. 21st,) “will be held,” he said, “under legitimate authority, and if any portion of the inhabitants shall refuse to vote, a fair opportunity to do so having been presented, this will be their own voluntary act, and they alone will be responsible for the consequences.” He affirmed that “every citizen will have an opportunity of expressing his opinion” whether Kansas shall be a Free or a Slave State, but added, in another paragraph, “Should the Constitution without Slavery be adopted by the votes of the majority, the rights of property in Slaves, now in the Territory, are reserved;” and goes on to assert and argue the justice of this provision, and that it would be “gross injustice to confiscate the property in Slaves already in the Territory.” That is, Slavery is to continue in Kansas, in any event, as long as the Slaveholders now there, and their “heirs and assigns,” choose to continue it.

As to the alleged opportunity of every citizen to express his opinion, its value may be better estimated in the light of the following extract from the President's organ, the *Washington Union*.

“The Democratic conservative portion of the country will regard as the people of Kansas, only such as are now uniting to frame a form of government in accordance with the provisions of law, and not those who are seeking to paralyze the popular will by illegal subterfuges and the quibbles of fanaticism.” But many even of the President’s own political faith recoiled from such open and glaring villany as he commended to them; and a wide schism in the party made “Democrat” no longer a sufficiently distinctive term; and added the prefixes, “Lecompton” and “Anti-Lecompton,” to the party nomenclature. Through the party, in and out of Congress, the line of division ran, and some of its most prominent members and influential presses denounced with emphasis, and opposed with energy, the Kansas policy of the Administration they had so lately helped with all their might to put into power.

In the Senate, the Message elicited a warm debate; and foremost among the assailants of its views of Kansas matters was Senator DOUGLAS; who, if he failed to make quite evident his own consistency, or to induce a very general and devout faith in his purity of motive, was at least effective in exposing the iniquity and impolicy of the measure he condemned.

The solemn admonition of the President proving of no avail to bring the Free State party to the polls on the 21st of December, the voting for the Constitution, “with” or “without Slavery,” was left entirely to the Pro-Slavery men of Kansas and their Missouriian allies. Together they mustered 6,700 votes, of which 6,140 were for the Constitution with Slavery. Of these, there is abundant evidence that at least one-half were fraudulent, but where the whole process was one continuous fraud, this is a matter of little moment. At the election of the 4th of January, under the act of the Territorial Legislature, the result, as officially declared, by Governor DENVER, STANTON’S successor in office, was, *for* the Constitution, 162, (*with* Slavery, 138; *without*, 24;) — *against* the Constitution, 10,226.

On the question of participating in the election held on the same day for State officers and a Legislature under the Lecompton Constitution, the Free State party was divided; a majority opposing, but a large minority thinking it better, by electing their own men, to keep control of the Government, if Congress *should* ratify the Lecompton Constitution. They accordingly nominated men pledged, if elected, and that Constitution should be approved by Congress,

to adopt and execute immediate measures for enabling the people, through a new Constitutional Convention, to obtain such a Constitution as the majority shall approve;" and in spite of desperate attempts,—in which the Governor of Missouri was implicated,—to cheat them out of their victory by illegal votes and false returns, they elected a large majority of their candidates. Regent CALHOUN delayed for a long time the official announcement of this result, with evident design to return the candidates of his own party, or to use his power of controlling the result, as a means of influencing the vote in Congress on the Lecompton Constitution. But the notoriety of the material facts,—attested, too, by his own Pro-Slavery subordinates,—and the pressure of public opinion, and possibly other causes less obvious, at length constrained him to make a true return.

On the second of February, the President sent to Congress the Lecompton Constitution, urging its acceptance, in a Message so compactly filled with falsehood as to the history of Kansas and its Free State people, that it would scarcely be hyperbole to call it one solid lie. Making no allusion to the multiplied frauds and violent outrages of the Pro-Slavery party, and treating the Free State men as rebels against the Federal Government and law, it presented the Constitution as a fair and legal expression of the popular will in Kansas, and assumed that admitting Kansas to the Union as a Slave State would put an end to agitation, or at least confine it to that State; while it would also be the shortest way to enable the people there to get rid of Slavery, if such is their wish. The Message awakened much excitement in both Houses, and was strongly denounced by the friends of freedom. In the Senate, it was referred to the Territorial Committee, well known to be thoroughly Pro-Slavery. In the House, after an earnest struggle, the Republicans and Anti-Lecompton Democrats uniting, defeated, by *one* majority—114 to 113—a motion to refer to the Territorial Committee; and carried, by three majority—114 to 111—a reference to a Select Committee of thirteen, to be appointed by the Speaker, with instructions "to inquire into all the facts connected with the formation of said Constitution," "what portion, if any, of the votes cast" for it "were illegal," and "whether it is acceptable to a majority of the legal voters of Kansas." The folly of trusting to a Slaveholder's honor where the interests of Slavery are involved, was soon made manifest in consequence of giving the appointment of this Com-

mittee to Speaker ORR. In defiance of all parliamentary usage, the Speaker gave a majority of the Committee to those who were hostile to the purpose for which it was raised: selecting, moreover, the ablest men of their party; and composed the minority, favorable to the object sought, mainly of men by no means distinguished among their fellows for ability or influence. The majority, of course, refused to make the proposed investigation, and in a few days voted to report in favor of admitting Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution.

On the fifteenth of March, the Senate had a warm contest on the question, and continued in session all night. The Southern senators exhibited their usual insolence, but the Republicans succeeded in forcing a postponement of the vote till the 23d. On that day the Senate passed—33 to 25—the bill for admitting Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution; after having rejected—34 to 25—a substitute offered by CRITTENDEN, of Kentucky, providing that the Constitution be submitted to the people, and, if approved by them, the President to admit Kansas by proclamation; if rejected, the people to call a Convention and frame a Constitution. The bill went to the House and on the 1st of April was brought to a vote there. CRITTENDEN'S substitute, somewhat modified, was adopted by 120 to 112; the Republicans reluctantly accepting it as the only means of securing union with the Anti-Lecompton men of other parties; though it was distasteful to them, as a seeming abandonment of the ground they had hitherto occupied, in opposition to every measure tainted with the Border Ruffian frauds. They claimed, however, to be justified by the necessity of the case, and the perfect certainty that the Lecompton Constitution would be promptly voted down as soon as it should be sent to the people of Kansas.

While these things were doing at Washington, the people of Kansas had elected the Convention authorized by the Territorial Legislature, and the Convention had met at Leavenworth and framed a Free State Constitution, which had been accepted by a popular vote. It was in the main the old Topeka Constitution, but with some improvement. It permitted colored persons to vote on the question of its adoption, but, with a still lingering inconsistency, provided for subsequently referring the question of colored suffrage to a vote of the people.

On the 8th of April, the Lecompton bill, as amended by the House, came back from the Senate with a message of non-concurrence in the amendment. The House voted to adhere, 119 to 111. The Senate asked a Committee of Conference, and on the 14th, by the defection of four Anti-Lecompton Democrats, and the Speaker's casting vote, a Conference was granted. The Speaker took care so to constitute the Committee, on the part of the House, that Slavery should rule it. To represent the Anti-Lecompton sentiment, he appointed, not the choice of the Anti-Lecompton members, but ENGLISH, of Indiana, a man already distrusted by many of his associates, and whose subsequent course left scarce a doubt that he had joined them only to betray their cause when the treason would be most effective. That time had now come. He proposed in the Committee, and procured to be reported to the House, a "plan of compromise," which, to the essential iniquity of the original Lecompton scheme, added a meanness peculiarly its own;—a sort of nondescript compound of falsehood, fraud, evasion and bribery; compensating for any lack of the bullying insolence of pure Lecomptonism, by a BENJAMIN'S portion of sneaking poltroonery, and an insulting implication that the people of Kansas were as venal as its author. Recognizing the Lecompton Constitution as "Republican in form;" assuming that the people of Kansas ask admission under it; but representing that its grant of land to Kansas (for railroad and other purposes,) is larger than Congress approves; it proposes an Ordinance making a smaller, but still very large, land grant; and submits—*not* the Constitution, but—*that Ordinance* to a vote of the people, at an election to be controlled by the Pro-Slavery party, the ballots to be inscribed, "Proposition Accepted," or "Proposition Rejected." If a majority vote to accept, the President's proclamation announcing the fact admits Kansas to the Union as a Slaveholding State;—if a majority reject, then it shall be held that they do not desire admission "with said Constitution *under the conditions* set forth in said proposition;" and they may elect delegates to form another Constitution, "whenever, and *not before*, the population of the Territory equals the ratio of representation" required for a Representative in Congress. On the 30th of April, the ENGLISH bill was adopted by both Houses, as a substitute for those which they had severally passed, and the President's signature soon made it a law. The process by which Anti-Lecompton Democrats enough to effect this

object were rendered, in the significant language of the *Richmond South*, "open to conviction," is a secret which needs no telling. Hardly was it deemed needful to veil the wholesale bribery, and not at all to conceal the relentless political proscription employed by the Executive to bend the Legislature to its will.

Loud was the exultation of the partizans of Slavery, when the issue of the contest was announced. Senator TOOMBS could "see nothing in the brilliant future but peace and harmony, and prosperity to the glorious organization of the Democratic party." The *Richmond South* was prompt to "congratulate the country on the result," declaring that "it achieves a Congressional recognition of the Lecompton Constitution; affirms the principles for which the South has contended throughout the struggle; admits Kansas into the Union as a Slave State; and thus consolidates the victory of 1854. In practice as well as principle, it is now established that no Federal prohibition will avail to restrict the expansion of the Pro-Slavery power. In view of such important consequences, the people of the South will accept this settlement of the Kansas controversy with unfeigned satisfaction." Well! the end is not yet. Perhaps, before it comes, all this exuberant rejoicing may be found to have been premature, and the victory now won by such disgraceful means may yield but a barren triumph, after all.

OREGON.

Since the date of our last Report, Oregon has taken preliminary steps for admission to the Union as a State. A Constitution has been formed, submitted to the people, and ratified by a majority of more than two to one. The question of allowing Slavery in the State was submitted separately, as was also that of admitting free negroes. The vote was, for Slavery, 1,645; against Slavery, 7,727; for admitting free negroes, 1,081; for excluding free negroes, 8,594; showing more hostility to free negroes than to Slavery. For while the vote against Slavery was but three and three-fourths to one, that against the negroes was about seven to one. From this token may be guessed — though we are not left to guess from this alone — the kind and value of Oregon Anti-Slavery. It is evidently an Anti-Slavery not of moral principle, but of selfish policy; not to be trusted in times of trial. Sham

Democracy is the dominant political faith of the Territory, and is likely to be of the State; and its influence will of course be cast into the Pro-Slavery scale. To its leading politicians, the DRED SCOTT decision is the end of the law for righteousness, and BUCHANAN's Kansas policy the model of Democratic statesmanship. A correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, writing from the Territory during the canvass for the vote upon the Constitution, affirmed that "nearly all the [Democratic] leaders are Pro-Slavery men," and only the fear of defeat "prevents their throwing the Slavery banner to the breeze." He adds, "perhaps half, and the most candid half, are out avowedly for Slavery." Candidates for office and party organs take the ground that "if we are compelled to have the colored race among us, they should be Slaves." Doubtless, a better heaven is working there, especially among the settlers from the North and East who have been trained under free-labor institutions; and some day we may hope its good effects will be more manifest; but we see much now to qualify our pleasure at the announcement that Oregon is to be a Free State. For the purposes of its own material prosperity,—to the extent of appreciating and employing at home the energy, efficiency, and economy of freedom,—it will be Free, and this, unquestionably, is much to rejoice at, and gives hope of more and better hereafter: but in its moral attitude, in its external policy, in its relation to the great general issue pending in the whole country between mastership and manhood, it promises as yet to stand little better than Florida or Texas; it is virtually a Slave State.

MISSOURI.

While Slavery has been desperately striving to enlarge its borders, the battle has begun to turn to its own gates with unexpected vigor; and endangering its hold even upon its present possessions. Missouri has become the scene of a powerful, widespread and still spreading agitation of the Slave question, the avowed intent of which is to drive Slavery from the State. While various causes have concurred to this effect, one chief immediate cause, no doubt, has been the struggle to enslave Kansas, and especially the part borne in it by the Missouri Borderers. The excitement thus enkindled burnt backward upon

those who kindled it. The developments, moreover, of that struggle, revealing as they did the comparative resources and strength of Freedom and of Slavery, quickened, among the more enlightened portion of the Missourian people, an already half-awakened sense of the impolicy of their own system; and created, or stimulated into a motive energy, a desire to be rid of the heavy incubus. In a few places, this feeling had become apparent two years ago or more, particularly in St. Louis, where some peculiar favoring circumstances gave to it a strength, which the divisions of its adversaries enabled to be politically effective, in 1856, in electing to Congress from that district an avowed opponent of Slavery-extension. More lately, it has carried the municipal election in St. Louis, by the choice of JOHN M. WIMER as Mayor of the City, against a united opposition; and now it claims an indisputable ascendancy there. The *St. Louis Intelligencer* says, "The WIMER party boldly avowed themselves in favor of gradual emancipation, and the early extinction of Slavery in Missouri. On this broad issue the battle was fought and won.

"We have at no time doubted that St. Louis is 'Free State' in sentiment by a heavy majority. This fact has long been notorious here. It has been the case for years; but the proverbial sensitiveness of a Slave State community to any discussion of Free State principles has heretofore kept the Free State feeling in abeyance. It has been evoked at last, and rises at once into political ascendancy. This ascendancy, it strikes us, is likely to be permanent; for, while it is true that hundreds of men voted for Mr. WIMER who are not in favor of emancipation, it is also true that hundreds did not vote for him who are as thorough emancipationists in sentiment as he is.

"The election of the WIMER ticket is, therefore, only the emphatic declaration of the City of St. Louis, not only on the expediency, but the *certainty*, of the early extinction of Slavery in Missouri. For it were very foolish in St. Louis to proclaim a policy that was of doubtful strength, and thus provoke isolation to herself from the rest of the State."

Nearly all the German papers of Missouri favor the movement for emancipation, and so does, in a cautious way, the organ of the Methodists in the State. The victory in St. Louis, moreover, is increasing, in two ways, the strength of the Emancipation

party throughout the State. First, it is inducing a large immigration thither from the Free States, by the hope it gives that Missouri will soon become Free; and then by this increase of immigration the price of land is much enhanced, and a cogent argument is thus addressed, through the pocket, to the landholders, in favor of the policy which brings forth such fruits. "It is well-known, to all owners and purchasers of real estate," says the *St. Louis Democrat*, "that the sales of this spring have been three fold as great, and at a greater increase of price than ever before obtained in this city. The same is true of the State. Much of the great tide of emigration from the Free States has turned itself upon Missouri; and the reason undoubtedly is, that the movement for free labor which has triumphed in St. Louis, and bids fair to be victorious in the State, has drawn attention to the rich lands of Missouri, and holds out the promise that they are not long to be cursed with the incubus which has so long made them barren and unprofitable."

The last municipal election in Jefferson City, the State Capital, was also carried by the Emancipation party. A writer thence to the *St. Louis Democrat* says, "The owners of three-fourths of the Slaves in the city voted the Free Labor ticket, believing that emancipation would increase the value of their lands, more than it would diminish the mercantile value of their negroes." And it is stated that "within a week after the triumph, thirteen families settled in this city of five or six hundred houses, several Eastern capitalists at once made liberal investments in the city and vicinity, several large manufacturing establishments are soon to be started, and the contracts and other demonstrations with reference to building are already such as to justify the expectation that two hundred houses will be erected in Jefferson during the current year."

The party has not yet tried its strength, single-handed, in a State election; but supported last summer, for Governor, the candidate of the American party; believing him more likely than his opponent to favor its object, although he was not a declared Emancipationist. The organs of the Sham Democracy evinced their alarm, and attested the formidable extent of the Emancipation feeling in the State, by trying to make out an Anti-Slavery character for their candidate. He "owns no Slaves," they said, "and is not opposed to the gradual abolition of

Slavery — *far from it. He would be among the first to lend his hand to carry out that measure.*” But in spite of this assertion, the Emancipationists went for his opponent, and almost elected him. For a time, indeed, it was thought they had succeeded, and at last, the official return, giving the Democratic candidate a small majority, did not escape strong suspicion of fraud. Though, as we have said, the Emancipationists supported the candidate of another party, yet the Slavery issue had been made so prominent in the canvass, that the result was generally accepted, both in and out of the State, as a test of the strength of the Emancipation party. The *Richmond South*, so estimating it, thus uttered its lament: — “Considering that the question of Emancipation was the controlling issue of the canvass, our joy at the result is not unmingled with feelings of disappointment. It is now clearly demonstrated that nearly one-half of the people of Missouri are in favor of the unconditional extinction of Slavery, and the lapse of a few years may witness the complete triumph of the Anti-Slavery sentiment. Certain it is that the Abolition feeling is every day gaining ground.”

The Emancipationists, and most of their sympathizers in other States, gave it the same interpretation, and hailed it as an omen of ultimate and not remote success. We think their hopes are quite too sanguine, but certainly the events which have awakened them are not without a cheering significance. True, the Missouriian type of Anti-Slavery is not a very high one. Its aim seems more at gain than godliness; its appeals are rather to self-love than to conscience or humanity. It views emancipation rather as a profitable investment than as a moral duty; and, eager for the white man's interest, it thinks little of the black man's rights. Still, that even such a type of Anti-Slavery should have appeared, and spread so rapidly, in a Slave State, and that the notorious “Border Ruffian” State, is surely an occasion for rejoicing, and an encouragement to hope and perseverance. It “agitates,” and agitation keeping thought awake may waken conscience too. It tells important truth, if not the most important; and uses cogent arguments, if not the strongest. Slavery is a curse as well as a crime. Godliness is also gain. Emancipation *would* enhance the State's prosperity, as well as right (in part) the bondman's wrongs. Moreover, Slavery is sensitive, and can not abide the atmosphere of free discussion, the irritation of

hostile criticism. Its "peculiar" property depreciates in value when it cannot be held in quiet;—when its tenure and influence are freely questioned. It will naturally tend to creep away gradually, of itself,—if not summarily ejected,—from regions where it is exposed to such annoyance; while, in a country situated and circumstanced as Missouri is, every inch of ground it abandons will at once be occupied by free labor; and the force which is pressing steadily upon it will thus continually accumulate in advancing; till, it may be, Slavery will be crowded out, without express and formal abolition. Such a fate is anticipated for it in Missouri, by some of even its own partizans. The St. Louis *Republican*, notorious as the leading organ of the Border Ruffians, utters this prediction:—

"Slavery will never be formally abolished in Missouri. Emancipation, either immediate or gradual, will never be enacted into law in this State. But yet Slavery will soon cease to exist in Missouri. The fiat is irreversible. It will not be abolished. It will disappear. It will melt away, as the snows of winter. It is going now; and once started, it will gather increased acceleration, like a stone rolling down a mountain-side."

May the prophecy be speedily fulfilled, unless a more drastic remedy should work a yet speedier purgation!

THE FOREIGN SLAVE-TRADE.

The project of reöpening the foreign Slave-trade continues to be pushed with unfaltering persistency in a portion of the South. Its advocates, at least a portion of them, like practical philosophers, intent on *things*, are not tenacious about names; and are willing to concede so much to "sickly sentimentality" as the use of pleasant euphemisms which may slightly veil but not conceal their meaning. If "African Apprentices" and "Labor Immigration" grate less harshly upon tender ears than "Slaves" and "Foreign Slave-trade,"—why, let the morbid taste be gratified, so that the *purpose* is achieved. Last Spring, an "African Apprentice bill" was passed by the House of Representatives of Louisiana, authorizing the importation of twenty-five hundred free Africans into that State, "for agricultural and other laboring

purposes, — provided, they shall be indentured as apprentices to labor for a term of years on which the parties may agree, — *not less than fifteen* years.” To how many *more*, no limit is set. The bill was indefinitely postponed in the Senate, but by only two majority. *Perhaps* the parties interested will consider this as final, and like good citizens submit in silence, neither troubling the Legislature farther, nor presuming to prosecute their enterprise without its leave; especially as “the mover for postponement avowed his fixed conviction that the proposed bill would greatly benefit the South, and his motion to postpone was only from regard to friends opposed to the measure, who had appealed to him to defer action until the next session, so that the matter might be thoroughly discussed by the people.” But from the following statements of the New Orleans *Delta*, it appears that legislative leave is not everywhere a necessary prerequisite to the prosecution of such schemes, although it may be well enough to “legitimate, *moralize* and regulate” the business, when actually begun and sure to continue.

“Southerners have taken into their own hand the law, and opened the African Slave-trade with the South; Africans are now imported into Mississippi and other sea-shore States; in Mississippi there is a market for African Slaves, and on plantations in that great and intrepid State, negroes recently imported from Africa are at their daily work. The authority on which we make this announcement is indisputable. We even have advices that in Mississippi, HENRY HUGHES and some of his party now privately urge the Labor Immigration movement, not to open the supply of Africans, but to legitimate, moralize, regulate and equalize the supply already opened, and impossible to be closed. We have some further details. Some negroes are disembarked on the Atlantic coast, and brought overland to the Mississippi cotton fields, but the Mississippi seacoast’s peculiar facilities for landing and securing cargoes, and the convenience of Pearl River as a channel for distribution, are not overlooked.”

The paper adds details relating to the Mississippi Slave-trade, “authenticated by operators,” showing enormous profits; those of a single voyage having amounted to \$200,000. “Where the profits are so exorbitant,” it continues, “we can well understand why the business has been begun in the South. We can well understand the impossibility of closing the trade now begun,

and, most of all, we now can understand that the great question is not whether there shall be for the South a supply of African labor, because that is now settled, but the great and absorbing question is whether the supply shall be so modified as to be legitimate, fair, regular and equal."

