

FIFTH

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

WITH THE MINUTES OF THE

MEETINGS OF THE SOCIETY FOR BUSINESS,

AND THE

S P E E C H E S

DELIVERED AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING

On the 8th May, 1838.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM S. DORR,

No. 123 Fulton Street.

1838. M. E.

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

NEW-YORK, WEDNESDAY, 4 o'clock, P. M. }
MAY 2, 1838. }

The American Anti-Slavery Society held its Fifth Annual Meeting at the BROADWAY TABERNACLE, in the City of New-York; according to the vote of last year, and the call of the Executive Committee.

LEWIS TAPPAN called the meeting to order.

In the absence of the President, GERRIT SMITH, Esq., Vice President of the Society, took the chair.

Prayer was offered by Rev. DAVID THURSTON, of Maine.

On motion of JOSHUA LEAVITT, the Recording Secretary of the Society, William M. Chace, Oliver Johnson, and Charles L. Remond, were chosen Secretaries of the meeting.

ROLL OF DELEGATES.

MAINE.

State Society.—David Thurston.

Bangor Theological Seminary.—H. T. Cheever.

East Pittston.—Ezekiel Robinson.

Agent A. A. S. Society.—Ichabod Codding.

Mercer.—Daniel B. Randall.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

State Society.—Nathaniel Bouton, Daniel Hoit.

Dartmouth College.—Christopher S. Bell, Benjamin F. Hosford.

New Ipswich.—Samuel Lee.

Dover.—David Root.

New Market.—Samuel Norris.

Agent American Anti-Slavery Society.—D. L. Robinson.

VERMONT.

State Society.—James Deane.
Brandon.—Orson S. Murray.
Bennington.—N. B. Hinsdill.
Agent A. A. S. Society.—G. Beckley.

MASSACHUSETTS.

State Society.—Henry G. Chapman, Alanson St. Clair, Joseph Tillson, Edmund Quincy, A. A. Phelps, Wendell Phillips, J. E. Fuller, E. G. Loring, W. L. Garrison, Seth Sprague, F. P. Tracy.
Groton.—Amos Farnsworth.
Brookline.—Samuel Philbrick.
Gardner.—Sumner Lincoln.
Springfield.—Samuel Osgood.
New Bedford.—Phineas Crandall.
Boston Wesleyan A. S. Society.—William Waterhouse.
Westfield.—Paul Townsend.
Lowell.—O. Scott, A. D. Merrill.
Lynn.—J. B. Chase.
Roxbury.—Stephen S. Smith.

RHODE ISLAND.

State Society.—Oliver Johnson, Asa Fairbanks, William Buffum, Charles L. Remond, William Adams.
Providence.—Thomas Davis, H. C. Wright, George Head, B. Arnold, Wyllys Ames, James Eames, Thomas W. Dorr, William M. Chace.
Centerville.—S. Palmer, William Dana.
Coventry.—John N. Whipple.

CONNECTICUT.

State Society.—J. T. Norton, Zalmon Storrs.
Hartford.—Joel Hawes.
Hartford Beriah Green A. S. Society.—Amos G. Beman.
Brooklyn.—G. W. Benson.
Middletown.—J. G. Baldwin, Richard Warner, J. C. Beman.
New Haven.—H. G. Ludlow.
Yale College Theological Seminary Society.—Horace Day.
Torrington.—Uriel Tyttle, E. D. Hudson.
Farmington.—Samuel Deming, A. L. Williams.

NEW-YORK.

State Society.—Beriah Green, Gerrit Smith, William Jay, William L. Chaplin, John Eastman, Alvan Stewart, Reuben Hough, Hiram Wilson
New-York City.—Duncan Dunbar, Thomas Van Ransalaer, Lewis Tappan, H. B. Stanton, C. B. Ray, A. Doolittle, J. S. Raymond, A. Cleaveland Cox, George Bourne, N. Southard, J. S. Gibbons, C. Davis, Isaac Pierce, John Jay, Joel Mann, Phillip A. Bell, Charles Follen, George Duffield, N. E. Johnson, H. L. Sharp, Elizur Wright, Jr., W. W. Niles, Joseph Hawley.