It is not to be supposed that the South is permitted to monopolize so lucrative a business, while the North, with all its capital and energy and commercial enterprise, has a tone of moral sentiment which can tolerate the Fugitive Slave Bill, and its occasional enforcement; help make a PIERCE or a BUCHANAN President; or give forty votes in Congress for the Lecompton abomination. For however a majority of the Northern people may abhor all these iniquities, there yet remain enough, and quite too many, who, by participating in them, prove themselves not morally incapable of engaging in a trade in men, which promises such ample gains. So we need not wonder that the papers tell so often of suspected Slavers fitted out at Northern ports, sometimes arrested afterwards by American or British cruisers, (seldom by the former though,) and proved to be what they had been suspected. We need not name the individual cases which have come to light within the year; but the following general statement, from the *New York Journal of Commerce*, will give some notion of the extent of the business:—

"A correspondent on the coast of Africa mentions twenty-two vessels, of all descriptions, which have been captured by the English cruisers, since April of last year, for being engaged in the Slave-trade. All but one were American, and the larger number belonged to New York, Boston, and New Orleans."

The *New York Tribune*, in an article relating to the case of the *Panchita*, "once seized in the port of New York on the charge of being fitted out for the Slave-trade, but set free under pretence of want of proof, and now brought back here, having been re-seized on the Coast of Africa by a British sloop-of-war;" speaks of "the admitted fact that by far the greater part of the vessels engaged in the Slave-trade are fitted out at this port, to the number of thirty or forty a year;" and, in answer to the question, why they are not seized by the United States Marshal, says, "the whole difficulty has arisen—the impunity we were about to say with which the Slave-trade is carried on from this port of New York—has arisen from the construction which

Judges BETTS and NELSON have seen fit to put upon the laws for the suppression of the Slave-trade. There is a singular but very natural contrast between the spirit of good will with which these two learned Judges apply themselves to the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act, and the severe spirit of strict construction with which they seem to be seized whenever the Slave-trade suppression acts are before them. They allow no quibbles of construction, nor for that matter any constitutional objection, however serious, to stand in the way of the rendition of fugitive Slaves. Even the risk of now and then consigning a free man to Slavery must not be allowed to defeat the intent of the law. But when dealing with the Slave-trade suppression acts, the utmost rigor is required in bringing the case within the strictest letter of the law. Property is not to be interfered with on slight grounds, and though invested for the purpose of the Slave-trade, it still remains highly sacred."

With a Federal Judiciary of which BETTS and NELSON are not worse than average samples, and with a President and Cabinet to match, is it any marvel that the advocates of the foreign Slave-trade are so confident and audacious?

SOUTHERN OUTRAGES.

Southern barbarism and intolerance of free opinion and expression are still revealing themselves in their accustomed methods, and with their wonted frequency. Among the last year's instances, we note the sentencing of SAMUEL GREEN, a respectable free colored man of Maryland, and a Methodist preacher, to ten years' imprisonment in the Penitentiary, for having in his possession a copy of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, — "the law allows it, and the Court awards it;" — the fining of JOHN UNDERWOOD, of Prince William County, Virginia, \$312,50, for "uttering and maintaining that owners have no rights of property in their Slaves;" the five months' imprisonment of CORNELIUS HUGHES, a Northern man, in Alexandria County, on a charge of attempting to carry off a Slave, a charge so groundless, that as soon as he was brought to trial, the prosecutor had to enter a *nolle prosequi*, for want of evidence; the infliction of five hundred lashes upon a Rev. THOMAS DONEGAN, in the Public Square

at Waxahatchie, Texas, under sentence of a mob-court and jury, upon a charge of tampering with Slaves; the destruction of the office of a paper called the *Free Press*, (a very dangerous title,) in Wood County, Texas, and the banishment of its editor, and another man, his friend, by a mass meeting of the citizens of the county; the ostracism of HELPER, of North Carolina, by his fellow-citizens, for having dared to write and publish an Anti-Slavery book; the driving of JOHN JOLIFFE, a well-known Anti-Slavery lawyer, and most estimable citizen, of Cincinnati, from Covington, Kentucky, by a mob, (including "a number of merchants and respectable looking men,") at the instigation and under the lead of the infamous GAINES, notorious as the master of the noble MARGARET GARNER and her children; and the repeated attempts of the Slaveholders and their underlings in Kentucky, to prevent, by lawless violence, menaces and personal outrages, the preaching of an Anti-Slavery Gospel there, by that truly Christian hero, JOHN G. FEE, and his faithful associates. And here, in justice to our feelings at the naming of this eminently worthy man, we cannot forbear a brief digression, to express our cordial sympathy with him in his trials and his perils; our admiration of his patient fortitude, his gentle courage and manly bearing through them all; and our high appreciation of the devoted self-denial, unfaltering fidelity, persistent, quiet energy, and enlightened zeal for Anti-Slavery truth, displayed in his self-sacrificing labors; which, we rejoice to think, are doing an important service to the cause of Freedom and humanity. Mainly through his exertions, we believe, Kentucky has nine or ten churches which refuse to sanction Slavery by their fellowship. His field of labor spreads through several counties, reaching from the northern to the southern border, nearly through the centre of the State; and the value of his efforts is attested by the very violence employed to stop them. He has been dragged forcibly from his pulpits by armed mobs; taken from this county and from that, with orders never to return; his person injured, his life and the lives of his friends endangered, and their property destroyed. In Rockcastle County, the meeting-house of his congregation was burned at night by Pro-Slavery incendiaries; and, when the meetings were continued in a private house, that too was burned, and the owner's wife and four small children (he being absent) narrowly escaped with life, and saved but little else.

The Judge of the County sided with the mob, and when the Court was sitting, a few weeks later, gave up the Court-House for a meeting to pass Resolutions against FEE and his associates. But they still persevere, with a spirit worthy of the ancient martyrs for truth; whether at last, like them, to seal their testimony with their blood, or whether to behold, this side of immortality, the triumph of the cause for which they toil and suffer, time only can reveal.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY IN OHIO.

The exhibitions of the Southern spirit of domination are not confined within the limits of the South, nor yet restricted to the invasion of individual rights. It menaces sometimes the security of Northern homes, and even the independence of sovereign States.

On the 27th of May last, a gang of a dozen or more United States Deputy Marshals, from Cincinnati, arrested four men in Champaign County, Ohio, charged with having aided the escape of a Fugitive Slave, whom a party of Kentuckians and United States Deputy Marshals had unsuccessfully attempted to take, a few days before. A writ of habeas corpus, on the prisoners' behalf, was issued by Judge BALDWIN, of the Champaign County Probate Court; and as the Marshals, on their way to Cincinnati, had entered Clarke County before they were overtaken, it was entrusted to Sheriff LAYTON, of that County, who, with one assistant, attempted to serve it. The Marshals resisted, fired several shots, beat the Sheriff till he was disabled, and then went on their way. The writ was then put into the hands of Sheriff LEWIS, of Greene County,—into which they next came,—and he, with a sufficient force to overcome resistance, followed them, served the writ, and arrested them also on a warrant issued in Clarke County, for assaulting Sheriff LAYTON, with intent to kill. They were committed to Springfield (Clarke County) jail, to answer to the charge, and their prisoners were returned to Champaign County, and there liberated on the habeas corpus. The Marshals telegraphed to Cincinnati, whereupon Judge LEAVITT, of the United States District Court, issued a writ of habeas corpus, to take them out of the hands of the State authorities,

and bring them before himself. The writ was obeyed, and on the 1st of June the hearing of the case commenced, but was adjourned to the 9th, to give time for procuring testimony. Meanwhile, Governor CHASE hastened to confer with the counsel acting for the Prosecuting Attorney of Clarke County, as to the measures proper to be taken for maintaining the State's authority, and immediately telegraphed to Attorney General WOLCOTT to appear in the case on the part of the State, in conjunction with the other counsel. "In this prompt action," says the *Columbus State Journal*, "we are certain that the Governor only fulfils the wishes of nine-tenths of the people of Ohio. Party discipline may restrain the expression of the real sentiments of the heart in some cases, but we do not believe there are many citizens of this State who desire to see her laws outraged, and her Sheriff's assaulted, beaten, and almost murdered, with impunity by insolent Federal officials."

On the 9th the trial proceeded. The testimony proved conclusively that the Marshals were brutal, insolent, abusive, and profane; that, while making the arrests and conveying their prisoners away, they refused to read their warrant or tell the offence it charged; used threats and blows to prevent the neighbors from following "to see fair play;" and throttled and handcuffed, and otherwise maltreated one of the prisoners who appealed to a neighbor not to leave them; that their assault upon the Sheriff was alike cowardly and ferocious, some crying "shoot him, kill him," four or five setting upon him at once, some holding him, while others struck him with their weapons, hurting him so severely as to unfit him for attending to business for some time afterward; that they were all under the influence of liquor, and half of them very drunk; that they openly avowed their determination not to submit to a habeas corpus from the State Courts; and, in a word, that they behaved more like drunken ruffians than like ministers of the law. On their behalf it was contended that, while acting as officers of the United States Government, they were not bound to obey the State's writ, nor were answerable to the State Courts as criminals for the force used in doing their own official duty; and had, consequently, a right to be released by a writ of habeas corpus from a United States Court. Thus the issue was distinctly made, whether the State has or has not a "right to enforce its own criminal laws within its own

jurisdiction, against all violators," pretending no matter what authority; whether it is or is not for the State Courts to decide as to the sufficiency of any alleged justification for acts charged as violations of its laws; or, in other words, whether it is a *State*; or only a dependent province of a Slaveholding empire, administered by the Federal Government as Vicegerent of the Slave Power. After taking some weeks for consideration, Judge LEAVITT decided, — just as everybody expected, and as he had probably predetermined at the issuing of the writ, — in favor of the Marshals, releasing them from custody. He affirmed "the right and authority of the United States officers to resist and disregard the State process, while engaged in the service of the writs of the United States tribunals; their duty to prevent, by any degree of force, any interruption in the performance of their duties; the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Courts, of all matters arising under the act of Congress providing for the reclamation of fugitives from labor; the violation of the sovereignty of the United States which would be involved in any attempt to execute 'the extraordinary' act of the Ohio Legislature, giving the State Courts authority to issue writs of habeas corpus against all parties detaining persons for any cause." He "unhesitatingly decided that the Marshals were justified in resisting the service of the writ in the hands of LAYTON, and that no more force was used than was necessary to overcome the violence of the Sheriff and his assistant. He saw *nothing to censure* or condemn in the conduct of the officers. He said that whatever prejudices might exist in the community against the act of Congress relative to fugitives, it was the duty of all good citizens to obey the law, and it must be enforced."

But the Federal officials had not been content with defensive measures only. As soon as he heard of the arrest of his Deputies, the United States Marshal in Cincinnati determined to proceed against all concerned in it; but "that he might have the full sanction of the Federal Executive for all his measures," he telegraphed to the Secretary of the Interior for instructions, and received, it is to be presumed, the sanction which he sought; inasmuch as he straightway went about his purposed work. Warrants were issued against Judge BALDWIN, Sheriffs LAYTON and LEWIS, the constables who had assisted them, the Prosecuting Attorney of Clarke County, the Justice who had committed

the offending Marshals to prison, and many others who, as Sheriff's *posse* or otherwise, had aided in the attempt to enforce the State laws. Then followed, for a month or more, arrests, examinations, holdings to bail, (in \$1500 each,) to answer to the charge of obstructing process of the United States Courts, and persecutions and harassings generally, of the good people of Champaign, Clarke, and Greene Counties, who had offended against the majesty of Slavery, by refusing to bow down to its brazen image, the Fugitive Slave Bill. In this congenial work were employed, both as officers to arrest and as witnesses against the arrested, the very scoundrels whose crimes they had tried in vain to bring to justice. Well might the *Anti-Slavery Bugle* say, while these events were in full progress, "How grandly imposing is our State sovereignty, when citizens, advocates, magistrates, sheriffs, judges, and senators can be seized at pleasure on the oath of official kidnappers, dubbed such by the dozen or score, as the case may require. The power of the Courts is nullified, our State laws spit upon, the writ of habeas corpus suspended, and our citizens left, without the shadow of protection, to the mercy of that infamous tool of the Slave Power, a Slave-catching Commissioner."

But all things earthly must have an end. When the time for trial came,—whether fearing to trust his convenient witnesses to cross-examination before a jury; or whether believing that the culprits had been disciplined enough, for a first offence, in the vexation and expense occasioned by the preliminary proceedings, and that the State had learned a proper lesson of subordination from the learned Judge of the District Court; or whether judging a renewal of the agitation inexpedient for the interest he served; or whatever else may thereunto have moved him;—the District Attorney entered a *nolle prosequi* on the indictments.

Considering of what slight avail was Gov. CHASE's "prompt action"—lauded by the organ of his party—to uphold the State's authority against the blustering arrogance of a knot of Federal officials; how strikingly magnanimous it was in him to go to Baltimore, in the very midst of these disgraceful events, and, among a festive gathering of Slaveholders, glorify the Union as "our ark of refuge, and, under God, our sure guarantee of prosperity and power and abiding glory;" protesting that "we do not

mean to let this Union be broken up; *Ohio*, I am *sure*, will not consent to it!"

One would think *Ohio had*, indeed, evinced sufficiently her loyalty to a Slaveholding and Slave-hunting Union; but when her Legislature met, the following winter, a majority of its members thought another proof was needed; and gave it by repealing the laws of the preceding Legislature against Slaveholding and kidnapping in the State, and the use of the State jails for confining alleged Fugitive Slaves, and the law for the protection of the liberty of *Ohio* citizens unlawfully arrested. This measure was carried through with a high hand, under pressure of the Previous Question to cut off debate; although a portion of its friends had pledged themselves to Senator MONROE, the author of one of the acts repealed, that he should have a hearing in its defence. It is asserted, and, we hope, with truth, that it was a mere chance majority by which this disgraceful work was done; and that it does not represent the sentiment of a majority of the people of *Ohio*. But this remains to be proved by their future action.

JUDGE TANEY'S OPINION PUT IN PRACTICE.

In noticing at length, in our last Report, the Opinion of the United States Supreme Court, in the DRED SCOTT case, we took occasion to correct the common error, of supposing that the Court judicially affirmed the incapacity of colored men to be citizens of the United States; and showed that only three of the nine Judges held that doctrine. But we never doubted that the Federal Administration would assume it to be authoritatively settled, and would treat the colored people in accordance with it. And such has been, and is, the fact. Wherever, since that tyrannous Opinion was pronounced, a colored man has sought permission to enjoy a right conditioned upon citizenship, he has been promptly and decisively repelled. If the instances of this are few, the obvious reason is that the general apprehension as to how such applications would be met prevented generally the making of them. The few which have been made, have served to elicit a distinct avowal of the Government's intention; and thus to hinder others from being made.

On the first of last April, Dr. Rock, a colored citizen of Mas-

sachusetts, and one of whom she has no reason to be ashamed, applied, through Senator WILSON, to the Department of State, for a passport or protection, to enable him to travel, for his health, in Europe. Secretary CASS said, in reply, "A passport, being a certificate of citizenship, has never, since the foundation of the Government, been granted to persons of color. No change in this respect has taken place in consequence of the decision of the DRED SCOTT case."

Here, in less than four lines, are three virtual misstatements, to justify an act so meanly wicked as to need them all, and many more, to give it even the semblance of decency. Passports, instead of *never*, have *always*, with one exception, been granted to colored persons when asked for; colored persons have, in other ways also, contrary to the Secretary's implied denial, been recognized as citizens; and before the DRED SCOTT decision, it was never considered the settled policy of the Government to refuse them passports. It may be *literally* true that the change is not "in consequence" of that decision; for it may have been purposed simultaneously with all the rest of the injustice toward the colored people, of which the DRED SCOTT decision is a part; both being, then, in consequence of the same antecedent purpose. But the statement is *substantially* false, no less, for its intent is, manifestly, to give the impression that no such change has taken place because of any recent change of governmental policy, apparent in that decision; whereas, not to mention several earlier instances, — the Secretary need but go back to his immediate predecessor for a case in which a Secretary of State granted a passport to a colored man. Indeed, there is conclusive proof of his own knowledge that the Government has been wont, through its duly authorized agents, to give passports to colored men; for he has, himself, officially instructed the American Minister at London to do so no more.

In answer to a recent letter of inquiry from OWEN LOVEJOY, M. C. from Illinois, the Commissioner of the General Land Office says, "The ruling of this office is, that colored persons not being citizens of the United States, as decided, they are not entitled to the right of preëmption, that privilege being restricted by positive law to citizens of the United States, or such as have filed their declarations of intention to become citizens, as required by the naturalization laws." Perhaps this, too, is no

new rule, though, hardly twenty months ago, the Secretary of the Interior, under PIERCE, replied to the inquiry of a colored man in New York, that "there is nothing in the laws of the United States which would prevent you, as a Freeman of African descent, from settling upon public land in the Territory of Minnèsota, and acquiring a right of præmption." The Secretary of the Treasury states, also, in answer to Mr. LOVEJOY, that "a free negro, not being a citizen of the United States, cannot receive a register for a vessel owned by him, nor can he command a vessel sailing under United States marine papers." Not exactly the rule of MADISON'S time, when he compelled the reluctant Collector of Norfolk, Virginia, to recognize officially the rights of good old PAUL CUFFEE, as owner and master of a ship entitled to "United States marine papers." In opposition to the earlier, and in accordance with the later rule, upon the petition of a free colored man in Maryland, for a permit to sail his own vessel, the Treasury Department has instructed the Baltimore Collector not to permit a negro to act as master of any vessel. We do not learn that the Wise Men at Washington have *yet* taken in sober earnest an ironical suggestion elicited by this act, that "the Administration issue a general order that free negroes shall be allowed to enter into no respectable or responsible business anywhere in the United States." Great reforms need time to reach completeness.

ACTION OF STATES.

While the General Government has thus been putting the meanness, injustice and cruelty of its theory into a corresponding practice, a determination to repudiate the new doctrines has continued to appear in the legislative action of several of the States. The Legislature of Maine, at its last session, declared that the opinion of the Supreme Court is extra-judicial; subordinates the interests of the people to the cupidity and ambition of a few thousand Slaveholders; is not binding in law or conscience on the Government or citizens of the United States; and demands the instant and emphatic reprobation of the country; that "the Supreme Court of the United States should, by peaceful and constitutional measures, be so reconstituted as to relieve it from the domination of a sectional faction, and make it a tribunal whose

decisions shall be in harmony with the Constitution of the United States and the spirit of our institutions, and at whose hands all classes of persons in the United States, without regard to race or locality, shall receive even and exact justice; that, until this extra-judicial opinion of the Supreme Court, establishing Slavery in all the Territories is reversed, and the advance of our National Flag ceases to be the advance of Slavery, it will be a duty to resist any further acquisition of territory which may be attempted with the purpose of enlarging the area of an institution which is the scandal of this country and age; that each State has an indisputable right to determine who shall be admitted to citizenship within its limits, and that persons so admitted by any State are, by the plain letter of the Constitution of the United States, 'entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States;' and that whatever may be done elsewhere, the people of Maine are determined to make effective, within the limits of their jurisdiction, the principles of the Declaration of American Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this State, which, ordained 'to establish justice' and 'secure the blessings of Liberty,' declare that 'all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent and inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying, possessing and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.' "

The New Hampshire Legislature, last June, enacted that "neither descent, near or remote, from a person of African blood, whether such person is or may have been a Slave, nor color of skin, shall disqualify any person from becoming a citizen of this State, or deprive such person of the full rights and privileges of a citizen thereof; that any Slave who shall come, or be brought into, or be in this State, with the consent of his master or mistress, or involuntarily, shall be free; that to hold or attempt to hold in this State, as a Slave, any person, of whatever color, class or condition, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any length of time, shall be punished with confinement at hard labor for not less than one nor more than five years;—this, however, not to apply to any act lawfully done by any officer of the United States or other person in the execution of legal process." The same Legislature also resolved that "the decision of the Court in the case of DRED SCOTT, as pronounced by Chief-Justice TANEY, contradicts the

facts of history, is repugnant to the Constitution, and subversive of the rights and liberties of the people; that it was the result of Pro-Slavery sympathies, and an improper desire to favor and strengthen the Slaveholding interest; that every person born within this State, and owing allegiance to no foreign government, is a citizen thereof, and by the Constitution of the United States entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in every other State; that the assertion that the Constitution regards Slaves as property in a general sense, beyond the range of local municipal regulations or stipulated agreements, is an unwarrantable assumption to which no Free State can with honor submit; that the doctrines maintained in those opinions, that Congress has no power to legislate concerning Slavery in the Territories, and that the effect of mere possession of Territories by the United States is to establish Slavery there, are contrary to the express provisions of the Constitution, are obnoxious to the laws of civilization, and odious to the people of the Free States; that the expression of extra-judicial opinions from the Supreme Bench, on subjects agitating the public mind, is undignified and unbecoming their position; that, in undertaking to decide questions not in issue, the Court evinced a desire illegally to control the action of Congress, to justify the State in resisting by all Constitutional means, the enforcement of laws dictated by the Court."

The Connecticut Legislature, in the same month, enacted, in effect, that "color and African descent should be no bar to citizenship; that all persons within the jurisdiction of the State shall, in all cases, be entitled to the protection of its Constitution and laws; and that any person having been held to service as a Slave in any other State or country, and not having *escaped* from any other State of the United States in which he was held to service or labor, under the laws thereof, coming into this State or now being therein, shall forthwith be free." It also "resolved that a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court, in denying the citizenship of colored persons, the power of Congress to forbid Slavery in the Territories, and the validity of the Missouri Compromise Act, volunteered opinions which are not law; have given occasion for the belief that they promulgated such opinions for partisan purposes, and thereby have lowered the dignity of said Court, and diminished the respect heretofore awarded to its decisions."

In Massachusetts, after more than three years of tenacious perseverance, success has crowned the effort to redeem the State's judicial bench from the disgrace of being occupied by a Slave-catching Commissioner. On the 19th of last March, at the call of overwhelming majorities in both branches of the Legislature, Governor BANKS removed EDWARD GREELEY LORING from the office of Probate Judge of Suffolk County, which, for more than three years, continuing still to be a Fugitive-Slave-Law Commissioner, he had held in open defiance of the law and public sentiment of Massachusetts; after having intensified, by his official aid in the kidnapping of ANTHONY BURNS, the odium with which such an incongruous union of offices was justly regarded. The first attempt to procure his removal was made in the winter of 1854-5, at the Legislative session next succeeding his surrender of BURNS to Slavery. The two Houses, at the request of numerous petitioners, asked it of Governor GARDNER, in an address adopted by a vote of nearly two to one; but he refused compliance, on the ground that there was no law making the two offices incompatible. As if the incompatibility were not intrinsic and self-evident! As if a man willing to be the tool of Slave-catchers *could* be fit to have charge of the interests of the widow and the fatherless! The Legislature promptly removed this objection by enacting, over the Governor's veto, a law forbidding the discharge of a Slave-catching Commissioner's functions by any holder of office under the State laws. In 1856, the Address was again petitioned for, but at so late a day that the Legislature took no action upon it. At the session of 1857, the petitioners presented themselves betimes, and the Address was voted by large majorities, and again rejected by Governor GARDNER. His signal and overwhelming defeat at the Gubernatorial Election, last autumn, was the people's emphatic answer to his demand of their approval of his action; and the renewal of the Legislative call for the removal of Judge LORING, and the new Governor's prompt compliance with it, are but the doing of an obvious duty, clearly enjoined by the popular will. It is conceded on all hands, by friends and foes alike, that this success is largely, not to say mainly due to the persistent fidelity of the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, in keeping the subject before the people and the Legislature. What they asked was granted, not because they asked it, nor because their numbers and personal influence were so great as to extort it

against the real convictions of those who yielded it; but because, few as they are, and limited as is their personal weight in the political scale, their pertinacity compelled the general attention through which the measure they demanded was seen and felt to be right and needful to the interests and honor of the State.

But we have to regret one drawback upon this triumph of justice. At the Governor's recommendation, the clauses of the Personal Liberty Bill of 1855, which forbid members of the bar to act as counsel for a Slave-hunter, and any officer or soldier in the militia to assist in the rendition of a Slave, were repealed.

President BUCHANAN has fitly rewarded LORING for his martyrdom in behalf of Slavery, by appointing him Judge of the United States Court of Claims;—another appropriate exhibition of the Pro-Slavery character of the Federal Government.

Judicial action, also, has been taken in some of the States, touching questions involved in Judge TANEY's Opinion. The Legislature of Maine, last spring, submitted to the Supreme Court of that State an inquiry as to the right of persons of African descent to vote. In this answer, given last July, seven judges affirm that right, sustaining the affirmation with conclusive arguments and abundant legal authorities. The decision, signed by five judges, first recites the provision of the State Constitution by which to be "a citizen of the United States" is made a condition of voting in Maine; and then goes on to say, "this raises for our consideration the distinct question whether free native-born colored persons, of African descent, are recognized as 'citizens of the United States,' in the above provision of the Constitution;" adding, that "the enjoyment of the elective franchise is believed to be one of the highest tests of the fact of citizenship;" that though there may be citizenship without it, "it is believed no instance can be found in which the right to vote at our general elections has been conceded to persons born on our soil, who were not at the time deemed citizens of the States in which they enjoyed the right."

It proceeds to quote from the Constitutions of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and North Carolina, showing that they all recognized, when the Federal Constitution was framed, and some still recognize, the citizenship of colored men, and their right to vote; alludes to the "provisions, equally broad and liberal with reference to the right of voting," con-

tained in the Constitutions of other States, adopted before and since that of the present Union ; adds the authority of Chancellor KENT, and of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, in favor of colored citizenship ; and states that the Convention which formed the Constitution of Maine expressly rejected a motion to exclude negroes from the right of voting. It continues :—“ From the adoption of the Constitution to the present day, it is believed there has been no instance in the State in which the right to vote has been denied to any person resident within the State, on account of his color. In view of these facts and considerations, we are of the opinion that our Constitution does not discriminate between the different races of people which constitute the inhabitants ; but that the term ‘ citizens of the United States,’ as used in that instrument, applies as well to free colored persons of African descent as to persons descended from white ancestors.”

One judge dissented, erroneously assuming that the DRED SCOTT decision judicially denies the citizenship of negroes descended from Africans brought to this country as Slaves ; and that this supposed decision governs the interpretation of the Constitution of Maine. Two judges gave separate opinions, concurring with the majority, but presenting some additional points ; holding that citizenship, as the term is used in the Constitution of the United States, is the *inevitable consequence of birth and allegiance*—a right which neither the States nor Congress can take away ; that it is no way dependent on race or color ; that Slavery exists only by local municipal law, and emancipation puts the freed man in the same condition, as to citizenship, with any other native of the State ; that nothing in the Federal Constitution shows any intention to introduce a new rule as to citizenship ; that the United States can make citizens by treaty, and have so made citizens of all the inhabitants of the Territories acquired by cession from France, Spain and Mexico, whatever their race or color ; that Congress has power to naturalize African aliens, and it is absurd to suppose that the Constitution which gives this power permits no person of African descent born in this country to be a citizen ; and that, except in the cases of naturalization and of making citizens by treaty, each State has the right to determine for itself the question of citizenship.

Last May, an important decision was rendered by the Supreme Court of Ohio, in a case involving mainly these two questions ;

first, whether a promissory note given by a Slave, in consideration of a release from Slavery, is valid; second, whether a Slave becomes free by going, with his master's permission, for a temporary purpose, into a Free State. The case was this:—HENRY POINDEXTER, held as a Slave in Kentucky, executed, with others as sureties, a promissory note to ANDERSON, who claimed a legal right to hold him; the consideration being an agreement to release the Slave, and to give him "free papers" so soon as the note should be paid. Before giving the note, POINDEXTER, with the consent and sometimes by the direction of ANDERSON, had, in several instances, come into the State of Ohio, and, after remaining a short time in doing errands on which he was sent, had voluntarily, but probably in ignorance of his rights, returned into Kentucky, and resumed his residence with ANDERSON. After the giving of the notes, POINDEXTER labored awhile for ANDERSON for wages, and then took up his residence in Ohio. At the trial in the Common Pleas of Clermont County, and again, on appeal, in the District Court, judgment was given for the defendants, and the case was then taken to the Supreme Court. There it was decided, by four of the five judges, that "if a person claimed as a Slave in Kentucky comes into Ohio by the direction or consent of his owner, even for a temporary business purpose, the Constitution and laws of Ohio operate on the condition of such person, and effect his immediate emancipation; that when a person held in Slavery by the municipal law of the State in which he lives once becomes free by virtue of the laws of another country or State, into which he goes by the consent of his owner, it is not in the power of the latter ever to reduce him again to his former condition of servitude, under any law which this Court can recognize as valid; and that, by the laws of Kentucky, a person who is held and treated as a Slave has no capacity to make any contract whatever, and promissory notes given to his master by himself and sureties for him, in the purchase of his freedom, are illegal and void, as to both principal and sureties."

BARTLEY, Chief Justice, concurred as to the invalidity of the note, but dissented on the other points; holding that, though change of *residence* from a Slave State to a Free, with the master's consent, would emancipate a Slave, yet, by the comity of nations, and the still higher obligations resting on the people of the several States of this Union, simply passing through, or going on an errand

into a Free State, with the master's permission, would not have that effect.

Judge BRINCKERHOFF, concurring with the majority, stated separately the grounds of his concurrence. These were, first, that under the laws of Kentucky, a Slave can hold no property, acquire no rights, make no contract, and consequently the note was void there; second, that even if valid there, it could not be enforced in Ohio, for while Slavery, originating in force and fraud, exists only as the effect of local positive law in derogation of natural right, the principle that no human being can be born a Slave is fundamental in the Constitution and laws of Ohio, and by these the rights of any person coming within her limits are to be ascertained; that the only exception is in the case of a person, held to service in another State, escaping into this; that nothing in the article of compact requiring such person to be delivered up, on claim of him to whom his service is due, gives any sanction to that Slavery, the essential element of which is asserted property in man; that it takes up and deals with the broad and general relation of master and servant, but has nothing whatever to do with the relation of owner and property; that when, therefore, a person held as a Slave in another State escapes into this State, he ceases to be, in any proper sense of the word, a Slave; the local law of the State he has left cannot follow him beyond the limits of the sovereignty which established it, and in Ohio he is a man, liable, it may be, to be delivered up on due claim and proof, but yet a man, "a person held to service," and in every other respect than this, a free man, although, if delivered up and taken back, he may become a Slave again, under the local law; that in the present case there was no escape, for the Slave had come to Ohio with the master's consent, and, so coming, became free, and, wherever he might go or be taken, could not again be enslaved by any law which this Court can recognize as valid; that this doctrine has been frequently held even where Slavery, with all its odious attributes, is upheld by the local law; that till very recently, it was never questioned that in the United States a person once legally free is always free; that the enslavement, by local authority, of a man once free, presents the monstrosity of a legalized wrong; it is iniquity intensified and hardened into law; and when the subject is legitimately before us, it is due to that principle of righteousness which is the soul of all law worthy of the name, and it

becomes us, as the administrators of such law, to protest against, condemn, and as far as may be, consistently with constitutional obligation, to nullify it, because it is wrong, rather than to lend it an indirect sanction through a morbid exaggeration of the spirit of courtesy. He concludes thus:—

“The fundamental, organic and unremitted policy of Ohio is to maintain the rights of men, and her tribunals, giving just effect to this policy, must not permit themselves to be moved by the plea of comity to turn aside from the plain path it prescribes, to the support of the Kentucky rule of Slavery. This policy of Ohio is hers by virtue of her own sovereign choice. She will, I trust, never permit it to be called in question. If she does, she will doubtless find suitable organs for the utterance of her altered will; but as an humble member of this Court, I can never consent to become the medium of its surrender.”

On the 7th of last December, the Supreme Court of New York decided the well-known LEMMON Slave case; affirming the judgment of the Court below, by which LEMMON's Slaves were discharged, on the ground that they could not be held in that State, though only in transit from one Slave State to another. The Court held—only one judge dissenting—that the Slaves in this case, although only brought into the State with a view to carry them thence to Texas, were within the operation of the statutes of 1817, 1830 and 1841, prohibiting the bringing of Slaves into the State, and declaring that every person brought in as a Slave shall be free; that the intent to include such cases as this is made evident by the repeal, in 1841, of that exceptional provision in the earlier statutes which permitted persons from other States, traveling to or through New York, to bring thither their Slaves, and take them thence within a limited period; that, as the State does not allow its own citizens to bring in a Slave, even in transit, or to hold him for any portion of time, comity does not require it to allow the citizens of another State to do so; that the Federal Constitution, in making comity a right, sets this limit to it, giving to the citizens of one State, in another, only the same privileges and immunities which that other allows to its own citizens; that the provision in regard to persons held to service or labor, *escaping*, &c., does not extend to the case of a person voluntarily brought by his master into another State; that the clause empowering

Congress to regulate commerce confers no power on Congress to declare the *status* of any person in any State; that the power to regulate commerce may be exercised over persons as passengers only on the ocean, and ceases when the voyage ends, and then the State laws control; that this power, as the U. S. Supreme Court has expressly declared, did not prevent the State of Mississippi from prohibiting the importation of Slaves into that State for sale; and that if this could be regarded, in the case of the Slaveholding States, as a police regulation, it may also be so regarded as to the Free States; for they consider that the holding of Slaves, in this State, for any purpose, is injurious to our condition, and to the public peace, as it is opposed to the sentiment of the people of this State.

The case goes to the Supreme Court of the United States for final adjudication, and the DRED SCOTT decision has already foreshadowed the judgment likely to be given there.

The principle recognized by the Courts of New York, that a Slave entering the State otherwise than as a fugitive thereby becomes free, was applied last August in Westchester County, to an exceedingly interesting case, (fully detailed in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* of August 29th,)—that of a bright, intelligent little girl of five or six years, brought to New York last spring by her master's sister, with his approval. The child was taken, by writ of habeas corpus, before the County judge, who at once, on proof of the facts, declared her free, and ordered her to be delivered to her grandfather, a free colored man self-purchased from Slavery. The interest of the case was greatly enhanced by the remarkable, one might say romantic, character of the grandfather's personal history; to relate which, however, would draw us from our present purpose, and would besides require more space than our limits allow.

Last summer, a Slave escaping from bondage having taken passage on an Illinois railroad, his master sued the corporation for "aiding and abetting" the escape. The case went to the Supreme Court of Illinois, which in the following winter gave judgment in favor of the Company; deciding "in effect, that the Constitution and laws of Illinois recognise all men within the State as *free* men; that Slavery is an institution of mere local law in the States where it exists, which local law extends to no other State; that the law of Missouri, under which the alleged Slave is claimed by the plaintiff, has no force whatever in the State of Illinois, but is 'repugnant to our laws,' and that, therefore, the

plaintiff, 'under the law of Illinois, has no property in the fugitive, and can here, under State authority, assert no property in or authority over him;' that 'the case comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts, and that a State tribunal cannot take cognizance of such causes;' and that 'property' in persons being repugnant to our laws and the genius of our State institutions, our Courts will not enforce, as a general rule, the laws of other States recognising this species of property, where the cause of action, based upon such laws, arises in this State."

A decision has lately been rendered in California, which may well be called a judicial curiosity. Last fall, one STOVALL brought his Slave, ARCHY, from Mississippi to California, held him there several months, hiring him out and receiving his wages; then put him in charge of an agent to be taken back to Mississippi. ARCHY escaped, and STOVALL caused him to be arrested by a policeman of San Francisco; but the Chief of Police detained him in prison, refusing to deliver him to STOVALL, who thereupon sued out a writ of habeas corpus, and took the case before the Judges of the Supreme Court. It was heard by two of the three judges composing the Court. They both held that on the ground of comity and of the DRED SCOTT decision, travellers from the Slave States have a right to hold their Slaves while passing with them through California, notwithstanding the provision of the State Constitution forbidding Slavery there. One of the judges further held that STOVALL was a traveller, and so his case came within the rule. The other did not so regard him, and consequently thought his claim illegal; yet concurred in giving ARCHY up to him, *because he was young*, and this was the first case of the kind, and he was probably *ignorant of the law*. Warning was given, however, that this is not to be a precedent; but hereafter the constitutional provision against Slavery is to be strictly enforced. Truly, a most considerate judge!—and exceedingly tender-hearted, yet nicely discriminating withal!

But California *has* judges less tender of the youth and ignorance of Slaveholding law-breakers;—judges who even think a black man's rights and interests and feelings entitled to some respect, especially when he has law as well as justice and humanity on his side. The County Judge of San Francisco issued a new writ of habeas corpus, just as STOVALL was embarking with ARCHY for Mississippi, and brought the parties before himself. At the hear-

ing, he declined to regard the decision of the two judges of the Supreme Court as decisive of the case, on the ground that, by the law of California, they could not act in this matter as a Supreme Court, but merely as judges with no higher authority than any other judge authorized to issue writs of habeas corpus, and that any decision on one writ of habeas corpus was no bar to the issue of another. ARCHY was discharged, but was immediately re-arrested, on a Commissioner's warrant, as a fugitive Slave. On the trial before the Commissioner, however, the proof was so clear that ARCHY had not "escaped" from Mississippi, but was brought thence by the claimant, that the Commissioner, though Southern by birth and feeling, was constrained to decide in his favor, and he was again discharged. The case produced much excitement in the various stages of its progress, and ARCHY seems to have had, very decidedly, the popular sympathy.

FUGITIVE SLAVE CASES.

We have had, during the year, sufficient evidence that they in whose interest it was enacted do not mean to let the black act of 1850 become a dead letter. Slave-hunting and legalized kidnapping have been attempted in New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, and elsewhere; but in most instances, so far as we have learned, with results not eminently cheering to the operators; though not without accompanying incidents instructive, and at times encouraging, to the friends of right and freedom.

In June last, a Fugitive, arrested with his wife, in Cincinnati, resisted, and gave the Deputy Marshal a nearly fatal stab, which procured him in return a discharge from Slavery, at the muzzle of the officer's pistol, sending him by a summary process to that land "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the servant is free from his master." The poor woman, less fortunate, was hurried back to bondage.

In a case which occurred at Springfield, Illinois, last summer, the counsel for the Slave-catchers had the brazen impudence and unutterable meanness to insist that the alleged Slave should not be heard by counsel. Now this is beautifully in keeping. The fellow who would engage in such cause *should* be one base enough to manage it in such a fashion. Moreover, of what use can counsel be to a

thing with no rights to be respected, and, of course, none to be defended? But, consistent as the advocate was with his cause, the Commissioner could not quite be brought to a corresponding consistency with his office. Still, though he did permit two kind-hearted lawyers to render the hunted man the gratuitous professional services which they promptly volunteered, he finally doomed the man to Slavery, in despite alike of the condition on which the claimant's title was originally acquired, and of the legal principle, till lately deemed well settled, that Slaves become free by going to a free State with their master's leave. For the Slave in this case was sold to the claimant, ten years before, on the express condition that he should be free at the end of seven years; the master, when that period had elapsed, agreed to pay him wages as a freeman; and during its continuance had frequently permitted him to visit his family, living in Illinois.

A better sequel followed an attempt, in August last, to seize four colored men residing in the neighborhood of Belvidere, New Jersey,—one of them an aged man, a much respected member of the Methodist Church, who had lived there nearly forty years, and had reared a family and acquired considerable property. But *nulum tempus occurrit regi*; no lapse of time outlaws the claims of Slavery. Happily, however, before an arrest was made, the Slave-hunters found their papers to be defective, and while they went to procure others, their intended victims heard of the danger, and made a timely escape. "The excitement consequent upon this attempt," says the Belvidere *Intelligencer*, "settled down into a feeling of deep indignation against the persons who originated the outrageous proceeding."

A case in Cincinnati, last November, exhibited the character of the vile business, in the dishonorable means employed in carrying it on, even by men called respectable, and occupying positions which ought to guarantee both respectability and integrity. Three persons, arrested as Fugitive Slaves from Kentucky, were taken from the kidnappers' hands by a writ of habeas corpus, and brought before Judge BURGOYNE, of the Probate Court; who, at the request of the claimant's counsel, postponed the examination to the afternoon of the next day, and committed the men to a temporary guardian, as required by the Ohio law. But, the next morning, the claimant's counsel obtained another writ of habeas corpus, from Judge CARTER, of the Common Pleas, to bring the men before the latter; who,

however, told Judge BURGOYNE that he would take no farther action in the matter till the proceeding in the Probate Court was finished. But at three in the afternoon, while a crowd was waiting in and around the Probate Court room for the trial to begin there, Judge CARTER proceeded, in violation of his promise, with the knowledge of Judge BURGOYNE, and in contempt of the process of the Probate Court, to hear the case, and summarily dispose of it by giving up the alleged Slaves to the claimant. They were at once hurried to the wharf, and in a few minutes were on the Kentucky shore. Judge BURGOYNE was justly indignant at this procedure, at once so illegal and so dishonorable; but, though called on by the counsel for the kidnapped men to proceed against Judge CARTER, for contempt, he declined to take such a step toward a brother judge; remarking, however, "If it had been any other than a brother member of the bench, I should not hesitate." The offence was too flagrant to be suffered to pass with entire impunity; so the counsel who procured the second writ was arraigned for contempt, and fined five hundred dollars.

In the latter part of November, several policemen of New York City, and the officers of the steamboat Florida, plying between that city and Savannah, attempted to kidnap and send to bondage a Fugitive Slave, JAMES STEID by name, who had escaped from Charleston, South Carolina, and taken passage on board the Florida at Savannah, passing for a white man, which he was light enough easily to do. His master, missing him, had traced him to Savannah; and, suspecting the course he had there taken, had telegraphed to the owners of the boat to have it searched on its arrival, and the Fugitive, if found, sent back. The boat arrived on the 28th, and was boarded by two policemen, who, after a long and diligent search, identified the man, at last, by the description which they had received; and, conveying him to Brooklyn, without a shadow of legal authority, confined him at the boarding house of one McNULTY, intending to keep him till the second of December, the time of the boat's departure for Savannah, and then put him on board and send him back. Alternately with two other policemen, they kept guard over him till the first of December, when the affair came somehow to the knowledge of certain friends of humanity, on whose application Judge CULVER, of the Brooklyn City Court, issued a habeas corpus to bring the man before himself, and, upon

his appearance, finding no evidence that he was legally detained, discharged him at once.