Troy.—William Yates, A. Judson.
Camden.—John Cross.
Rochester.—S. B. Treadwell.
Poughkeepsie.—J. M. Blakely.
Sangerfield.—William F. Winchell.
Clinton County Society.—J. M. Barker, S. Hawley.
Madison County Society.—J. N. T. Tucker.
Auburn.—E. W. Goodwin.
Brooklyn.—S. H. Cox.
Utica Society.—E. C. Pritchett, George Storrs.
Washington County Society.—Hiram Coriss.
Albany.—D. C. Bassett.
Peterborough.—Abishai Scofield.
Elmyra.—J. Frost.
Pleasant Valley.—Robert Laird.
Lockport.—John Keep.
Ninerville.—E. M. K. Glen.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia.—J. G. Whittier, Henry Grew, J. C. Bowers, Alfred Ketcham, S. H. Gloucester, Samuel Nichless, A. Woodard, James A. Wright, William Marot, Daniel Neal, Jr., James Forten, Jr., Lewis C. Gunn, Benjamin Lundy.
Bridgewater.—Robert Purvis.
Honesdale.—Joshua B. Graves, Silas Stevens.
Norriston.—Samuel Tyson.

NEW JERSEY.

Newark.—James Dougherty, Jesse Randal, Andrew S. Holbrook, S. R. Ward.
Patterson.—Z. Grennell.
Boonton.—George W. Esten, Daniel Norris, Swain A Condit.
West Milford.—Ebenezer McDowel.
Union A. S. Society.—William F. Gardner.
Bloomfield.—Joshua Leavitt.

OHIO.

Greenfield.—Samuel Crothers, R. S. Douglass.
Painesville.—A. Wilcox.
Oberlin A. S. Society.—R. E. Gillett, A. A. Dresser.
Sangerfield.—W. S. Winchell.
Ross County Society.—Richard Long.
Farmington.—Sidney Woodford.
Poland.—Walter Miller.

DELAWARE.

Wilmington.—C. W. Denison, Dr. Gibbons.

MICHIGAN:

State Society.—Silas Woodbury, John P. Cleveland.

On motion of REV. DAVID ROOT, it was voted that the *fourth* article of the Constitution be so construed as to include all who have contributed to the funds of this Society, either directly or by contributions to the funds of an auxiliary Society, as members of this Society.

On motion of LEWIS TAPPAN, it was voted that a committee be appointed to bring forward business. The following gentlemen were chosen the committee, viz:—

Henry T. Cheever, Maine; Samuel J. May, Mass.; David Root, N. H.; Orson S. Murray, Vt.; Austin F. Williams, Conn.; William L. Chaplin, N. Y.; Henry Grew, Penn.; Asa Fairbanks, R. I.; Charles W. Denison, Del.; Aaron Wilcox, Ohio; H. B. Stanton, N. Y.; Joel Hawes, Conn.; G. W. Esten, N. J.; and J. G. Whittier, Penn.

The following motion was offered by REV. A. ST. CLAIR, of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That nothing in the Constitution of this Society shall be so construed as to deprive the delegates from any auxiliary societies of seats in its meetings or of the right of deliberating and acting—but that they be considered entitled to all the privileges heretofore enjoyed by delegates by the uniform practice of the Society.

After discussion, on motion, the subject was referred to a committee to consider and report thereon, with instructions also if they judge proper, to report any other amendments to the Constitution.

Messrs. Alanson St. Clair, William Jay, Lewis Tappan, H. C. Wright, Edmund Quincy, were appointed the Committee.

LEWIS TAPPAN, submitted several propositions to the meeting which were adopted.

1. That a Committee be appointed to examine the records of the Executive Committee, and Sub-Committees.
2. That auditors be appointed to examine the Treasurer's, and Assistant Treasurer's Reports.
3. That a Committee be appointed to examine the accounts, books, correspondence, and doings of the Publishing Agent for the past year.
4. That a committee be appointed to examine the publications issued and sold by the Society.
5. That a Committee be appointed on the *Office Expenditures*.
6. A Committee to nominate Officers for the ensuing year.

On motion of L. TAPPAN, it was voted, that the Committee on Membership be directed to report on the expediency of amending the Constitution, so as to increase the numbers of the Executive Committee.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, half-past 7.

Rev. DAVID THURSTON in the chair.

Statements were made by gentlemen from different sections of the country, in relation to the progress of the cause in their respective states.

THURSDAY MORNING.

Meeting called to order by GERRITT SMITH, Esq.—Prayer by Rev. HENRY GREW, Philadelphia.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were then read. Rev. Mr. MAY, Chairman of the Committee on business, made a report of several resolutions. The report was accepted.