About the middle of December, a man named JACOB DUPEN was seized by Slave-hunters, while he was at work in the field, near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; was taken to Philadelphia, and the next morning, at an unusually early hour, was brought before Judge KANE, and, on the testimony of a single witness besides the officer who arrested him, was remanded to Slavery, before any one disposed to befriend him had time to interpose on his behalf. The whole process occupied hardly more than half an hour. The counsel procured for him as soon as the case was known, though prompt in repairing to the Court room, was but just in time to learn that a decision had already been given; and, on asking if it was not unusual to hear cases so early, was told by the judge that in Fugitive cases an attempt is often made to interfere with the execution of the law, and for that reason they should be peremptorily heard. Judge KANE was evidently better fitted for his work than the Illinois Commissioner mentioned on a former page.

Within the last three or four weeks, a party of Slave-hunters visited Easton, New York, in pursuit of a Fugitive called FRANK, who had arrived there, fresh from the South, about six months before. Calling on the man for whom the Fugitive had been at work, they pretended at first that their object was to buy a farm; but soon revealing their real purpose, they were plainly told that if they prosecuted their search, they would do it at their peril. After some prying about the out-buildings, they took counsel of "the better part of valor," and retreated, not without profane asseverations that they would yet have their man. He, meanwhile, had modestly withdrawn from the conspicuity which his Southern friends so coveted for him. On the next day, Sunday, April 18th, a large "Anti-Kidnapping meeting" was held at Easton Corners; strong speeches were made, and resolutions were adopted unanimously, "by acclamation and with earnest enthusiasm," declaring it "the voice of this meeting that we 'obey God rather than man' in hiding the outcast and furnishing 'a covert to him from the face of the spoiler'; that we will use all the means in our power, consistent with our sense of right, to rescue him from the grasp of the kidnapper; and that we pledge ourselves not only to protect the Fugitive, but to see to it that the kidnappers be put where they can do no harm." It was also resolved to appoint a Vigilance

Committee of three in each school district, "to commence suits against the kidnapper, and attend to such other matters as the exigencies of the case and the times demand." The Fugitive, it seems, did not go far; for a few days later, it was publicly announced that he was at work on a farm at Union Village, in the same county; "that he intended to remain there; that he could be seen at any time; also that a 'minute man' for each of the four bells in that village is engaged to herald the approach of any *special visitors*, when a Committee of fifty will wait upon them to see FRANK." A correspondent of the *Albany Evening Journal* says, "He is well worth a most vigorous effort of these Slave-catchers, being fully six feet in height, well-proportioned, active, and has white blood enough to make him of the right metal. In addition to these natural endowments, the good folks here have placed a pair of COLT'S revolvers in his hands, and told him to use them if he had need of a protector. He is about thirty years of age, and at the appraisal of a deceased master was valued at \$1,400."

KIDNAPPING. CASES OF EMANCIPATION.

With these attempts, (only a part of those which have been made within the past year,) to re-enslave self-emancipated bondmen, may be mentioned some instances of the kidnapping of free colored people for the purpose of enslaving them. Such, among others, was the case of GEORGE ANDERSON, taken from New York city, and sold in Virginia; of SARAH HARRISON, taken from the same city to Washington, with the intention of selling her there; of DANIEL PRICE and JOHN F. HITE, decoyed from Geneva, New York, with a design — accomplished as to the latter, but defeated as to the former, by his escape on the way — to sell them in Kentucky. Happily, in all the instances which have come to our knowledge, the victims of the atrocious crime have either escaped before its consummation, or been rescued afterward, and restored to their homes. In most cases, also, the perpetrators have been arrested, and convicted or committed to await trial for the offence.

It is pleasant to be able to offset against these atrocities several instances of voluntary emancipation, which show that the Southern conscience is not *wholly* stupefied by the modern inculcations of Reverends and Honorables who defend Slavery as right, humane

and Christian. Last June, a Col. MENDENHALL, of Guilford County, North Carolina, emancipated five women Slaves in his family, and took them to Logan County, Ohio, where he had provided for them comfortable homes and the means of support till they should be able to take care of themselves, as free women. This was his fourth journey to Ohio on such an errand, and these women complete the number of fifty Slaves whom he has emancipated, and settled in that State. In December, Mayor WEAVER, of Pittsburgh, Pa., received a letter, dated New Orleans, from R. K. WALKER, stating that he was appointed executor of the estate of BAKER WOODRUFF, of Louisiana, lately deceased, who, by his will, liberated all his Slaves, numbering about sixty, and left instructions that they should be conveyed to Pennsylvania, and provision made for them for one year. Sometime in the same month, the Alexandria, (Va.) *Gazette* stated that "the last will and testament of the late GEORGE W. P. CUSTIS, of this County, was admitted to probate at the December term of the County Court, and by it we learn that he directed that *all his Slaves* on his different plantations be set free within the next five years, leaving it to his executors to provide the necessary funds from his estate to remove them from the Commonwealth. There are, probably, some two or three hundred Slaves thus set free."

THE CHURCH.

The year has witnessed some important ecclesiastical developments in relation to Slavery. The New School Presbyterian General Assembly, sitting at Cleveland, in May and June last, occupied several days with an earnest discussion of the subject. No less than twenty-seven memorials in regard to it were presented early in the session, all but one from the North, and nearly all from the Northwest, asking for some distinct Anti-Slavery expression from the Assembly. One was from the South, setting forth the claim of a portion of the Southern church-members and ministers, that Slavery is "right," without limit or qualification of the term. The Committee to whom the memorials were referred, reported that, because of "an impression on the minds of our Churches, that opinions different from those formerly held are now maintained among our people, the Assembly re-affirm the views heretofore set forth as to the character of Slavery;" that "papers sent to the Assembly

show the impression to be wide-spread that the system of Slavery is now held, within the Presbyterian Church, to be right, a desirable system, standing in all respects on the same basis with the natural relations, such as parent and child, husband and wife, and therefore ought to be perpetuated;" that "we believe that another class of sentiments, irreconcilably opposed to these, prevails extensively among our Southern brethren;—such as that Slavery is undesirable and fraught with many evils; is to be continued no longer than the best interests of both master and Slave require; that good citizens should labor earnestly for a system of emancipation in the States, and individual Christians should seek to be disconnected from Slavery as soon as possible; that freedom is the natural condition of men so soon as it can be properly enjoyed and preserved; that Slaves while continuing such should be instructed and elevated as far as possible; that the family relation, and that of church-members, among Slaves should be held sacred, and the law of Christian love should animate the designs of Christian masters, so constituted by the providence of God." The first class of opinions the Committee denounce as clearly opposed to humanity and the Scriptures; and declare their "entire disapproval and condemnation" of the position taken by the Presbytery of Lexington South, in speaking of Slavery as right, without limiting or qualifying the expression; "but with those who hold the second class of opinions," they "do not hesitate to declare their kind sympathy. They would treat them precisely as the Apostles treated warm-hearted primitive Christians in the same circumstances. The Apostles never taught that Slavery was on a level with the natural relations; never countenanced the idea that it ought to be perpetuated; but they bore with it for the time; inculcated principles which were calculated to raise servants to the power of faith, knowledge and holiness, to a fitness to exercise all the functions of free men; exhorted masters to give their servants that which is just and equal; endeavored to fill the heart of the master with tender sympathy, so that he should desire emancipation and effect it as soon as possible. So do we feel toward our brethren whose opinions and practice come under our second classification. We would help and not hinder them; we would encourage and not discourage them; and we would labor along with them in every wise and suitable effort to remove the great evil from among men."

One would think that not even Dr. Ross himself need be excessively alarmed by such a Report; but it is not strange that it was

acceptable to neither of the real parties to the controversy in the Church, and that the proposal to adopt it called out an animated debate. In the progress of the contest some side issues arose, which tested in a measure the strength of the contending parties, and foreshadowed the final result. The chief of these came up on what is ordinarily a mere formal business,—the approving of the records of the different Synods. When those of the Synod of Mississippi were reached, a motion was made to postpone approval of them, for the reason that possibly the Assembly might take measures looking toward the discipline of Slaveholding churches, and therefore ought not to approve the records of a Synod, one of whose Presbyteries, that of Lexington South, had openly avowed that its ministers and members hold Slaves. In support of the motion, extracts were read from a speech of ROBERT MCLANE, a minister of that Presbytery, in which he declared that he and others of its ministers held Slaves, as many as they could, and for purposes of gain. Resolutions also were read, which the Presbytery had adopted on the death of Mr. HOLLEY, another of its ministers, expressly endorsing his avowal, at the Assembly session of 1856, that he held Slaves because he believed the Bible gave him a right to do so; and calling on a Western Presbytery, which for that avowal had preferred charges against him, to transfer its charges from the dead to the living. After some debate, and the exhibition of much warmth on both sides, the motion to postpone prevailed.

The Assembly now came back to the consideration of its Committee's Report. The more Anti-Slavery members were dissatisfied with its tameness, and Hon. W. P. CUTLER, of Ohio, moved a substitute, explicitly condemning "the doctrine, that Slavery is sanctioned by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as a fundamental error with which we have no sympathy or fellowship;" disapproving the position of the Presbytery of Lexington South as "unscriptural, opposed to the convictions of our Church, and calculated to mar its peace, hinder its prosperity, and bring reproach upon our holy religion;" calling on the Presbytery "to review and rectify its position;" and in case of its neglect to comply, directing the Synod of Mississippi "to take cognizance of the case at its earliest convenience." The Southern members of the Assembly hereupon presented a written statement of their position, signed by Dr. Ross and nineteen others, to the effect that they "do not believe the system of American Slavery to stand *precisely*, in *all*

respects, on the same footing with that of husband and wife, parent and child, but as differing therefrom with respect to the date of its origin, the nearness and sacredness of its relations, the nature of its peculiar obligations, the design and length of its continuation;” that they believe it “did not exist from the beginning, as did the family relation, nor will continue to the end; but that it does exist by Divine ordination and recognition for wise purposes, to be overruled for His glory, in the elevation, civilization, and final redemption of the African race; that sin cannot be predicated of the relation itself, but of the abuse of that relation;” that “it stands in the same category with the family relation in that it is ordained of God, in the sense above explained, and, like the family relation, is a subject of Divine legislation;” that in calling it “right,” they “do not mean to say that every system of Slavery is right, as it may have existed in *other ages and in other countries, but only as it now exists with us*, and under all the circumstances in which we are now placed;” and in saying “it is right” for our Churches to hold Slaves under the present circumstances, they mean that they are acting consistently with the spirit and letter of the Gospel in so doing, and for them to assert to the contrary would place them before the world as destitute not only of the spirit of Christianity, but of every principle of moral honesty; that they believe the Slave is not prepared for Freedom, and to give it to him now, under all the circumstances, would not be best for either master or Slave; that Freedom is better than Slavery where men are prepared to appreciate it — that Slavery is better than Freedom under certain circumstances — just as, with respect to human government, Republicanism may be best for one people, but a curse to another.

After all sides had had ample opportunity, and had amply used it, to defend their respective positions, the final vote was taken, and an “Exposition of principle and duty” was adopted by the very decisive vote of 170 to 25. It includes most of CUTLER’s substitute to the original Report, with much additional matter, but omits the part which demanded prompt disciplinary action against persistence in the practice and justification of Slaveholding. It affirms that the Presbyterian Church in these United States has, from the beginning, maintained an attitude of decided opposition to the institution of Slavery; recites the action of the Church at successive periods,—through its Synods before the organization of the General Assembly,

and through the Assembly since,—from 1787 to 1856, and continues thus:—

“Occupying the position in relation to this subject which the framers of our Constitution held at the first, and which our Church has always held, it is with deep grief that we now discover that a portion of the Church at the South has so far departed from the established doctrine of the Church, in relation to Slavery, as to maintain ‘it is an ordinance of God,’ and that the system of Slavery existing in these United States is Scriptural and right. Against this new doctrine we feel constrained to bear our solemn testimony. It is at war with the whole spirit and tenor of the Gospel of love and good will, as well as abhorrent to the conscience of the Christian world. We can have no sympathy or fellowship with it; and we exhort all our people to eschew it as a serious and pernicious error.

“We are especially pained by the fact that the Presbytery of Lexington South have given official notice to us that a number of ministers and ruling elders, as well as many church members in their connection, hold Slaves ‘from principle’ and ‘of choice,’ ‘believing it to be according to the Bible right,’ and have, without any qualifying explanation, assumed the responsibility of sustaining such ministers, elders and church members in their position. We deem it our duty, in the exercise of our constitutional authority, ‘to bear testimony against error in doctrine or immorality in practice in any Church, Presbytery or Synod,’ to disapprove and earnestly condemn the position which has been thus assumed by the Presbytery of Lexington South, as one which is opposed to the established convictions of the Presbyterian Church, and must operate to mar its peace and seriously hinder its prosperity, as well as bring reproach on our holy religion; and we do hereby call on that Presbytery to review and correct their position. Such doctrines and practice cannot be permanently tolerated in the Presbyterian Church. May they speedily melt away under the illuminating and mellowing influence of the Gospel and grace of God our Saviour!

“We do not, indeed, pronounce a sentence of indiscriminate condemnation upon all our brethren who are unfortunately connected with the system of Slavery. We tenderly sympathize with those who deplore the evil, and are honestly doing all in their power for the present well-being of their Slaves, and for their complete emancipation. We would aid and not embarrass such brethren. And yet, in the language of the General Assembly of 1818, we would ‘earnestly warn them against unduly extending the plea of necessity against making it a cover for the love and practice of Slavery, or a pretence for not using efforts that are lawful and practicable to extinguish this evil.’”

The minority responded immediately with the following Protest, signed by Dr. Ross and twenty-one others:—

“We, the undersigned, Southern ministers and Ruling Elders, protest against the present decision of the General Assembly.

“We protest because, while past General Assemblies have asserted that the system of Slavery was wrong, they have heretofore affirmed that the Slaveholder was so controlled by State laws, obligations of guardianship and humanity, that he was, as thus situated, without censure or odium as the master.

“This averment, in the testimony of past Assemblies, has so far satisfied the South as to make it unnecessary to do more than protest against the mere Anti-Slavery part of such testimony.

“We protest then, now, that the present act of the Assembly is such an assertion of the sin of Slavery as degrades the whole Southern Church—an assertion without authority from the Word of God, or the organic law of the Presbyterian body.

“We protest that such action is, under present conditions, the virtual excising of the South, whatever be the motives of those who vote the deed.

“We protest that such indirect excision is unrighteous, oppressive and uncalled for, the exercise of usurped power, destructive of the unity of our own branch of the Church, hurtful to the North and the South, and adding to the peril of the union of these United States.”

To this the Assembly answered, that its present action is in perfect harmony with the testimonies of former Assemblies, and chiefly a reaffirmation of them; that the General Assembly never affirmed that the Slaveholder was so controlled by State laws, obligations of guardianship and humanity, as to be without censure or odium as the master, but had only conceded that exceptional cases may exist, as defined by the resolutions of the Assembly of 1850, approved by this Assembly; that nothing in the present action is unconstitutional, or reflects on any portion of the Southern Church which abides by the old doctrine of the Church on this subject; that no “virtual excision” of the South is intended, or involved, even by remote implication; that the charge of “unrighteous, oppressive, uncalled for” action rests on the groundless assumption of “indirect excision” of the South; and that “if our Southern brethren shall break the unity of the Church because we stand by our common position, as in duty bound, the responsibility for the consequences will not rest on the Assembly.”

The Southern members promptly issued an “Address to the ministers and Churches in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church,” setting forth that the action of the Assembly had convinced them “that peace and harmony can no longer prevail

among us, and that the glory of God, the welfare of our Churches, and the good of the country, demand a separation of the discordant elements, and the existence of another Assembly, in which the agitation of the Slavery question will be unknown;” that the Assembly’s declaration of the sinfulness of Slaveholding violates the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the Church, and the principle involved in it, “if carried into practice, would convert the highest judicatory of the Church into an ecclesiastical despotism as tyrannical as that which has distinguished the Church of Rome;” that the agitation of Slavery in the Assembly destroys the peace of the Church, is unfavorable to its spiritual growth, and paralyzes its efforts to advance the Redeemer’s cause through the channel of its admirable system of government; and that the only course left them is “to invite all Constitutional Presbyterians in the land, who are opposed to the agitation of Slavery in the General Assembly, to unite in the organization of a Church in which this subject shall be utterly eschewed.” They say, “We do not restrict our invitation to the Southern Churches. We wish to have a National Church—that is, a Church the constituent parts of which will come from every section of the Union, with a common basis as to doctrine and government, and an understanding that, however we may differ in our views respecting Slavery, *the subject is never to be introduced* into the Assembly, either by Northern or Southern men, unless, indeed, judicial cases are brought up regularly from the lower courts.” Nothing less will satisfy them. No existing organization seems to them a safe sanctuary and shelter from agitation. Even the conservative steadfastness of the Old School Church fails to secure their confidence. “There is so much,” they say, “of the same Abolition spirit pervading other Churches that adhere to the same standards of Faith, that we could not expect peace on this subject by uniting with them. We are persuaded that, although this question may be suppressed in their judicatories for awhile, the Abolition spirit exists to such an extent as to threaten their dismemberment.” They do, indeed, venture a half hopeful glance at a good time coming, when the “disturbing elements of the different branches of the Presbyterian Church” will unite in one body, and “the conservative portion” in another; but at present they see no prospect of relief in joining any of these “branches,” and choose to form an organization where they will “not be liable to another division from this exciting subject.” Perhaps they will succeed;—as Xerxes did in chaining the

Hellespont. Human opinion is so stable, thought is so tame and amenable to prescription, systems and theories of social ethics are so unchangeable, and, withal, Slavery has such a self-preservative virtue and such a self-commendatory beauty in it, to ensure its permanence and exemption from dislike and criticism, that we are safe in wishing them abundant joy of their easy and delightful task. They conclude by inviting "all Presbyterians, from all sections of the country, to meet in Convention, in the City of Washington, on the 27th day of August, 1857, for the purpose of consultation, and of organizing a General Assembly in which, it will be distinctly understood, the subject of Slavery will not be introduced;" and by "praying that God may overrule the distractions of Zion for His own glory, and that we may be guided in this crisis of our history by His unerring counsel."

The *Free Presbyterian*, edited by a man who is at once a sterling Abolitionist and of unquestioned soundness in the Presbyterian theological faith, commenting on these proceedings of the General Assembly and the seceders, says, with force and justice, that "whatever progress has been made at this meeting, toward separating the Church from Slavery, has been made by the South, and not by the North. The Northern men have, really and professedly, confined themselves to a reiteration of former testimony on this subject, and are just where they were forty years ago. * * * * When the old landmarks of freedom are being torn away, it is something gained when a good old testimony is reaffirmed; but the great want of the Presbyterian Churches on this subject has not been a true testimony, but a will to enforce that testimony and make it practical. In 1818, the Presbyterian Church pronounced Slaveholding one of the highest crimes, yet Slaveholding has enjoyed the fullest toleration in Old and New School Churches. The number of Slaveholders in them has increased from a few hundreds to many thousands. It is not testimony, but discipline, that these Churches should put forth. After all their admonitions, they take the Slaveholder to their communion tables, make him President of their Colleges and Theological Seminaries, and Moderator of their General Assemblies; and all this in the face of testimonies charging him with heresy before which that of ARIUS or PELAGIUS dwindles into insignificance. And there is nothing in the late action of the New School Assembly to change this state of affairs. If the Slaveholders will admit that Slavery is not a Bible institution, or will only keep quiet on the

subject, they may, for anything that yet appears, enjoy the same toleration and fellowship for forty years to come that they have for forty years past. * * * * * The South has shown more courage and consistency in maintaining a wrong position, than the North in defending a right one. If the Slaveholder's premises are right—that God ordained and approved Slavery as He did the family relation—His action, in separating from those who affirm the sinfulness of Slavery, is manly and consistent. * * * * * The Anti-Slavery men in the Assembly have always maintained that Slavery is 'intrinsicly unrighteous,' yet have lived for forty years, and are willing still to live, in closest religious fellowship with those who practise this wicked system, if they will admit that they are doing wrong. Had the Northern men shown the same courage and consistency in carrying out their right theory, which the Southern men display in maintaining their wrong one, the question would long ago have had a righteous settlement in that Church. * * * * * Notwithstanding what we have written, we look with hope to the New School Church. After the Slaveholders leave, it will be her duty and policy to say in her organic law that they shall not come back. But should the Church fail to embody in her organic law the doctrine of no fellowship with Slaveholders, a few moderate Slaveholders may still remain in her communion, and in time the evil grow up to a magnitude to trouble her peace in the future, as it has in the past and present."

We hear of no intimations that the Church has taken or meditates any such step as is here recommended; but, on the contrary, it seems to think its work complete, and to rejoice at the result already attained, rather as promising "rest from agitation," than as a beginning to cleanse the Church entirely from Slavery. The N. Y. *Evangelist*, one of its leading organs, alluding to the approaching session of the General Assembly, says, "No agitating subjects will probably come before it. The Slavery discussion has, we trust, *come to an end among us*. The secession of the Southern portion of our Church has taken the necessity of further discussion and action out of the way." The *American Presbyterian*, another prominent New School paper, with ALBERT BARNES as one of its editors, quotes approvingly from the organ of that Church, on the Western Reserve, "All the trouble in the Churches, which has grown out of the existence of Slavery in our connection, has ceased, and *we have a blessed calm on that subject*. * * * * * The vexed question

has been *satisfactorily* disposed of." Of course, then, there is nothing more to be done; though nothing has yet been done to put and keep Slavery practically out of the fellowship of the Church.