A resolution "that we consider the Declaration of sentiments made by the Convention at Philadelphia, Dec. 4, 1833, a declaration of the principles of the American A. S. Society," was debated the rest of the forenoon.

The following Committees were announced from the chair, viz:

Committee to examine the records of the Executive Committee and Sub-Committees—Beriah Green, Whitesboro, N. Y.; H. G. Chapman, Boston, Mass.; Wm. Adams, Pawtucket, R. I.

Auditors to examine the Treasurer's and Assistant Treasurer's Reports—Ellis G. Loring, Boston, Mass.; Robert Purvis, Philadelphia, Penn.; A. F. Williams, Farmington, Conn.

Committee to examine the accounts, books, correspondence, and doings of the Publishing Agent for the past year—Edmund Quincy, Boston, Mass.; J. G. Whittier, Philadelphia, Penn.; Wm. Buffum, Smithfield, R. I.

Committee to examine the publications issued and sold by the Society—Wm. Jay, Bedford, N. Y. ; Henry Grew, Philadelphia, Penn. ; John E. Fuller, Boston, Mass.

Committee on office expenditures—Wendell Phillips, Boston, Mass. ; W. L. Chaplin, Utica, N. Y. ; Joel Hawes, Hartford, Conn.

Committee to nominate officers for the year ensuing—H. T. Cheever, Maine ; Amos Farnsworth, Mass. ; Samuel Lee, N. H. ; Orson S. Murray, Vermont ; Wm. Adams, R. I. ; E. D. Hudson, Conn. ; W. L. Chaplin, N. Y. ; A. N. Dougherty, N. J. ; Robert Purvis, Penn. ; Charles W. Denison Delaware.

The Committee on membership, &c., made a report which was laid upon the table.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq., in the chair. Prayer by Rev. Dr. COX, of Brooklyn, L. I.

LEWIS TAPPAN read a letter from Mr. HITCHCOCK, a missionary to the Sandwich Islands. On motion it was voted that this letter with extracts from others of the same import from Messrs. GREEN and GULICK, and from Mrs. WADE in Burmah, be printed and circulated among the members of the different religious bodies that are to meet in this city the coming week.

The Report of the Committee on membership and alterations of the Constitution was called up and the amendment to the 9th article was adopted. The further consideration of this report was laid upon the table until 9 o'clock, to-morrow morning. The 9th article, as amended, is as follows :

ART. IX.—“Any Anti-Slavery Society, founded on the same principles, may become auxiliary to this Society, and be entitled to be represented at its meetings. The officers of auxiliary societies shall be *ex-officio* members of the Parent Institution.”

THURSDAY EVENING.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, President of the Society, in the chair. Prayer by Rev. JOEL HAWES, of Hartford, Conn.

Mr. MAY, Chairman of the business committee, submitted the following resolution, which, after discussion, was rejected; and on division, 19 rose in the affirmative, and 44 in the negative:

Resolved, That we earnestly desire that the agents and members of this Society, while engaged in advocating the pure and pacific principles of emancipation, may continue patient under their manifold provocations, forgiving their enemies, not relying upon physical strength for their defence against the violence of others, but by their patient endurance of evil, evince the spirit of their Master, whose mission was one of "*peace on earth and good will to men.*"

FRIDAY MORNING.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq., in the chair. Prayer by Rev. J. C. Beman, Middletown, Conn.

Minutes of yesterday read and approved.

On motion, it was voted that Dr. HAWES, of Conn., be excused from the committee on office expenditures. Mr. Monroe was appointed in his place.

The report of the committee on membership was called up, and the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That a committee of five be raised, to whom shall be referred the proposed amendment of the 9th article; that this committee be instructed to revise the whole Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and report to the Executive Committee the alterations they may think necessary, in order to their being published in the Emancipator: at least three months before the next annual meeting, so that the members of the Society may then be prepared to act upon them.

The following gentlemen are the committee:

E. G. Loring, A. A. Phelps, D. L. Child, W. L. Chaplin, and J. T. Norton.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, immediately to call the attention of abolitionists to the enterprise of establishing libraries, containing a complete assortment of Anti-Slavery books, in all the cities, towns and villages, and school districts throughout the country, and to devise means to accomplish this object.

On motion, voted that the report of the Executive Committee be laid on the table until to-morrow morning.