The Southern seceders held their Convention in August, at Richmond, Virginia, instead of Washington; and, after due deliberation and debate, adopted Resolutions, reiterating the sentiments and doctrines put forth at Cleveland; and inviting all Presbyteries "opposed to the agitation of Slavery in the highest judicatory of the Church, to appoint delegates to meet at Knoxville, Tennessee, on the first Thursday in April, 1858," [which, ominously, fell upon the *first day* of that month,] "for the purpose of organizing a general Synod," in which there shall be forever the same "blessed calm, on the subject" of Slavery, as their secession had caused in the Church they had left. Their apprehensions touching the Old School Church had, moreover, so far abated that a Resolution was adopted recommending the future Synod, when duly organized, to "invite the Old School General Assembly to a fraternal conference with a view to union." So it may yet prove that even the proverbial strength of theologic odium cannot withstand the attraction of Pro-Slavery sympathy.

At the time and place appointed, eleven ministers and nine laymen, representing four Synods and twelve Presbyteries, met and formed the contemplated organization, under the title of "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;" and adopted a "Declaration of Principles," which, after defining their position, theologically, on the old Presbyterian groundwork, — the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechism, — proceeds to lay down the law by which the United Synod is to be governed in relation to Slavery. They say:—

"As Slaveholding, or the relation between master and Slave, is not referred to in the Confession of Faith as an offence, it cannot, *in itself*, be made the basis of discipline in the Presbyterian Church; though the Church Courts may take judicial cognizance of *cruelties* practised in this and other relations in life; as Slaveholders were admitted into the Churches organized by the Apostles, and as neither Christ nor his Apostles intimated that the Slaveholding relation was a sin, although they lived in the midst of the institution, and enjoined upon masters to treat their Slaves with kindness, it follows, necessarily, that a Church Court that makes Slave-

holding, *in any case*, a bar to communion, is usurping authority that belongs only to the Great Head of the Church; as neither the Saviour nor his Apostles intimated that the Slaveholding relation was sinful, and as they did not attempt to remove Slaveholders from the Church by legislation, or by testifying against it; and, as Slavery is an institution of the State, its continuance or abolition depending entirely upon the will of the State, irrespective of the views and decisions of Church Courts, the discussion or agitation of Slavery in the judicatories of the Church, except so far as respects the moral and religious duties growing out of the relation of master and Slave, is inappropriate to the functions of said judicatories." They add that (with the exception named) such agitation "would be inconsistent with the design of our withdrawal from our former connection, and in forming a new organization," and therefore, "whilst we propose no alteration of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, believing that, as it now stands, the spirit of it is against the agitation of Slaveholding in the Church, we express the opinion that those who unite with us, or who may come after us, will be under a moral obligation, so long as the Constitution remains as it is, to exclude Slavery, as a subject of discussion, from the Church Courts."

Such is the position of the new Church, of which its organ, the *Knoxville Presbyterian Witness*, says, "it was founded in prayer;" adding, "the Lord will be with us, if we ask Him, and if He be with us, who can be against us?" It evidently values itself on *not* having taken "ultra Pro-Slavery ground," — which, according to Dr. BOYD, one of its prominent speakers, "the North had the impression it was going to take;" and it apparently expects additions to its numbers, from the North, in compliance with its expressed "wish that Presbyteries *from every section* of the Union," who agree with it as to doctrine, government, and discipline, and as to the compatibility of Slaveholding with church-membership, and the impropriety of agitating the Slave question, "should unite with" it, "and thus aid in the diffusion of the truths of our common Christianity, free from an agitation which has already resulted in the dismemberment of several Evangelical Churches." Dr. BOYD said, "I believe many of the best men of the North will stand with us, and aid us with their sympathy and their means. We can even get Northern ministers, men of the right stamp." The place for the next meeting of the Synod — Lynchburg, Va. —

was chosen with express reference to the convenience of Northern men who might be willing to attend it. Some of the most wealthy and influential New School Presbyterians of Southern Pennsylvania are said to sympathize strongly with the movement; and the *Philadelphia Christian Observer* is virtually an organ of it, though nominally connected with the New School Church. And the *American Presbyterian*, unequivocally New School, shows, as we have seen, much more solicitude to prove that members of that body, who condemn Anti-Slavery agitation, need not secede to escape it, than to lift higher the standard of Anti-Slavery truth and righteousness in the Church.

The history of this movement for a new Church, is not complete without the narration of an episode connected with it. Last summer, the Rev. SAMUEL SAWYER, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church (New School) in Rogersville, Tennessee, published a statement, of which we give below the prominent points.

Colonel NETHERLAND, a member of that Church, sold a Slave to be sent to Mississippi. The Slave, unwilling to be separated from his wife and children, escaped to the woods, and lay hid for more than a year, until found and brought back by some hunters. To make him confess who had harbored him, Col. NETHERLAND agreed with the trader who bought him, that he should be publicly whipped; and the trader took him, with his chains on, to a field just behind the Church, bound him, naked and blindfold, to the earth, with arms and legs stretched to four saplings, and beat him over three hundred and thirty blows with a leather strap nailed to a wooden handle.

This was not all. Col. NETHERLAND had an old, gray-headed Slave, who had helped nurse him in childhood, and whom he suspected of knowing where the runaway was hid; and to compel him to tell, he handed him over to the same negro trader, to be beaten at discretion. The trader took the Slave to the next county, and on a Sunday morning, in a stable on the public highway, tied him to a plank so that he could not move, and whipped him with a handsaw, raising large blisters and cutting the skin in pieces; whipped him till the neighbors closed their doors and windows, to shut out his cries,—till the women of the place cried out against it,—till a man threatened to return him to court,—till the landlord, after hearing, as he supposed, at least three hundred blows, told him he must stop; and then angry at the interruption,

the trader manaeled the Slave, and took him to the county seat, and, though he had two fits in consequence of the beating, tied him up in the jail, and beat him with sticks till he was tired; promising to try it again the next day. The jailer refusing to permit it, the Slave, after remaining nearly a week, to heal his back, was sent home.

These facts coming to the knowledge of the Church, the Session *mildly requested* (!) Col. NETHERLAND to come before it, and show that he was not responsible for the outrages. He refused, and, with his friends, demanded that the pastor should leave the place, for having interfered in the matter. They carried their point. NETHERLAND was not disciplined, and SAWYER was constrained to resign his pastoral charge.

After the appearance of SAWYER's statement, NETHERLAND published an ill-tempered reply, attempting to fasten the charge of falsehood upon SAWYER; but, by his own admissions and assertions, confirming the most material allegations of the latter. Excitement ran high, and the press, secular and religious, all over the country, engaged in the controversy arising out of the case. The N. Y. *Evangelist*, having peculiar facilities for ascertaining the truth, declared that "after full inquiry and investigation, we are constrained to believe in the substantial accuracy of the statements of Rev. Mr. SAWYER. We know it is said that this is an extreme case, and may not occur again in twenty years, and that to regard this as an exponent of the sentiment of Southern Christians, would be manifestly unjust. Now the value of such a defence can only be ascertained by considering the circumstances in which these occurrences took place. If we mistake not, these will show that there is nothing in the parties to this unhappy difficulty, or in the peculiar position of the Church, which would forbid the belief that a similar attempt of a pastor in most places South would be followed by a like result." * * * "We cannot suppress the fear that equal cruelties are liable to occur in every Church where such sentiments are held respecting the institution of Slavery, and that the offender will escape merited censure and discipline."

It also said, "A minority in the Church highly disapproved of these disgraceful proceedings; while the majority, we understand, denied the right of a pastor to interfere between a master and his Slave, and protect the bondman from any degree of cruelty."

These events took place a few weeks before the time set, by Dr. Ross and his fellow seceders, for the holding of their Richmond Convention, to lay the foundations of their new Church. The Rogersville Church appointed Col. Netherland its delegate to that Convention; he went, and was received without a murmur. Mr. SAWYER also went, as a member of the Holston Presbytery,—having been invited in common with all its members,—and presented his credentials, duly signed by its Moderator. “He was waited on,” says the *Evangelist*, “by various prominent members of the Convention, who expressed no opposition to the oppressive master being regarded as a member, but who requested that he would not press his claim to a seat, as it might bring an exciting question before the house. He remonstrated on the ground that he was a minister in good standing in the Presbytery; that his credentials were genuine; that the Convention had no business with local differences; that Col. NETHERLAND, the Rogersville delegate, had taken his seat, and that an unwillingness on their part to have his name enrolled, under all the circumstances, would be construed, whether they thought so or not, into an indorsement of the doctrine of the Southern Convention, that a minister is not to be fellowshiped in the South who ventures to discipline a man for oppression. They still believed this the wisest course, and Mr. SAWYER withdrew his credentials.”

So, while the wrong doer was admitted, the exposor and rebuker of the wrong was driven out. Little as it is to the credit of Mr. SAWYER’S moral or Christian discernment that he should wish, or be willing,—after all he had just seen and attested,—to go into such company, or on such an errand; still, out of his going may have come this good:—that men may see, more clearly than many would else perhaps have done, what sort of a religion was organizing itself in that Convention, and of how much worth is the distinction it sets up between the mere legal relation, and the abuses of Slavery.

Of the Old School Presbyterian Church, little need be said. To see in it any danger to the peace of the Slaveholding Zion requires the morbid sensitiveness of Dr. Ross and his associates; and even their fears, we see, have been allayed, if not dispelled, by a year’s reflection. The last session of its General Assembly we have the unquestionable authority of the New York *Observer* for representing as quiet and harmonious. And it evidently means to keep

itself harmonious and quiet; for it “resolved” to discontinue correspondence with the bodies representing the New England Churches, because of “proceedings in those bodies of a secular and political bearing, which the sense of the Assembly seeks to avoid;”—a pleasant periphrase for “they *will* talk to us about our Slaveholding, and we do n’t wish to hear them.” But this unwillingness to be annoyed with such trivial questions as that of Slavery must not be taken to imply a want of interest in those things which most deeply concern the welfare of humanity; for—not to mention its recorded condemnation of the deadly sin of dancing, and of similar pernicious and most perilous enormities—the Assembly, at this very session whereof we are now speaking, did solemnly reiterate and reaffirm its solemn Act and Testimony of 1849, “that sitting in public prayer is considered *grievously improper*, whenever the infirmities of the worshipper do not render it necessary, and that ministers BE REQUIRED TO REPROVE IT WITH PERSEVERING ADMONITION.”

Nearly a year ago, with a view to uniting two of the smaller Presbyterian Churches,—the Associate, and the Associate Reformed,—the General Synod of the latter adopted a Basis of Union, including these as two of its articles:—

“That the law of God, as written upon the heart of man, and as set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is supreme in its authority and obligations; and that, where the commands of the Church or State are in conflict with the commands of this law, we are to obey God rather than man.

“That Slaveholding—that is, the holding of unoffending human beings in involuntary bondage, and considering and treating them as property, and subject to be bought and sold—is a violation of the law of God, and contrary both to the letter and spirit of Christianity.”

A Convention of ministers and elders of these two Churches, and of another small body, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, held at Xenia, Ohio, in March last, uttered its “protest against Slavery, as one of the sins which separate between us and our God, and justly shut from our land the influences of his spirit, as a crime against Christ, our country and humanity;” declared that it could “regard no revival as genuine which leaves the subject of it with the lash of the oppressor in his hand, and his bleeding

victim at his feet;" and invited "the coöperation of Christians of all denominations to labor and pray for its limitation and final extinction; and that God may pour out the spirit of repentance on those who directly, or by complicity in ecclesiastical or political relations, are involved in the fearful guilt of this sin; and, moreover, that God in pouring out His Spirit as floods upon the thirsty ground, would visit the four millions of his poor in our land, to whom the word of God is bound, hastening their emancipation, and enfranchisement with that liberty wherewith Christ maketh his people free."

Neither of the Churches represented in the Convention admits Slaveholders to its communion, but as Churches they have taken no earnest part in the Anti-Slavery cause, and this action seems to be a sign of progress on their part. A more decisive indication of progress appears in a movement commenced last summer within the bounds of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, an inveterately Pro-Slavery Body, existing chiefly in the West and Southwest. A Convention of its ministers and members, and others, was held in Vanderburgh County, Indiana, close upon the border of Kentucky; and, on the fifth of June last, formed an "Evangelical Association of Southern Indiana," having, for its "special object, to develop the true spirit of Christianity, by practising and sustaining the law of love in all human relations, and by protesting against all sin; hence, this Association will bear a firm testimony against Slavery, polygamy, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath-breaking, &c., &c.; consequently it will withhold its fellowship from Slaveholders, &c., and from those *ministers, Churches, and ecclesiastical bodies which practise and endorse Slaveholding,*" &c.

The Slave question still agitates the Methodist Episcopal Church; and, if we mistake not, the movement in favor of expelling Slavery from the Church is steadily gaining strength by the agitation. The friends of the movement seem determined to give the Church no rest till their object is accomplished; and through the denominational press, in meetings of Conferences, and in special gatherings for that express purpose, they urge their demands with earnest zeal, untiring perseverance, and a force of argument not easy to gainsay. They contend that Slavery has no more constitutional than moral right in their Church; that the law of Methodism, rightly construed, is against

it; and Lough, — because their adversaries urge a different construction, — they demand such changes in the Rules as will leave no room to doubt their meaning, they yet insist that there is no need of waiting for such changes, before rooting Slavery out by the faithful administration of the law as it now stands. The Pro-Slavery party, on the other hand, assert the necessity of a previous alteration of the Rules; — a change which can be made only by a vote of three-fourths of the members of all the Annual Conferences, ratified by two-thirds of the General Conference. The *Northern Independent*, a leading organ of the Anti-Slavery party, takes the ground, “that we are now an Anti-Slavery Church — made such by the rule which forbids the doing of evil; that the General Conference, by a bare majority, can proceed at once to carry out the prohibition now existing in the General Rules; that the administration of the Church may and should be thoroughly prohibitory, even now, and without waiting for further legislation; that Slavery is a high crime, and therefore needs no more specific prohibition than already exists in our Discipline; that we are not obliged to tolerate in the Church flagrant sins, crimes of the most horrible character, till by good luck we can get a three-fourths vote of all the Annual Conferences, and a two-thirds vote of the General Conference for a specific prohibition of such crimes; or, in other words, that our Discipline prohibits not only such crimes as are expressly named, but all crimes.”

The *Methodist Quarterly Magazine*, in a series of able articles on the Slave question, argues that constitutionally the Church is Anti-Slavery, and bound by its Discipline to be outspoken, active, and earnest for the abolition of Slavery. It maintains that, according to the Methodist doctrine and Discipline, Slavery is not “a political matter with which the Church and pulpit have nothing to do,” but one with which both “*are bound to deal*;” that it is not one with which we of the North have no concern, but that “our free Northern Church *makes* it her business;” that “a fundamental object of the existence of our Church is the extirpation of Slavery, and ‘modern Abolitionism’ is the same as the ‘*extirpationism*’ of our Discipline;” that the proceeding of “a whole Conference,” in obliging its candidates for holy orders to pledge themselves to have nothing to do with “modern Abolitionism,” was “undisciplinatory, unconstitutional, and un-Meth-

odistical ; ” that it is improper to “ admit Slaveholding ministers (or even perhaps the ministers of a Pro-Slavery Church) into our pulpits ; ” that no pulpit and no periodical organ of Methodism has a right to be silent on the sin of Slavery, nor any Church nor any man a right “ to ask any one of them to be silent or withhold the freest, fullest effort toward ‘ the extirpation of Slavery ; ’ ” and that “ no section of the Church has any right to hold a check-rein of silence on this subject upon the rest of the Church.”

In December last, a Convention of preachers and lay delegates in Central New York, in favor of extirpating Slavery from the M. E. Church by the next General Conference, was held at Rochester. Some of the ablest men of the Church in that region took part in its deliberations. Two questions mainly occupied its attention :—“ Is Slavery in the M. E. Church by moral or constitutional right ? ” and “ What is the just and practical method to free the Church from the evil ? ” On the former question, the Convention with “ great unanimity,” and after able arguments, legal and moral, took ground in the negative. On the latter, which had previously been less thoroughly canvassed, there was at first more diversity of opinion, but after discussion, only four members dissented from the vote against attempting to change the General Rule by getting a vote in the Annual Conferences previous to the General Conference, and in favor of direct extirpatory legislation, first with intent then to change the General Rule in 1860, if practicable. “ To get Slavery out of the Church by a just process of legislation,” it was said, “ is the first thing to be sought. The changing of the General Rule in 1860 is an uncertain matter. To change the chapter so as to exclude all Slaveholders, and remove such as are now in it from the Church, is possible. There are, perhaps, Anti-Slavery men enough in the different Conferences to change the Rule ; but it is probable they would not unite on any single proposed plan.”

The Wisconsin Annual Conference, at its session last fall, adopted Resolutions declaring “ that American Slavery, ‘ the sum of ’ villanies,’ the climax of all wrong, should not be tolerated in Church or State ; that we will labor to the utmost of our ability, with our voices, pens, prayers, and suffrages, to abolish it from both as speedily as possible ; that it is a matter of congratulation and ‘ exceeding great joy,’ that the sentiment, that all men are entitled to the blessings of ‘ life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,’ is

so rapidly advancing in our country; that though we are deeply mortified that the M. E. Church has within her sacred pale those who hold Slaves, yet we hail with joy every newly-developed evidence that this burning reproach will soon be wiped away from our beloved Zion, and that she will march forth, pure from the blood of her brethren, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.'" Believing that "the failure to secure the desired result in the last General Conference was owing to want of uniformity of views among Anti-Slavery men," the Conference also voted to appoint a Committee of correspondence, to secure concert of action, and suggested to other Conferences the doing of the same.

The New England Conference says, in a report adopted at its recent meeting in Worcester, Mass., "We had been led to believe by the repeated declarations of those whose position afforded opportunity for an acquaintance with the facts of which they spoke, that Slavery existed in our Church only to a limited extent, and that in such a form as deprived it of almost everything objectionable in its character. But the facts brought to light in a book entitled 'Pictures of Slavery,' by a minister of our Church (Rev. J. D. LONG) of unimpeached character and of eminent Christian virtue, show us that Slavery exists in our Eastern border Conferences to an alarming extent, and that it does not differ in its character, in our Church, from its known character out of it, and that the ministry, both local and travelling, are not so free from connection with it as we believe our discipline and the cause of righteousness require." The Conference also resolved "that 'the time has fully come' when the General Conference, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, should 'so change the chapter on Slavery as to make Slaveholding a disqualification for membership in our Church.'"

Resolutions of the New York East Conference, at its session just held in New York city, "affirm the language of our Church in 1784, that Slaveholding is contrary to the golden rule and the inalienable rights of man, and we therefore deem it our most bounden duty to take some effectual method to extirpate this abomination from among us; that it is the duty of our Church, as a unit, to educate her membership to the high standard of these her primitive doctrines; and to this end it is her duty to inculcate them prudently, but firmly, through her organs, whether press or

pulpit; that, while we oppose Slavery as citizens, and give our sympathy to those who, in the State, are maintaining the cause of freedom against the Slave Power, we are especially the opponents of oppression as a *sin*, and the supporters of emancipation as the *requirement of righteousness*; and, therefore, our Anti-Slaveryism should be deeply imbued with the spirit of the Gospel; should wisely consult the honor and unity of our Church, in the full faith that the highest good will be obtained through the legitimate instrumentality of her established institutions; that we thank God, and congratulate the friends of humanity, for the rapid extension of the principles of justice and freedom during the past year, the cheering prospects of the extension of free institutions in our country; and we cherish the anticipation that, with proper effort in maintaining and diffusing light and truth on the subject, all misunderstanding will disappear, and the Church will unite, as with the heart of one man, upon the ancient Wesleyan platform, and, as in the great English emancipation struggle, Methodism will be unanimous and energetic in the cause of freedom."

These Resolutions, moderate as they are, were not adopted without earnest opposition. They were under discussion for more than a week, and were combated by some of the oldest members of the Conference; veteran conservatives whose influence, a few years ago, was almost all-controlling. But the tide of Anti-Slavery feeling has risen too high for their "thus far" to stay it.

The action of these Conferences is not the only indication of a growing sentiment in the northern portion of the Church, averse to the longer tolerance of Slavery in its bosom. Another token, quite as significant and emphatic, is the welcome given to the periodical organs of the progressive party. The *Methodist Quarterly* says, that "never has our subscription list risen so rapidly as since our announcement that we place ourselves upon the Discipline as an Anti-Slavery organ of an Anti-Slavery Church. Seventy-five additional names have been received in a single week; a clear index in what direction the free heart of the Church is tending." The *Northern Independent*,—which, it will be remembered, was established a little more than a year ago, in consequence of the displacement of its editor, by a shabby trick of the conservatives, from the editorial charge of the official organ of Methodism in Central New York,—has already a paying circulation of over 10,000, which is constantly increasing; while the old paper, which

was entrusted to one of the tools of the Pro-Slavery party, has lost nearly half its subscribers, and sunk below the paying point. In view of such facts as these, taken with all the other signs of progress which appear from time to time, it is not strange that some sanguine spirits look for a complete and speedy triumph in the conflict against Slavery within the Church. Thus *Zion's Herald* says:—

“It is as evident as any future event can be, that the next General Conference (1860) shall and will make a regulation by which Slaveholders shall be excluded from Church communion. The Border knows it, unless it is demented. The great body of the North, not merely New England, but all the North, are determined that their voice shall be right on this subject, and that they will be no longer divided and feeble, but firm and united in the aid which they will render to true Anti-Slavery men on the Border.”