ALVAN STEWART, Esq., submitted the following resolution.

That the clause of the 2d article of the Constitution of this Society be struck out which admits "that each state in

which slavery exists has by the Constitution of the United States the exclusive right to legislate in regard to its abolition in said state."

The meeting was addressed by Mr. STEWART, and Hon. W. JAY.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq., in the chair. Prayer by Rev. Mr. WEEKS, of Ohio.

The Committee to audit the Treasurer's Report, resigned, for the want of time to attend to the duty, and the chair appointed the following gentlemen in their stead, viz :

Austin F. Williams, James S. Gibbons, and Dr. James McCune Smith.

The debate on Mr. Stewart's proposition was renewed, and occupied the attention of the meeting the remainder of the afternoon.

FRIDAY EVENING, 8 o'clock.

The President, ARTHUR TAPPAN, in the chair.

The debate upon Mr. Stewart's proposition to amend the Constitution was resumed.

SATURDAY MORNING.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq., in the chair.

Prayer by Rev. MR. ROBINSON, of Maine.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read.

Two resolutions were submitted by the business committee, the first of which was adopted as follows :

Resolved, That in our efforts to abolish slavery, we meet each other, not as members of any religious or political party; but as abolitionists, on the broad ground of common brotherhood and humanity, as moral and accountable beings, entitled to equal rights and privileges.

The other having reference to religious tests, was laid on the table.

The debate was continued on Mr. Stewart's resolution.—The vote being called, by yeas and nays, it was rejected, 46 voting in the affirmative, and 38 in the negative; two-thirds being required to alter the constitution.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq. in the chair.

Prayer by Rev. O. Scott, of Mass.

E. WRIGHT, Jr., read portions of the annual report. On motion, the report was referred to the Executive Committee to dispose of.

HON. WM. JAY, from the Committee on Publications, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on the Publications of this Society, report, that, in their opinion, these publications are sound in doctrine, and well calculated to promote the great objects of this Society."

The report was accepted, and the Committee discharged.

SATURDAY EVENING.

ALVAN STEWART, Esq., was called to the chair.

A resolution from the Business Committee, in reference to the free colored people, was laid on the table.

The Committee on Nominations submitted their report, which was accepted and laid on the table, and the Committee were discharged.

The resolution having reference to religious tests was discussed.

MONDAY MORNING.

The meeting was called to order by GERRIT SMITH, Esq.

Prayer by Rev. THEODORE S. WRIGHT, of New-York city.

Minutes read, verbally amended and approved.

The Chairman of the Business Committee read a number of resolutions which had been submitted to them. The two following were adopted :

1. *Resolved*, That the exigencies of the Anti-Slavery enterprise urgently demand the efficient and persevering efforts of this society—that its energies should be especially applied to secure a sufficient supply of books and publications for the instruction of the national mind in the grand principles of human rights, and to the formation of auxiliaries in states where they have not yet been organized.

2. *Resolved*, That in prosecuting its great work of reformation, this society under God must rely upon the confidence and steady support of its friends and auxiliaries.

The third resolution on state organization, after discussion was referred to a committee, consisting of one for each

state represented and one from the Executive Committee. L. Tappan, D. Thurston, D. Root, O. S. Murray, A. St. Clair, T. W. Dorr, W. L. Chaplin, J. C. Beaman, J. Leavitt, J. G. Whittier, S. Crothers and C. W. Denison, were appointed the committee.

On motion of OLIVER JOHNSON, the following resolutions were introduced as a substitute for that which was under discussion when the society adjourned on Saturday; and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it is the glory of the Anti-Slavery cause, that its principles are of such fundamental importance to the welfare of the whole human family, that men who differ widely from each other on political and theological subjects can labor harmoniously together for its promotion, and that no political party, or religious denomination, which is not in itself corrupt, has any thing to fear from its progress or final triumph.

Resolved, That while we hail with joy the efforts of our brethren of any religious denomination in which slavery exists, to purify their own church from the sin of slavery; we should deprecate the formation of any Anti-Slavery Society, which imposes a religious or political test for the purpose of rendering the Anti-Slavery cause subservient to the interests of a sect or party, or of opposing existing organizations.

The committee on the books and accounts of the Publishing Agent were discharged, on their own request, for the want of time to attend to the business, and Messrs. Thurston, Coddington, and Grew were appointed in their place.