But, ardently as we desire this consummation, our confidence that it is at hand is by no means so strong as the *Herald's*. The conservative influence has still great strength in the North, and though not enough to resist effectually the friends of progress in the local Conferences, yet it is not so clear how it will be when the opposing forces come face to face in the General Conference, with the Pro-Slavery strength here augmented by that of the Border Conferences, full of actual Slaveholding and the spirit of Slavery. How the North will abide the threats of another division, the solemn warnings of peril to the cause of Methodism and religion, and all the varied and powerful appliances which will be brought to bear against the movement for freedom, we have yet to see. We hope — at least, we earnestly wish — that every test may be borne unflinchingly; but our fear is that the Anti-Slavery tone is not yet high enough in the Northern Conferences, to put beyond a doubt the fidelity of all, or of enough to ensure the victory. Even the *Quarterly*, manly and noble as are its utterances, in the main, ventures not without a “perhaps,” the intimation that ministers of Pro-Slavery Churches should be excluded from Northern Methodist pulpits; and the solicitude of the New York East Conference for “the unity of our Church,” suggests some apprehension that the tenacity of its Anti-Slavery purpose may relax in the day of trial. Dr. BANGS, in the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, sounds the alarm, that if the Anti-Slavery party

persist in their proposed measures, the Church must be divided; for the conservatives will not submit to acts they deem unconstitutional. An organ of Southern Methodism claims that many in the Northern Church are more in sympathy with the Southern than with the Northern branch, and that if all should join the former who prefer its spirit to that of their own Church, "it will add thousands to our communion of the best men of the country, and will open the way to our becoming the National Methodist Church." Another Southern organ insists that a Southern Methodist paper ought to be speedily established in New York, and would find ample support in the North, as is evident, it argues, from the abundant prosperity of such political papers as the *Journal of Commerce* and *Day Book*, and such religious papers as the *New York Observer* and *Philadelphia Christian Observer*.

These are hints at a part of what the movement for Freedom will encounter in the General Conference. Has it moral *momentum* enough to go through? We shall rejoice to be convinced by the event that it has. But, meanwhile, let not him who putteth on his harness boast himself as he who putteth it off. Till the battle is fought and won, Slavery is in the Church. The Northern Conferences, preachers, lay members, are all in actual religious fellowship with the Slaveholders, in fact and in spirit, who abound in and control the Southern Conferences of the Methodist Church North. Whether for want of Methodist law to exclude them, or for want of faithful administration of such law as there is, such men are in the Church, enjoying its privileges, holding its offices, and borrowing whatever of respectability its good name can lend them. "Rev. LEVI D. TRAVERSE," local preacher in Maryland, boasting that he holds twenty Slaves, offering a reward of three hundred dollars for the arrest of a Fugitive man and wife whom he calls his property, and saying he has "never read from the Sacred Volume a word condemnatory of the institution and practice of Slavery;"—Rev. B. H. NADAL, repelling, in public discussion at Fincastle Court House, Virginia, the allegation that the *tendencies* of the M. E. Church and the Baltimore Conference are toward Abolition, and supporting his denial of the charge, by pointing to "members of the M. E. Church who were as *consistent* Slaveholders as any in the Church South, *worked* the Slaves as hard, *threshed* them as often, *bred* as many in proportion to the numbers held, and *perpetuated* the Slavery of those held for life in as many

instances in proportion to a given number," and by proving that "Methodism in the Baltimore Conference had as much interest in the perpetuation and extension of Slavery as had the Church South, and that he, himself, as a representative of the Episcopacy, was as faithful in denouncing even tendencies to Abolitionism as was his opponent;" these men, and such as these, are members and ministers of the same Church to which belong the men and the Conferences whose emphatic testimonies we have quoted.

Rev. H. C. ATWATER, a minister of the M. E. Church, who has made an extensive tour in Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Virginia, on purpose to learn the position of the M. E. Church members there, in relation to Slavery, testifies that he found them intensely Pro-Slavery, utterly denying that any Anti-Slavery blood is in their veins, or that the Church to which they belong is Abolitionized, and referring, in proof, to the thousands of Slaves held without a word of rebuke by the membership, in six of the Conferences of the Northern Church. He adds, "I am only sorry to say, that the Pro-Slavery course of the Church North furnishes them with abundance of material to silence those who accuse them of belonging to an Anti-Slavery Church."

Rev. J. D. LONG's book, an allusion to which by the New England Conference we quoted on a former page, abounds in proof of the deep implication of the membership, both preachers and laymen, of the South Eastern Conferences in Slavery. A native, and for nearly forty years a resident of Maryland, and for nine years a preacher within the bounds of the Philadelphia Conference, he may fairly be presumed to be a competent witness as to the condition of his Church in that region. He affirms that in the Philadelphia Conference "are at least a thousand mercenary Slaveholders," and has no doubt that the Baltimore Conference has twice as many, and that more Slaves are owned by its members now than before the secession of the Southern Church;—so far is it from being true that, by that secession, the Northern Church was disconnected from Slavery. *Zion's Herald*, the *Northern Independent*, and other Methodist journals would supply us, were it needful to draw upon them, with an indefinite amount of testimony from ministers, editors, and others, of both the Southern and Northern Churches, confirmatory of such as we have cited, in proof of the Pro-Slavery position of the M. E. Church, be the letter or the spirit of the Discipline what it may. These are construed

differently by the opposing parties, but the *practical* interpretation of them is the actual presence of Slavery in the Church.

In November last, a Convention of delegates from the Northern and Western Conferences of the Methodist Protestant Church met in Cincinnati, to consider the relations of that body to Slavery. The Convention adopted a memorial to the General Conference, specifying such changes in the Discipline as were deemed necessary to free the Church from complicity with Slavery. Another Convention is to be held at Springfield, Ohio, to hear and act upon the response of the General Conference to the memorial; and, in case the Conference refuses to make the desired changes, that Convention is empowered to make them, and to authorize the publication of a new edition of the Discipline containing them; which shall be the authorized Book of Discipline of all concurring Conferences. Thus, the Northern Conferences will be separated from the Southern, and organized as an Anti-Slavery Church.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The Pro-Slavery character of the average organized religion of the country is not more clearly apparent in the doing or not doing of the various Churches claiming to be Christian, than in the conduct of those bodies, semi-evangelical, as they have been sometimes called, which are employed to do specific portions of the general work assumed to belong to the Church at large. Of these, as all observant Anti-Slavery men are aware, none has a more instructive history than the American Tract Society, nor it, perhaps, in former years, a more instructive record than in that just past. It is of course fresh in the memory of all, that at its Annual Meeting in the spring of 1856, feeling the "outside pressure" of a rising Anti-Slavery sentiment crowding it up to action in one important department of the work it proposes to do—"promoting the interests of vital godliness and sound morality"—it took the decisive step of appointing a very Reverend and Honorable Committee of Investigation, to deliberate and enquire, during the lapse of the year, as to what ought to be done touching the vexed—and vexing—question of American Slavery. At the meeting of 1857, the Committee reported the following series of Resolutions, as equivocal, if not as authoritative, as a Delphic oracle:—

Resolved, 1. That the American Tract Society was established for a definite purpose, namely, 'to diffuse a knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of sinners, and to promote the interests of VITAL GODLINESS AND SOUND MORALITY, by the circulation of religious tracts CALCULATED TO RECEIVE the approbation of all evangelical Christians.'

"2. That this Society cannot therefore with propriety allow itself to be made a *special organ* of any one system of religious or moral reform, such as Temperance, Peace, Anti-Popery, Anti-Slavery, etc.; while, within its proper sphere, its influence should *sustain the cause of truth and righteousness in all their departments.*

"3. That in endeavoring to accomplish its high and holy mission, the Society should deal evenhandedly, and bear impartial testimony against *all* fundamental doctrinal error and *practical immorality, prevailing in any and every part of our country.*

"4. That in the judgment of your Committee, the *political* aspects of Slavery lie entirely without the proper sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications; but that those *moral DUTIES WHICH GROW OUT OF THE EXISTENCE OF SLAVERY*, as well as those moral evils and vices which it is *known to promote*, and which are *condemned in Scripture*, and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, *undoubtedly* do fall within the province of this Society, and *can and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit.*

"5. That whatever considerations in the past may have seemed to recommend to the Publishing Committee the course pursued in its revision of certain works, yet, *IN THE FUTURE PUBLICATIONS OF BOOKS AND TRACTS, NO ALTERATION OR OMISSION OF THE SENTIMENTS OF ANY AUTHOR SHOULD BE MADE*; but works not adapted to the design of the Society in their original form, or by a regular *IMPARTIAL* abridgment, should be wholly omitted.

"8. That we cordially recognize the *FIDELITY* and devotedness with which the interests of the Society have been superintended and conducted by the officers and Executive Committee, five of the present members having been among its original founders.

"9. That with great confidence in the *WISDOM* of the Executive Committee, we anticipate that their action, *in carrying out the principles contained in the previous resolutions*, will be such as will tend to promote the *WIDEST AND BEST usefulness* of the Society *THROUGHOUT OUR WHOLE COUNTRY.*"

Widely diverse, not to say diametrically opposite, as are understood to be the views and feelings of different members of the Society, the Report just suited everybody; and was unanimously adopted. The editor of the *Independent* "liked it, both negative and positive side" of it; the editor of the *N. Y. Observer* liked it, —we suppose, for he wondered *why* the other party liked it; the

editor of the *Journal of Commerce* liked it,—considering that the carrying of it out was to be entrusted to hands in which he had “entire confidence” that they would “meddle with Slavery as *little* as they feel themselves permitted to do under the instructions embodied in the resolution;”—which “little” he was shrewd enough, of course, to see would be “not at all.” At all events, it is plain enough that a Publishing Committee which did not *mean* to meddle with Slavery could find warrant enough in the Resolutions for very emphatically and energetically letting it alone. At best—or worst, according to the side from which they are looked at—the Resolutions did not even make a show of demanding that anything should be published against *Slavery*, the essential abomination itself;—only the “moral duties which *grow out* of its existence, and the moral evils it is known to promote,” are to be discussed. And the men who were to say whether even this would “promote the *widest and best usefulness* of the Society throughout our *whole country*, were just the men who had for years been steadily refusing to send out anything even remotely alluding to Slavery, and who, nevertheless, were assured of the Society’s cordial recognition of their *fidelity*, and *great confidence* in their *wisdom*.”

Well! the meeting passed away, and the Committee remained to do the work assigned it, if any one knows what that was. The quick sensitiveness of the South, (“the thief doth fear each bush an officer,”) was alarmed lest it *might* be something; and that alarm *somehow* made itself appreciated by the Committee in New York;—*how*, those who know the gentle meekness of spirit, and mildness of speech, and courtesy of manner which Slaveholding generates and fosters, will, perhaps, be able accurately enough to guess. But somehow—for the cause is known in the effect. Hardly more than a month had gone by, when the Corresponding Secretaries found it expedient to send a very pleasantly worded missive to the South and Southwest, expressing “deep regret” at a “misapprehension” perceived to exist “in the minds of some highly esteemed brethren, as to the true import” of those Delphic Resolutions; assuring these highly esteemed brethren that no violation of the “catholic principle” acted on “for thirty-two years” was contemplated by the Report; that “the almost unanimous voice of the Society, and of its friends in all parts of the country, is decided that the Society must carry out in good faith the sacred compact in its Constitution, and must convey the messages of salvation through a

crucified Redeemer to every *accessible* immortal being, in all circumstances and conditions, throughout all our boundaries;” and that “we believe the tenor and aim of the Report of the Special Committee to be in full accordance with this view, and that it was *so understood by the Society in unanimously adopting it*. That Report solemnly reaffirms, word for word, the fundamental catholic article of the Society’s Constitution; and the Special Committee have, in their closing resolution, enjoined on the Publishing Committee ‘that their action, in carrying out the principles contained in the previous resolutions, will be such as will tend to promote *the widest and best usefulness of this Society throughout the whole country.*’ ”

Of course, this was not meant for Northern eyes, except indeed for some which have a peculiar *cast*, enabling them to take South-side views of certain subjects; but, in these days of steam printing presses and the like, it is hard to keep that which is spoken in the ear, from being proclaimed upon the house-tops; so the missive of the Secretaries got into the Northern newspapers, to set simple, unsophisticated people a-wondering what sort of “immortal beings” down South are not “accessible” to the Tract Society’s “messages of salvation,” and to cheer the hearts of the initiated with authentic assurance that the usefulness of the Society “throughout the whole country” will not be put in jeopardy by any rash attempts to get at *inaccessible* immortals. How this or some similar assurance was understood by the Southern brethren, we are permitted to infer from a communication published in a Maryland paper, with the official signature of the Society’s General Agent for Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia; stating that “the Colporteurs of the American Tract Society are not permitted to sell or distribute any books but those issued by the Society. Of the 250 millions of publications that have gone out from the Tract House, there has *not been one word* on the subject of *Slavery*. I have the assurance of the officers of the Society that they will abide by the Constitution, and publish *only what is agreed to* by evangelical Christians *all over the country.*” But there were men at the North too,—it was not to be forgotten,—who had *their* notions of what had been enjoined upon the Executive Committee; and who expected, nay, demanded that something in accordance with their notions should be done. To satisfy them, and not offend the South, was the problem for solution, and an expedient was adopted which seemed to promise fair. A treatise on the Duty of Masters, the Publishing Committee say, was

“under consideration at the time of the last Anniversary, and was supposed to meet the views presented in the Resolutions of that Anniversary;”—probably had been prepared with express reference to the Report expected from the Special Committee of the year before. It was—at least ought to be—just what was needed for the exigency. Composed of articles which had already been published with acceptance at the South; all from Southern men; no where condemning Slavery as in itself sinful, but, all through, implying the opposite, and quietly assuming that Slaves *owe* their masters the service exacted by the relation; surely the South would acquiesce in its re-issue by the Society. But this hope was doomed to disappointment. The Slaveholders were not going to let themselves be lectured on these duties by the Tract Society, no matter who wrote the lecture. The precedent would be dangerous. If they might be told of one duty to-day, they might be told of another to-morrow. If the text this year were, “Render to your servants what is just and equal,” next year it might be, “Let the oppressed go free; break every yoke.” Resist beginnings, was the only safe motto. No sooner, therefore, was it known that the Committee really intended to publish a tract on the forbidden subject, than remonstrances, protestations, warnings of the consequences, menaces of withdrawal of support and exclusion of agents, colporteurs and tracts came pouring in—so we are told—till the hapless gentlemen of the Committee were constrained—or chose to seem constrained—to yield to the pressure, and on the tenth of September “the Publishing Committee, with the concurrence of the other members of the Executive Committee,” issued their manifesto, announcing their unanimous decision not to proceed with the contemplated publication. The reasons assigned were the death of one of the authors from whose addresses the tract was compiled, and the refusal of two others, on account of the excited state of feeling on the subject, to let their part of the matter be used;—but chiefly the “expressions most unanimous and decided from all quarters of our Southern field, that *any* publication by our press, *bearing upon the topic of Slavery*, could have no other result than precipitating the entire withdrawal of the South from coöperation with the Society.”

“The Committee have believed that the action and instructions of the anniversary, explicitly cherishing as they do the Society’s usefulness ‘*throughout our whole country*,’ could not contemplate,

even on the part of those Northern friends most earnestly advocating them, any revolutionary and disruptive change in the line of the Society's policy, cutting off from the Society a portion of 'our whole country' so large, and in our past labors so largely blessed, as the entire South."

It may be proper here to say, that loud as was the storm aroused by a proposal to publish on the Duty of *Masters*, and fearful as were the consequences apprehended by the Committee should *any* publication, bearing upon Slavery, issue from their press, they had, about or at the very time when their subsequently suppressed tract was in press, another tract there, which has since been published under the title of "SAMBO and TONEY;" teaching the duty of *Slaves*, and exhorting them — among other things — to "be attentive to your master's business, and obey him in all things." We have not heard of the Society's having been driven from its Southern field because this little tract is now included in its regular series.

On the 23d of September, the Secretaries of the Society sent forth a Circular to its "Agents, Superintendents, and Colporteurs," explaining and vindicating the action of the Executive Committee, in suppressing the tract on the Duty of Masters. Its principal points are, that the publication of tracts touching Slavery would be an untried, and at best doubtful measure; that no publication distinctly on the subject could find entrance to the South; that it would be a sad necessity for the Society to be compelled to spend its strength on a theme collateral to its great object, when there are so many other channels for that discussion; a departure from the course heretofore pursued promises no good, but involves far-reaching evil — the same evil dwelt on in the Publishing Committee's statement; — the approbation of Christians over our country cannot be secured to any such publication at present; the Society gave no positive order to publish, but only expressed a wish that it should be done, unless it would work great injury; or, if there was a positive order, the state of things has since so changed as to make obedience impossible without violating the Constitution, and in the use of a discretion necessarily reserved, the Committee may decline to publish; and, finally, the Committee *have*, for thirty-two years, been doing substantially what the Resolutions require — publishing on "moral evils" and "moral duties," whether arising from Slavery or other institutions, good or bad.

They close by leaving the question to all true and earnest friends of the Society, anticipating a general concurrence in their own conclusion.

If unpalatable truth is no longer to be spoken; if evil-doers are to dictate when and by whom evil-doing shall be rebuked; if it is wrong to declare the whole counsel of God, whether men will hear or will forbear; if, letting men go on unrepented in the persistent commission of a most heinous sin, in order to secure their co-operation in assailing sin in general, and particular sins of far less magnitude, is the best way to "promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality;" in a word, if timid and crooked policy is better than principle, and treacherous peace than purity; then by all means should the past course of the Tract Society, and the present action of its Executive Committee, meet the hearty approval of all good men; and the judgment to be henceforward passed upon MOSES, NATHAN, JESUS, and PAUL, and other disturbers, like them, of the quiet of respectable sinners, may be reserved for future consideration.

Without taking time or space to expose at length the defects in principle, the inaccuracies as to fact, (not to use a shorter and more pithy Saxon word,) or the fallacies in argument, of the Secretary's Circular, we would briefly fix attention on a few points in relation to it. First, it shows plainly, if there was any room for doubt before, that the interpretation of the Resolutions of last spring which is to prevail, is that which makes the publishing of Tracts on Slavery entirely discretionary with the Executive Committee. That certain "moral duties and moral evils growing out of Slavery can and ought to be discussed," it says, "is expressed as an opinion, not as an order." And lest this *opinion* should lead the Committee to do what "would limit the range of the Society's usefulness," the clause about "widest usefulness throughout *our whole* country" was added as "*a guard or limitation*;" making the instruction to the Committee mean, "*as a whole*," do what *we* think ought to be done, unless *you* think it would do mischief. Next, it will be noticed how coolly it is assumed throughout, as indeed it has been in all the action of the Society and all the arguments of its partisans, that Slavery is either not sinful, or so trivial a sin that "Evangelical Christians" may practise and uphold it, without serious detriment to their Christian character and standing; that whether it is right or wrong, a system ordained and approved by God, or "the sum of

all villanies," is a matter about which intelligent and well-informed men may differ, without evincing on either side any moral obliquity or spiritual obtuseness. The Secretaries say, the Society "cannot do aught else than diffuse a knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of sinners, and promote the interests of *vital godliness and sound morality*;" and again, "to preach Christ in such manner as to secure the approval of all good men, is the object and aim of the Society, as defined in the letter and spirit of the Constitution;" and again, "the approval of evangelical Christians is an essential condition of all our issues, this cannot be secured to any specific issue upon" Slavery; "Christians, evangelical Christians, the *best* Christians of the land, are in total disagreement upon almost every phase of this subject;" and yet again, "the day *may come* when evangelical Christians will agree substantially in their views on Slavery, as they now do on other great questions once held in dispute." Mark! it is not as to any details of action, any specific remedy for Slavery, or as to the fit distribution of culpability between the mere relation and its abuses; or as to any collateral question whatsoever, that the Secretaries speak; but as to whether *Slavery*, just as it is in our land, relation, practice, abuses, legitimate fruits, inevitable accompaniments and consequences, taken all together,—the horrible concrete *fact* suggested to the common mind by the mention of that word,—is such an evil, and so related to God's law and to Christian truth and duty, is in the aggregate so immoral and ungodly as to be a proper subject of animadversion, in any manner or measure, by a body professedly helping to evangelize the world,—to "promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality." And this it is, about which "the best Christians of the land" so widely differ! What is such talk but virtually taking sides with Slavery?—denying its *evident* and atrocious wickedness, and shielding it from the reprobation it deserves? Then, too, what a proclamation is this Circular, and all the action of the Society on the subject, of the overbearing insolence and arrogant domination of the Slave Power, and the tame servility—if it is not hearty, though unconfessed loyalty to the despot—of the self-styled evangelical religion of the country as embodied in the Tract Society and its supporters! Whether from conviction of duty, or because pressed by the growing Anti-Slavery sentiment of the North, the Society proposes to say *something* bearing on the Slave question,—very guardedly, very moderately, very gently, in words borrowed from

Southern lips themselves, not denouncing Slavery as sinful, not demanding the Slave's deliverance, only enjoining certain "duties growing out of the existence" of the system, and thereby implying its right to exist; but even this is more than the tyrant will endure, therefore silence is enjoined. The South utters its mandate, and it is obeyed;—obeyed without delay or hesitation. And the whole argument for silence is resolved, in the last analysis, by no long process either, into—SOUTHERN DICTATION AND MENACE. Finally—for we must make an end somewhere—if the Committee and the Secretaries had adhered faithfully to the principle they insist upon, their own Circulars in self-vindication could not have been issued from the press of the Society. For, very plainly, they are *not* "calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians," whether this phrase is used in its literal or in its conventional sense. What really evangelical Christians must think of such documents, we need not stop to ask; but their authors must have known that they would be disapproved by many whom that term in its conventional use includes; or if they were so obtuse as not to know it beforehand, they have since, we are glad to see, been very distinctly made aware of it. Many who have liberally aided the Society in times past, and even many who, we fear, will aid it in time to come, have expressed their disapproval; some in decidedly emphatic language, as a specimen or two may serve to show. The Chicago Congregational Association has spoken thus:—

"*Resolved*, That the recent circular of the Executive Committee of the American Tract Society, announcing their determination *not* to carry out the instructions of the Society with reference to publications on the subject of Slavery, has filled us with disappointment, sorrow and alarm; that we regard their decision as a manifestation of weakness unworthy of Christian men in their position; that we pronounce their excuses to be undeserving of attention, and an insult to the intelligence of the public; and that we deem their course to be treacherous to their official duty, and most injurious to the interests of the Society."

Eleven ministers of Congregational Churches in Northern Vermont have sent up a remonstrance containing these *rather* plain words:—

"With this view of the position in which the Society is placed by its present conductors, it cannot, in our opinion, be justly re-

garded as an evangelical institution. As now conducted, *it dissents* from the great body of Evangelical Christians *on points* which, in their estimation, *are of fundamental importance to the interests of true piety and sound morals.* As, in compliance with the demands of an unreasonable and wicked faction, it refuses to give utterance to the convictions of the Christian world on such points, its name and the names of its officers are no longer trustworthy vouchers for the evangelical character of its publications. As now conducted, it has proved UNFAITHFUL TO ITS OWN CONSTITUTION; TO THE CAUSE OF HUMANITY AND OF GOD; TO THE CAUSE OF TRUTH AND OF EVANGELICAL RELIGION. By throwing itself, as it has done, as a shield between Slavery and the public sentiment of Christendom opposed to Slavery, it has become THE ENEMY OF LIBERTY, AND THE BULWARK OF OPPRESSION. It is the corrupter of public law, and of the principles of morality; and, by giving countenance to the notion that peace and joy in the Holy Ghost may be promoted, and may exist, without practical righteousness, it becomes A MIGHTY CORRUPTER OF THE RELIGION OF THE GOSPEL."

DISUNION CONVENTION.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Massachusetts Disunion Convention of January, 1857, the subjoined Call was issued in the summer following, and received nearly seven thousand signatures, from citizens of seventeen States:—

"Whereas, it must be obvious to all that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, between whom harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous;

"And whereas, Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judiciary and Legislative; has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish Freedom even in the Territories, and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the Free States, and has inflicted, at many times and places, outrages far greater than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel;

"And whereas, there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations;

"The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at _____, in October, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability, and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require."

Among the responses which this Call evoked was a letter from Judge JAY—"illustrious and venerable name"—breathing a noble and manly spirit, and exposing and rebuking, with plain severity and stirring eloquence, the arrogance of the Slave Power, the servility of Northern politicians, and the corruption of the Church. Though declining to sign the Call,—on the ground that the very reasons which prove Disunion desirable, prove it impossible,—he yet makes out, in his painfully graphic delineation of the character of the Union, and the condition to which it has brought the country, a most ample justification for the Disunion movement. He says:—

"Although fully aware of the many social, commercial and political advantages resulting from the Federal Union, I am nevertheless convinced that it is at present a most grievous moral curse to the American people. To the people of the South it is a curse, by fostering, strengthening and extending an iniquitous and baneful institution. To the millions among us, of African descent, it is a curse, by riveting the chains of the bondman and deepening the degradation of the Freeman. To the people of the Free States it is a curse, by tempting them to trample under foot the obligations of truth, justice and humanity, for those wages of iniquity with which the Federal Government so abundantly rewards apostates to liberty and righteousness. * * * * An aristocracy, not of birth, nor of education, but solely of wealth in land and the bodies and souls of men, now governs with insolent and arbitrary sway twenty-five millions of people. Northern Democrats have formed with these lords of the lash a most intimate and submissive alliance, and are now the humble and willing instruments of a most crushing and loathsome despotism. The seductions of the Federal Government, proffered through the friends of Slavery, have converted the Northern Democracy into a stupendous organized LIE; a party with Liberty ever on its lips, and human bondage in its heart." * * * * "The Democratic party does not embrace all the Pro-Slavery of the North. Adventurers from all parties are continually investing capital in the Union-saving trade."

He describes the scene on Bunker Hill, last June, when, at the inauguration of a statue to WARREN, the notorious MASON,—author of the Fugitive Slave Bill, friend and eulogist of Bully BROOKS, advocate of Southern secession from the Union should a Republican be chosen President,—was present by "gracious invitation from the gentlemen of the Bunker Hill Association;" and, on being introduced to the assembled people by "a distinguished gentleman of

Boston," [ROBERT C. WINTHROP,] who "took *pleasure in welcoming him*" to New England, was "received with loud applause." "And think you," he asks, "that men who thus prostrate themselves before the Slave Power will, from the love of liberty, aid you in re-eueing the North from its degrading domination?" Turning to the Church, he denounces its "time-serving, man-pleasing poliey" as "probably still more offensive to God than that of our Pro-Slavery politicians;" and relates some of the facts which justify his charge, and "show the demoralizing influence, even over Christian ministers, of ecclesiastical union with Slavholders." To the Union, also, he says, "we must attribute the unhappy position of the American Tract Society," which, discovering that "to offend the Slaveholders will lessen the circulation of their tracts and curtail their receipts, must therefore do evil, and tacitly countenance sin, for the glory of God and the salvation of souls!" In drawing his letter toward its close he says:—

"While I believe you are doomed to disappointment, I nevertheless rejoice in every exposure of the immoral influence exerted by the Union. I rejoice in such exposure as tending, not to bring about dissolution, but to render it unnecessary. When the people of the North shall cease to idolize the Union, they will cease to offer on its altar their rights and their duties; when released from their self-imposed thralldom to the Slave Power, they will cease to place its minions in office; when no longer covetous of the trade and the votes of the South, they will no longer be bullied into all manner of wickedness, and into submission to all manner of insult, by the idle and ever-repeated threats of dissolution. But when this day arrives, the Union will be converted from a curse into a blessing. Our lower-law divines, instead of vindicating cruelty and oppression, and denouncing as fanatics all who esteem the will of God a higher law than an accursed Act of Congress, will become preachers of righteousness. Democrats, seeing the Federal patronage wielded by the friends of liberty and the rights of man, will, in the extent and rapidity of their conversion to truth and justice, eclipse all the marvels of New England revivals; and men who have for long years been bowed to the earth by spinal weakness will, as by miracle, stand erect. Till all these things come to pass, the North, I am persuaded, will continue its union with the South; and when they do come to pass, you will have no wish to see the Union severed."

The responses which came from all parts of the North, and the evidence they gave of a wide-spread interest in the movement, and

sympathy with the spirit which animated it, induced, and we think justified, anticipations of a large and enthusiastic gathering, whose proceedings would give a vigorous impulse to the cause. But, in the midst of these anticipations, came suddenly over the land the great commercial revulsion of that year, involving multitudes in pecuniary embarrassment, impoverishing the rich, depriving the laboring poor of the work which won their daily bread, and causing everywhere anxiety and suffering. Judging it impossible, in this condition of the country, to secure a general representation of the Disunion sentiment of the North, the Committee of Arrangements reluctantly decided to postpone the Convention. At so late a day was this decision made and announced, that some were already on their way to Cleveland, and others had arrived there, before hearing of the postponement. Those on the way mostly persevered to the end, and when the day had come, so many were convened that it was thought best to organize and proceed with the intended business, not as *the* Convention which had been countermanded, but as a Convention having the same end in view. Considering the unfavorable circumstances of the gathering, it was quite respectable in numbers,—nine or ten States being represented,—and the proceedings were full of animation and interest. The regret and disappointment of all present that the contemplated Convention had been postponed was expressed in the first resolution, unanimously adopted. Then followed others, declaring that Slavery and Liberty are eternal antagonisms, and the history of the United States is a sad yet clear illustration of this truth; that, in forming the Union, the doctrine was adopted that the end sanctifies the means, and the eternal law of right was set at naught; that the United States Government is a continued conspiracy against liberty, till not only the Slaves, but the people of the North are under a despotism unknown to the American Colonies; that the Union exists to protect a despotism worse than any in the old world, and the very reason for its formation—to protect us from foreign despotism—is now even stronger for its destruction; that it is a crime and curse which should not exist an hour, and to seek its destruction is the only means of escaping participation in the guilt of Slavery; that the Slaves ought to strike down their masters by force whenever the blow can be effective, unless WASHINGTON was a murderer and the American Revolution a crime; that when we see them in arms for Freedom, we will give them all the aid and comfort we can in the same spirit which brought

LA FAYETTE and KOSCIUSKO to the support of our Revolutionary fathers; that the time has come when a regard for our own liberty, as well as duty to the enslaved, demands the organization of a revolution among parties outside of the Federal Government, to effect its overthrow; and that the object can be best accomplished by means adapted to withdraw individual States from the Confederacy, leaving their future confederation to the guidance of circumstances. On several of these, a spirited discussion arose, two or three defenders of the Union, on the ground of the Anti-Slavery character of the Constitution, being present. The Resolutions were all, finally, adopted, most of them unanimously, but those relating to armed resistance by the Slaves, and one or two others, by a majority only.

After a session of two days, the Convention adjourned, and its members dispersed with a full conviction that, in spite of all the drawbacks and disappointments they had encountered, it was by no means in vain that they had come together.

COMPENSATED EMANCIPATION.

It is not to be expected as Anti-Slavery principles gain ground, that they will be apprehended by all minds with the same degree of clearness, or received by all hearts with the same wholeness of devotion. Some will accept them entire, and work for them earnestly, not counting the cost to interest or reputation. Others will see but in part, and honestly and heartily set about some kind of half-way work; while yet another class, unwilling to meet the consequences of simple fidelity to their own perceptions, distinct or dim, will try to compromise between policy and duty; pressed one way by conscience, and a dread of falling *too far* behind the van of the evidently advancing column of reform; drawn the other way by fear of going forward faster than the present popular voice demands or will approve; feeling the need of doing something, but cautious of doing too much; willing — glad, perhaps — to have the *credit* of being Anti-Slavery, so far as it is *creditable*, but *not* willing to be counted “ultra” or “fanatical;” really “loving the cause of Freedom” in a moderate, cool, judicious way, and desirous of its promotion by *prudent* measures; but none of your ardent, enthusiastic lovers, devoting hand, head and heart to the object of affection. Now and then

this *stratum* of Anti-Slavery crops out in some pleasant plan of abolishing Slavery without offending Slaveholders; some smooth device for "charming" so "wisely" the old serpent and dragon, that he will not only hearken, but hasten to obey the charmer's voice. A few earnest, whole-souled Anti-Slavery men have been sometimes misled into favoring such schemes, but we believe they are seldom found long among their supporters. One of these devices, if we err not in our estimate, has come to light within the past year, under the most respectable of auspices, and with as fair a promise of success as any of its predecessors ever had.

On the 26th of August, 1857, a Convention met in Cleveland, Ohio, remained in session three days, and organized a National Compensation Emancipation Society, having for its object, as set forth in its Constitution, "to promote the extinction of American Slavery by contributing to the compensation of the Slaveholders for their losses in the emancipation of their Slaves." Its President is an L. L. D.; of its five Vice-Presidents, two are D. D., and two are Honorables;—so that it is presumptively evident that no vulgar fanaticism controls its policy. Of the persons named as present at the Convention, we recognize two only, who have been known as thorough Abolitionists,—JOHN RANKIN and GERRIT SMITH; but these are men whose fidelity to the Slave has been too well tested in their lives for even the grave mistake we think they have now made, to shake our trust in their Anti-Slavery sincerity and devotion. What was the tone of Anti-Slavery feeling in the Convention as a whole, may be guessed from the fact that a proposition offered by GERRIT SMITH, to declare Slavery "inhuman and revolting," was voted down as likely to "alienate the South." We must not omit to say, however, in justice to the Compensators, that while they propose the payment of two hundred and fifty dollars to the Slaveholders, for each Slave emancipated, they remember that the Slave has a claim to compensation also, and while "no measure of aid in this direction would exceed" their "wishes," they suggest the definite sum of *twenty-five dollars* apiece, as one which "would go far towards supplying them with humble homes upon this Continent, or upon another, should they prefer so wide a removal from the land of their birth."

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

The year has brought news from over the water, full of cheer to the friends of universal freedom. One item is the abolition of Slavery by Holland in her colonies — not, indeed, as it should have been, immediate and complete, but still an abolition which at least holds out the sure *promise* of freedom to the bondman after a few years. Another and still more important piece of intelligence is the distinct avowal of the determination of the Russian Emperor to put a speedy end to serfdom throughout his dominions, giving us the spectacle of a theoretical despotism abolishing Slavery in deference to the sacredness of human rights, while the self-styled democracy of our sham republic is straining every nerve to “enlarge the area” of human bondage. The plan of emancipation embraces these particulars:—

“*First.* The proprietors are to secure to the cultivators whatever land may be necessary for their subsistence, and for the payment of their dues to both proprietor and Government.

“*Second.* In consideration of this disposition of land, the peasants must pay rent to the proprietor either in money or in labor; both to be determined by the Committee in session in the capital of the province.

“*Third.* The cabin and the kitchen-garden of the peasant are to become his own property as soon as paid for, whether in money or in labor.

“*Fourth.* The time necessary to complete the new order of things shall not be more than twelve years; and during this time, the peasants shall be in a transition state.

“*Fifth.* At the expiration of this term, the peasants shall have the right to leave the spot where they may be, and go and live where they choose. Thus, then, freedom will be definitely accomplished.

“*Sixth.* Thereafter, half of all the seignorial lands are to be set apart for the use of the peasants, never to be re-united to the said seignorial estates.”

OBITUARY.

In drawing our history of the year's events to a close, we have to turn sad and tearful eyes upon vacant places in our scanty ranks, whence the brave and true have fallen with harness on and

faces to the foe. On the 11th of last December, our faithful fellow soldier in this warfare, WILLIAM H. TOPP, of Albany, in his forty-fifth year reached the end of his earthly life, a life devoted to constant and faithful labor in improving the condition of the oppressed and degraded race with which, not more by blood and hue than by hearty sympathy with their sufferings and earnest love of their welfare, he was identified. Though of that proscribed race, says the Albany *Evening Journal* :

“By his industry, enterprise, taste, intelligence and manly deportment, he had acquired a handsome property, and the confidence and friendship of all who knew him. The very character he had established in that community, even had he done nothing else, is an evidence that his life-long labors for his race have not been in vain. The *life* of such a man is itself the most powerful of arguments, more potent for good than any word which could be uttered, or statute enacted.

“For many years he has cheerfully and liberally contributed of his talent, his moral influence, and his means, most valuable coöperation in bearing upward and onward the Anti-Slavery enterprise. Many heroic adventurers from the scenes of Southern oppression have thanked God and taken fresh courage, and refer with blessings to his memory for his generous and self-sacrificing aid in the hour of greatest need.

“As an upright and honorable business man, he had no superior, and in that capacity he had won the confidence and esteem of a large circle of patrons and friends. In social life his was always a welcome presence. Few are recipients to as great a degree of the rare endowment of native refinement, and an intuitive sense of propriety. His self-possessed, dignified and gentlemanly bearing indicated to all the spirit of a superior man.

“The members of a bereaved family-circle mourn the loss of a devoted husband, a fond and affectionate parent and brother; from a numerous and widely extended circle of relatives and friends has been removed an endeared relative, a faithful, true, and beloved friend.

“Through life, the devotional and religious element, sincere, catholic and liberal, has been strongly marked in his character.

“Thus early he has been removed from a position of great usefulness in this sphere of life, but, we may hope and fondly believe, to one of still greater importance, whither he has gone.”

On the ninth of March, SARAH H. EARLE, of Worcester, Mass., was called from among us, leaving us to mourn the departure of one of the brightest, purest, loveliest spirits ever tabernacled in

earthly form — a model wife and mother — an early, steadfast and most efficient friend of the Anti-Slavery cause; one whose unswerving fidelity and perseverance in the cause, from the time its standard was first uplifted, have ever been our strength and our example; one of those “whose lives have made their names and goodness one.” She had, as she deserved, the admiration, reverence, affection and gratitude of those who knew her; she has that place in our memory through which we trust her life will in some measure yet live in us, and reveal its influence in our zeal and faithfulness in serving the cause she loved.

AGENTS AND MEETINGS.

At its Annual Meeting, May, 1856, the Society voted to hold during the year then ensuing, ONE HUNDRED Anti-Slavery Conventions, at the most favorable points which could be selected in all parts of the Northern States. In carrying out this vote, the Executive Committee employed the Agents and the means in their power to the fullest extent, drawing upon and anticipating their resources in a manner unusual even in the Anti-Slavery cause, whose laborers have ever had to work in faith that the means *would be* provided, rather than with knowledge that they *were*. Nearly *ninety* of the one hundred Conventions were duly held before the Annual Meeting of 1857, of which twenty-seven were held in the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin; and the remainder in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

A similar course was pursued by the Society during the year 1857-58, and with an obviously increased interest on the part of the people in all sections of the country visited. Again the Society, with the efficient help of Mrs. ABBY KELLEY FOSTER, as its General Agent, and with the aid of several corps of lecturers of the highest ability and worth, occupied the field of the Northern States, and particularly the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois, and instituted and held a series of Conventions and Lectures of a most efficient character.

During these two years — May, 1856, to May, 1858 — in addition to the services of Mrs. FOSTER, as General Agent, already mentioned, and which, it should be added, were for a considerable

part of the time rendered gratuitously, the Society had the effective aid of SAMUEL MAY, Jr., as General Agent for New England, and of the following persons, as its Agents for longer or shorter periods, many of them for the entire time:—

PARKER PILLSBURY and ANDREW T. FOSS, of New Hampshire; CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, of Connecticut; STEPHEN S. FOSTER, CHARLES K. WHIPPLE, CHARLES L. REMOND, SARAH P. REMOND, JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, and WM. WELLS BROWN, of Massachusetts; SALLIE HOLLEY, CAROLINE F. PUTNAM, SUSAN B. ANTHONY, LUCY N. COLMAN, and AARON M. POWELL, of New York; and BENJAMIN S. JONES and JANE ELIZABETH JONES, of Ohio.

The Society also had the occasional—in some instances the frequent—and most valuable aid, as public speakers at its meetings, as well as in many other ways, of the following persons, to whom the grateful acknowledgments of the Committee and of the Society are, for the cause's sake, due, and are hereby respectfully tendered:—

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Esq., EDMUND QUINCY, Esq., Rev. T. W. HIGGINSON, Rev. THEODORE PARKER, Rev. JOHN T. SARGENT, Rev. DAVID A. WASSON, J. B. SWASEY, Esq., and Messrs. CHAS. E. HODGES and NATHANIEL H. WHITING, of Massachusetts; Rev. FREDERICK FROTHINGHAM, of Maine; SYDNEY H. GAY, Esq. and OLIVER JOHNSON, Esq., (Editors of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*,) Mrs. ERNESTINE L. ROSE, Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, and Rev. WILLIAM H. FISH, of New York; Rev. OCTAVIUS B. FROTHINGHAM and Mrs. LUCY STONE, of New Jersey; JAMES MILLER MCKIM, LUCRETIA MOTT, Rev. WILLIAM H. FURNESS, THOMAS WHITSON, and JOSEPH A. DUGDALE, of Pennsylvania; and of MARIUS R. ROBINSON, Esq., (Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Bugle*,) JAMES BARNABY, HENRY C. WRIGHT, Dr. ABRAHAM BROOKE, and Rev. M. D. CONWAY, of Ohio. To these undoubtedly other names are to be added; we beg all such to excuse the undesigned omission, and to labor on, that the time may speedily come when the friends and advocates of our just and righteous cause shall be too numerous to be recorded, save in the grateful hearts of those for whom they have so faithfully labored.

TRACT DISTRIBUTION AND TRACT FUND.

The enterprise of a wide, gratuitous distribution of brief but able Tracts, though by no means new to the cause or to the Society, but always to some extent in operation, was first undertaken systematically and as a distinct work, in the autumn of 1854. The Executive Committee at that time secured the services of many of the ablest writers in the country, to prepare a series of twenty Tracts, to be printed in a neat form and good type, and distributed as widely as possible over the whole country, by means of auxiliary and local societies, agents, lecturers, and individual friends of the cause. This was done. Nearly four years having elapsed, we are able to say of the undertaking that it has been successful and highly useful, especially when the very moderate amount, which has been subscribed and appropriated for this object, is taken into consideration.

The total amount contributed to the Society's Tract Fund, from all sources, since its establishment, in 1854, to May 1, 1858, is \$3,339.48. The entire amount expended, to the present time, is \$3,281.76. It will be seen that the entire fund is nearly expended, and the usefulness of this valuable agency is already much crippled. We invite, and urgently call upon, the friends of our enterprise to help us in sowing abroad the seeds of the only Anti-Slavery which is enduring, because the only one based upon uncompromising moral principle. We subjoin a list of the Tracts published by this Society for gratuitous distribution, all of which were prepared expressly for this series, with the exception of Nos. 10, 13, and 16; No. 10 having been originally written for, and published by, the *Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society*, which subsequently gave the stereotype plates to this Society; No. 13 having been first published by Mr. JOHN P. JEWETT, of Boston, by whom the stereotype plates were given to this Society; and No. 16 being a publication issued by the Fourth Congregational Church in Hartford, Conn., the stereotype plates being presented by said Church to this Society. All the Tracts of this series are stereotyped, excepting Nos. 12, 18, and 20. The following are the titles of the series:—

- No. 1. THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, EXAMINED.
- “ 2. WHITE SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.
- “ 3. COLONIZATION. By Rev. O. B. Frothingham.
- “ 4. DOES SLAVERY CHRISTIANIZE THE NEGRO? By Rev. T. W. Higginson.
- “ 5. THE INTER-STATE SLAVE TRADE. By John G. Palfrey.
- “ 6. THE “RUIN” OF JAMAICA. By Richard Hildreth.
- “ 7. REVOLUTION THE ONLY REMEDY FOR SLAVERY.
- “ 8. TO MOTHERS IN THE FREE STATES. By Mrs. E. L. Follen.
- “ 9. INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY UPON THE WHITE POPULATION. By a Lady.
- “ 10. SLAVERY AND THE NORTH. By C. C. Burleigh.
- “ 11. DISUNION OUR WISDOM AND OUR DUTY. By Rev. Charles E. Hodges.
- “ 12. ANTI-SLAVERY HYMNS AND SONGS. By Mrs. E. L. Follen.
- “ 13. THE TWO ALTARS; OR, TWO PICTURES IN ONE. By Mrs. Harriet B. Stowe.
- “ 14. “HOW CAN I HELP TO ABOLISH SLAVERY?” OR, COUNSELS TO THE NEWLY CONVERTED. By Maria W. Chapman.
- “ 15. WHAT HAVE WE, AS INDIVIDUALS, TO DO WITH SLAVERY? By Susan C. Cabot.
- “ 16. THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY; AND ITS POLICY OF SUPPRESSION AND SILENCE.
Being the Unanimous Remonstrance of the Fourth Congregational Society, Hartford, Ct.
- “ 17. THE GOD OF THE BIBLE AGAINST SLAVERY. By Rev. Charles Beecher.
- “ 18. THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW AND ITS VICTIMS.
- “ 19. RELATIONS OF ANTI-SLAVERY TO RELIGION. By Chas. K. Whipple.
- “ 20. A RIDE THROUGH KANSAS. By Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

All donations for the Tract Fund, or for the circulation of any particular Tract of the above series, should be sent to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer of the American Anti-Slavery Society, No. 21 Cornhill, Boston.

The entire number of these Tracts issued and gratuitously distributed by the Society is 303,000, or about four million five hundred thousand pages. This does not include upwards of half a million of pages of other Anti-Slavery publications (among them a large supply of the Tracts of the Leeds (England) Anti-Slavery Association) gratuitously distributed by the Society during the same period, making a sum total of over five millions of pages of Anti-Slavery matter gratuitously circulated by this Society, since the establishment of the Tract Fund.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS. — Since the last Report, the Society has stereotyped and published, in a neat duodecimo volume of 208 pages, the valuable work, compiled and arranged by WENDELL PHILLIPS, Esq., entitled “The United States Constitution a Pro-Slavery Compact;” being Extracts from President Madison’s report of the debates in the Convention on forming the Constitution; also containing the debates in the several State Conventions which adopted the Constitution, and several other important documents. This is a manual of the greatest value to every one who would know the real character of the influences under which the United States Constitution was framed and adopted, and thus learn its true intent and meaning.

The Society has also published a new edition of the “Legion of Liberty,” from the stereotype plates bequeathed to the Society by the late JULIUS R. AMES, of Albany, N. Y. This is a collection of testimonies and utterances of distinguished persons of all countries, on the subjects of Liberty and Slavery.

There have also been issued by the Society, in pamphlet form, a large edition of the Speech of WENDELL PHILLIPS, at the State Disunion Convention, held in Worcester, Mass., in January, 1857; the able article from the *Westminster Review*, entitled the “Manifest Destiny of the United States,” understood to be from the pen of Mrs. HARRIET MARTINEAU; and a Discourse on the “Significance of the Struggle between Liberty and Slavery in America,” by Rev. F. FROTHINGHAM, of Portland, Maine.

The Society has also distributed at a low price, or gratuitously, a large number of copies of the Prize Tract, written by CHARLES K. WHIPPLE, and offered to the *American Tract Society*, but rejected by them, entitled, “The Family Relation as Affected by Slavery.”

The NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD is the organ of the Society. It is issued every week, on Saturday, from the office of the Society, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York. OLIVER JOHNSON, Esq., Editor; with a corps of editorial assistants, and of European and Home Correspondents, not surpassed by those of any other American journal. TERMS: Two Dollars *per annum*. Subscriptions, in Great Britain and Ireland, may be sent to RICHARD D. WEBB, 176 Great Brunswick Street, Dublin.

The Executive Committee regret that, owing to circumstances beyond their control, the preparation and publication of these two Reports have been so long delayed. They offer them now in the confidence that they will prove a contribution to the Anti-Slavery history of the country, and a guide to future labors, as valuable as it is needful.

MAY 2, 1859.

DR. FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, in acc't with the Amer. Anti-Slavery Society, from May, 1856, to May, 1857.* CR.

To STANDARD and Donation Account,	\$15,174 61
“ Publication Account,	57 98
“ Balance from Old Account,	4,076 04
Total,	<u>\$19,308 63</u>

By Expense Account,	\$2,035 56
“ STANDARD Account,	7,189 27
“ Publication Account,	1,046 95
“ Agency Account,	5,776 07
“ Balance to New Account,	3,260 78
Total,	<u>\$19,308 63</u>

(E. E.)

(Signed) S. H. GAY, *Assistant Treasurer.*

NEW YORK, May 1, 1857.

25

Receipts of the Auxiliary Societies in Massachusetts, N. York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, for their last fiscal years,	\$18,854 03
Added to those of the American Society,	19,308 63
Make a Total of	<u>\$38,162 66</u>

Expenditures, for one year, of the American Society and Auxiliaries,	\$33,970 12
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

I have examined the above account, and find it correctly cast and the items properly vouched.

OLIVER JOHNSON.

Officers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, ELECTED MAY, 1857.

PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, MASSACHUSETTS.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

PETER LIBBEY, Maine.	THOMAS WHITSON, Pennsylvania.
LUTHER MELENDY, New Hampshire.	JOSEPH MOORE, “
THEODORE B. MOSES, “	GEORGE T. ATKINSON, New Jersey.
JEHIEL C. CLAPLUN, Vermont.	ALFRED GIBBS CAMPBELL, “
FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.	THOMAS GARRETT, Delaware.
EDMUND QUINCY, “	THOMAS DONALDSON, Ohio.
ASA FAIRBANKS, Rhode Island.	SARAH OTIS ERNST, “
JAMES B. WHITCOMB, Connecticut.	BENJAMIN BOWN, “
SAMUEL J. MAY, New York.	WILLIAM HEARN, Indiana.
CORNELIUS BRAMHALL, “	WILLIAM HOPKINS, “
AMY POST, “	JOSEPH MERRITT, Michigan.
PLINY SEXTON, “	THOMAS CHANDLER, “
LUCRETIA MOTT, Pennsylvania.	CYRUS FULLER, “
ROBERT PURVIS, “	CARVER TOMLINSON, Illinois.
EDWARD M. DAVIS, “	CALEB GREEN, Minnesota.
GEORGIANA B. KIRBY, California.	

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

SYDNEY H. GAY, NEW YORK CITY.

RECORDING SECRETARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, BOSTON.

TREASURER.

FRANCIS JACKSON, BOSTON.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.	SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.
FRANCIS JACKSON.	ELIZA LEE FOLLEN.
EDMUND QUINCY.	CHARLES F. HOVEY.
MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.	SAMUEL MAY, JR.
WENDELL PHILLIPS.	WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH.
ANNE WARREN WESTON.	CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

DR. FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, in acc't with the Amer. Anti-Slavery Society, from May, 1857, to May, 1858.* CR.

To Agency Account,	\$6,673 42
“ STANDARD Account,	6,617 61
“ Publication Account,	537 95
“ Expense Account,	2,224 46
“ Balance to New Account,	2,459 04
Total,	<u>\$18,512 48</u>

By Balance from Old Account,	\$ 3,260 78
“ STANDARD and Donation Account,	15,199 89
“ Publication Account,	51 81
Total,	<u>\$18,512 48</u>

To which may be added the receipts of Auxiliary Societies in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and the West, according to their last Annual Reports, amounting to the sum of 17,354 76

Making the aggregate receipts of this Society and its Auxiliaries, \$35,867 24

And their expenditures amounting to \$32,942 11

Officers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, ELECTED MAY, 1858.

PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, MASSACHUSETTS.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

PETER LIBBEY, Maine.	THOMAS WHITSON, Pennsylvania.
LUTHER MELENDY, New Hampshire.	JOSEPH MOORE, “
THEODORE B. MOSES, “	ROWLAND JOHNSON, New Jersey.
JEHIEL C. CLAFLIN, Vermont.	ALFRED GIBBS CAMPBELL, “
FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.	THOMAS GARRETT, Delaware.
EDMUND QUINCY, “	THOMAS DONALDSON, Ohio.
ASA FAIRBANKS, Rhode Island.	SARAH OTIS EKNST, “
JAMES B. WHITCOMB, Connecticut.	BENJAMIN BOWN, “
SAMUEL J. MAY, New York.	WILLIAM HEARN, Indiana.
CORNELIUS BRAMHALL, “	WILLIAM HOPKINS, “
AMY POST, “	JOSEPH MERRITT, Michigan.
PLINY SEXTON, “	THOMAS CHANDLER, “
LYDIA MOTT, “	CYRUS FULLER, “
LUCRETIA MOTT, Pennsylvania.	CARVER TOMLINSON, Illinois.
ROBERT PURVIS, “	CALEB GREEN, Minnesota.
EDWARD M. DAVIS, “	GEORGIANA B. KIRBY, California.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

SYDNEY H. GAY, NEW YORK CITY.

RECORDING SECRETARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, BOSTON.

TREASURER.

FRANCIS JACKSON, BOSTON.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.	SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.
FRANCIS JACKSON.	ELIZA LEE FOLLEN.
EDMUND QUINCY.	CHARLES F. HOVEY.
MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.	SAMUEL MAY, JR.
WENDELL PHILLIPS.	WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH.
ANNE WARREN WESTON.	CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

E R R A T A .

- Page 5, line 10. After *emigration*, insert *and*.
“ 57, line 13 from bottom. For *or*, read *and*.
“ 101, line 6 from bottom. For *wronged one*, read *wrong done*.
“ 112, last line. For *in consequence*, read *in the consequences*.
“ 133, between lines 19 and 20 from bottom. Insert, *and persistence in such action would*; and omit the word *to*, beginning of 19th line.
“ 155, line 7. For *His*, read *his*.
“ 160, line 20. For *of*, before *Southern*, read *by*; and put a comma after *doctrine*.
“ 164, line 17 from bottom. Put semi-colon after *first*.
“ 172, line 16. Put quotation marks after *country*. Three lines lower, put quotations marks before *cordial*.
“ 174, line 13. For *these*, read *their*.
“ 179, line 4 from bottom. Insert *Cleveland, O.* in the blank. Delete *in*, after the blank. Insert *28th*, after *October*.
“ 186. line 11. Put quotation marks after *him*. The next word should begin a new paragraph, and all the quotation marks below, on that page, should be removed.

A few other inaccuracies, of less moment, will readily be corrected by the reader.

INDEX.

- Abolitionists and Republicans contrasted, 33.
Abolition Societies, early, 66.
- ACTION OF STATES, 131—142.**
Adams's, Charles F., letter, 94.
Address, Southern New School Presbyterian, 152.
African Apprenticé Bill, 120.
- AGENTS AND MEETINGS, 187.**
Agitation in Missouri, 116.
Anti-Lecompton Democracy, 111.
Archy, Case of, 141.
Assault on Sumner, 19.
Baltimore, Methodist Episcopal Conference, 88.
Banishments from the South, 6—13.
Baptist Convention in Ohio, 90.
Baxter on Slavery, 65.
Bellows's, Dr., letter, 96.
Bishops' Methodist Episcopal, Address, 84.
Blodgett, J. L., whipped, 13.
Border Ruffians in Kansas, 39. Resisted, 41.
Brinkerhoff, Judge, Opinion of, 138.
Buchanan nominated, 27. Services of, to Slave Power, 28. Inaugural of, 48. Kansas, Policy of, 49, 109. Annual Message of, 110. Lecompton Message of, 112.
Calhoun, Regent of Kansas, 108. Action of, 112.
California, Judicial novelty in, 141.
Carter, Judge, dishonorable conduct of, 144.
Champaign County, Ohio, Fugitive case, 125.
Chase, Gov., action of, 126. Glorifies Union, 128.
- CHURCH, 79—90, 147—170.**
Clarke County, Ohio, *vs.* United States Marshals, 125.
Clarkson's testimony, 65.
Coates, Lindley, Obituary of, 99.
Colored Citizenship denied, 61. Affirmed, 62. Implied, 130, 131.
Men naturalized, 63.

- COMPENSATED EMANCIPATION**, 183, 184.
 Congregational Churches, 81—83.
 Congress, Action of, on Kansas, 50, 112, 114. On the Slave Trade, 57.
 Power of, over Territories, 70—72.
 Connecticut Association, 83.
 Connecticut on Dred Scott case, 133.
 Consequences of Tancy's doctrine, 72. Of Slavery in the Union, 73.
 Consociation, Evangelical, of Rhode Island, 83.
 Covenanters, 89.
 Cowper on Slavery, 64.
 Crime to circulate Senators' Speeches, 6.
 Crittenden's Substitute, 113.
 Curtis, Judge, in Dred Scott case, 63, 69, 70.
 Darien, Ga., Committee, 66.
 Declaration of Independence, Original Draft, 66.
 Delegates apportioned in Kansas, 102.
 Democratic Platform, 24. Misrepresentations, 36. Party divided, 111.
 Denver, Governor of Kansas, 111.
 Dexter's, Rev. H. M., letter, 96.
- DISUNION CONVENTION**, 90—98, 179—183.
 Disunion, why demanded, 38.
 Douglas against Lecompton, 111.
- DRED SCOTT CASE**, 58—76. The real issue in, 58. Summary of facts, 59.
 Judges interested, 59. Decision extra-judicial, 61, 69. Not binding,
 69, 70. Colored citizenship, 61—64. Black men "no rights," &c.,
 62. Moral of, 74. Northern responses to, 74—76.
 Earle, Sarah H., Obituary of, 186.
- EMANCIPATION, CASES OF**, 146, 147.
 Emancipationists in St. Louis, 117. Jefferson City, 118.
 English Compromise, 114. How carried, 116.
 Exposition of Principle, New School Presbyterian, 150.
 Fairfax County, Va., Resolutions, 66.
 Fee, John G., persecuted in Kentucky, 124.
- FOREIGN SLAVE TRADE**, 53, 120.
 Franklin, President Pennsylvania Abolition Society, 66.
 Free Discussion, Texan view of, 15, 16.
 Fremont Meeting in Wheeling, 9.
 Fremont nominated, 30.
- FUGITIVE SLAVE CASES**, 142—146.
 Funeral of Bully Brooks, 24.
 Geary, Governor of Kansas, 45. Policy of, 45, 46. Resigns, 46.
 Giddings's, J. R., letter, 94.
 Habcas Corpus, Pro-Slavery use of, 125, 143.
 Hamilton, Alexander, Abolitionist, 66.
 Hedrick, Professor, driven from North Carolina, 11. Dismissed from
 office, 11.
 Henry's, Patrick, testimony, 68.

- Holland, Slavery abolished by, 185.
- HUMBOLDT'S PROTEST, 98.
- Illinois, Judicial Action in, 140.
- Imprisonments in Kansas, 41.
- Investigating Committee, House of Representatives, 49.
- Jay, John, President Abolition Society, 66.
- Jay's, Judge, letter, 180.
- Jefferson's testimony, 66, 67, 68.
- Kane, Judge, Slave case before, 145.
- KANSAS, 39—51, 101—115. Election frauds, 49, 102, 105, 106, 112. Free State triumph, 105, 112.
- Kent on Colored citizenship, 63.
- KIDNAPPING, 146.
- Lawrence besieged, 104. Sacked, 39. Convention, 103.
- Leavenworth Constitution, 113.
- Leavitt, Judge, Decision of, 127.
- Lecompton Constitution, 107. False show of submitting, 108. Pro-Slavery vote on, 111. Rejected by the people, 111. Referred in Congress, 112. Rejected by House of Representatives, 113.
- Legal persecution in Kansas, 41, 104.
- Legislature, Territorial, meets, 110.
- Lemmon Case, 139.
- Lexington South Presbytery, 148, 149.
- Lynch law, 5—13.
- McLean, Judge, in Dred Scott case, 62, 69, 70.
- Madison's testimony, 67.
- Maine, Legislation of, 75, 131. Judicial Action of, 135.
- Mansfield's Decision, 65, 72.
- Marshals, United States, brutality of, 125, 126.
- Martin's, Luther, testimony, 67, 68.
- Mason's testimony, 67.
- Mason, Senator, on Bunker Hill, 180.
- Massachusetts General Association, 82.
- Massachusetts Personal Liberty Bill in part repealed, 135. Supreme Court *vs.* Slavery, 65.
- Methodist Episcopal Church, 84, 162. Annual Conferences, 88, 89, 164—166. Convention, 164. General Conference, 84—87. Quarterly Magazine, 163, 166. Slaveholding, 87, 88, 169. Methodist Protestant Church, 170.
- MISSOURI, 116—120.
- Missouri Compromise declared void, 70. Court on Dred Scott, 60.
- Emancipation movement, 116—120. River blockaded, 43, 44.
- MOBOCRACY IN THE U. S. SENATE, 16—24.
- Montesquieu's sarcasm, 65.
- Morris's, Gouverneur, testimony, 67.
- Necker's suggestion, 65.
- Negroes excluded from Oregon, 115.

- Netherland, Col., Case of, 158.
 New Church formed, 153.
 New England Methodist Episcopal Conference, 165.
 New Hampshire Legislation, 132.
 New York East Methodist Episcopal Conference, 89, 165.
 New York Legislation, 74. Judicial Action, 139, 140.
 Northern aid to Kansas, 42, 43.
 North Carolina Convention, 66, 67. Supreme Court, 63.
 Northern Christian Advocate, 87, 88.
 Northern Independent, 87, 166.
OBITUARY, 99, 185.
OFFICERS AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, 194, 196.
 Ohio legislation, 75, 129. Judicial Action, 136—139. State Sovereignty, 125.
OREGON, 51, 115. Pro-Slavery attitude of, 116.
 Orr, Speaker, dishonorable act of, 113.
 Ossawatimie burned, 40.
 Oxford (Kansas) poll book, 106. Returns rejected, 106.
 Paley on Slavery, 64.
 Passports to Colored men, 63, 130. Refused, 130.
 Pennsylvania Legislature, 66, 68, 69.
 Pinckney's, Gen. (South Carolina) testimony, 67.
 Pinckney's, Wm. (Maryland) testimony, 68, 69.
 Prediction of St. Louis Republican, 120.
 Pre-emption, Colored men's right of, 130, 131.
 Presbyterian Church, New School, 80, 147. Old School, 160. Reformed, 89. Associate Reformed, 161. Cumberland, 162.
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, 24.
 President Pierce on Kansas affairs, 47.
 Protest, Southern New School Presbyterian, 152.
 Raynal, Abbé on Slavery, 65.
 Registry of Voters in Kansas, 102.
 Republican Platform, 30. Nominations, 30, 32.
 Robertson on Slavery, 64.
 Robinson, Gov., indicted, 41. Acquitted, 104.
 Ross, Dr., statement of, 149.
 Russell's, George R., letter, 95.
 Russian Emancipation, 185.
 Secession, Southern New School Presbyterian, 156.
 Shannon, Gov., of Kansas, 44.
 Sharpe, Granville, 65.
 Sherman's, Roger, testimony, 67.
 Slavery contrary to Common Law, 65.
SLAVE INSURRECTIONS, 76—79
 Slave Trade, Foreign, 53, 120. Profits of, 121. Now carried on, 56, 121. By Northern men, 56, 122.
SOUTHERN OUTRAGES, 123—125.

SOUTHERN REFUGEEISM, 3—16.

Standard, National Anti-Slavery, 192.

Stanton, Secretary of Kansas, 101. Convenes Legislature, 108. Removed from office, 110.

State officials for Kansas chosen, 112.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY IN OHIO, 125—129.

Stowe's, Professor, letter, 97.

Sumner and Brooks, 16—24.

Sumner's statement, 20.

Supreme Court, how constituted, 59.

Synod of Mississippi, 149.

Taney, Judge, in Dred Scott Case, 61—73. On Slave property, 72.

TANEY'S OPINION PUT IN PRACTICE, 129—131.

Toombs jubilant, 115.

Topeka Constitution ratified, 103. Convention, 103. Legislature dispersed, 41.

Topp, Wm. H., Obituary of, 186.

TRACT DISTRIBUTION AND FUND, 189—191.

TRACT SOCIETY, AMERICAN, 170—179. Investigating Committee of, 171.

TREASURER'S REPORTS, 192, 195.

Underwood, John C., fined, 123.

Union, Washington, Extract from, 111.

Unitarian, Western Conference, 83.

Vermont Churches, delegate from, 83.

Virginia Convention, 1774, 66.

Voting for Fremont forbidden, 12.

Wade's, Edward, letter, 95.

Walker's, Amasa, letter, 93.

Walker, Robert J., Governor of Kansas, 47. Inaugural of, 101, 109.

Promises fair Election, 103. Connives at Election frauds, 106, 107.

Denounces Lecompton Constitution, 109. Resigns, 109.

Warburton on Slavery, 64.

Washington on Slave Trade, 66.

Wesley on Slavery, 64.

Wilberforce, 65.

Wilson's, Senator, letter, 97.

Wisconsin Legislation, 76. Methodist Episcopal Conference, 164.

Woodson, Acting Governor of Kansas, 47.