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

GERRIT SMITH Esq. in the chair. Prayer by Rev. C. B. RAY, of New-York city.

The committee on office expenditures were discharged at their own request, and Dr. J. McCune Smith, James S. Gibbons and Dr. Thomas Ritter were appointed in their place.

The committee to whom was referred the subject of an arrangement between the Executive Committee and the state societies reported the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it be recommended to such state or other auxiliaries as are disposed to take the charge of the abolition cause within their respective fields, to make arrangements with the Executive Committee of this society, *guaranteeing* to our treasury such stated payments as may be judged reasonable, and then assume within their own limits the entire direction of lecturers and agents in forming local societies, collecting funds, circulating memorials and establishing libraries; and that this society will not send its agents to labor for these objects in such states as carry out this plan, except in concurrence with the State Executive Committee.

The following resolutions were presented by the Business Committee and adopted.

Resolved, That Samuel E. Cornish, Wm. Yates, C. B. Ray, of N. Y., Jehiel C. Beman, of Conn. Henry Grew, of Penn. and Charles W. Dennison, of Del., be a committee to report at an early day to the Executive Committee on the following topics:

1st. The importance of agricultural pursuits for free colored men.

2d. The importance of mechanical trades and the necessity of close and undeviating attention to mechanical occupations.

3d. The kind of education most needed by colored youth.

4th. The necessity of colored men, who would be MEN and FREEMEN, having a periodical of THEIR OWN—devoted exclusively to their interests, and conducted by THEMSELVES.

Whereas, Thomas L. Jennings, Rev. Theodore S. Wright, Charles B. Ray and Wm. Yates have appeared before the Business Committee of this society and stated that the Colored American is in need of immediate and more extended support—and that it is wished in behalf of the same to present its claims to the support of the present meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society,—Therefore,

Resolved, That an opportunity to present such claims be given; and afterwards that slips of paper be circulated to obtain the names of such as are inclined to subscribe—and of such as are willing to give pledges to get other subscribers.

Resolved, That this society regards the "COLORED AMERICAN" as an efficient and useful auxiliary in the cause of human rights, and entitled to the patronage and support of the friends of that cause, in all parts of the country.

Resolved, That the recent decision of the "Reform Convention" of Pennsylvania, disfranchising 40,000 citizens on account of their complexion, and depriving them of rights which they have enjoyed for nearly half a century, is a mournful evidence of the power of slavery over the legislature of a free state, and an additional incentive to increased exertion on our part for the overthrow of the execrable system.

Resolved, That our fellow-citizens thus threatened with disfranchisement, by their calm, manly and dignified "Appeal" against the proceedings of the "Reform Convention," have entitled themselves to our respect and sympathy.

Resolved, That whatever may be the event, whether the people of Pennsylvania shall approve or reject the proposal of the Reform Convention, we recommend our injured fellow-citizens to a course of calmness and forbearance—not voluntarily relinquishing any of their rights; but patiently and firmly enduring their present trial in the assurance that the day of their deliverance is not far distant.

Resolved, That we shall deprecate the organization of any abolition political party, but that we recommend to abolitionists throughout the country to interrogate candidates for office with reference to their opinions on subjects connected with the abolition of slavery, and to vote irrespective of party for those only who will advocate the principles of universal liberty.

TUESDAY MORNING.

In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, Rev. DAVID THURSTON of Maine was called to the chair.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. GEORGE STORRS, of Utica.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read.

Resolved, That we recommend to Abolitionists to abstain as far as practicable from the use of the products of slave labor.

On report of the Business Committee it was

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society be directed, at a proper time, to cause the following inquiries to be addressed to the several gentlemen who may be before the people of the United States as candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President, at the next election :

"1. Are you in favor of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia—for the honor and welfare of the nation ?

"2. Are you in favor of so regulating commerce among the several states that human beings shall not be made subjects of such trade ?

"3. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein ?

"4. Are you in favor of acknowledging the independence of Hayti, and of establishing commercial relations with that nation on the same terms with the most favored nations?"

Resolved, That we observe with feelings of horror and execration, an export slave trade, commenced and prosecuted between the United States and Texas; and earnestly call every patriot, and especially members of Congress, to instant, persevering, and effectual exertions to put a stop to this nefarious traffic, and thus prevent our country from becoming the Guinea of the New World.

The report of the Committee of Nominations was taken up and adopted, and the following were elected officers of the American Anti-Slavery Society for the ensuing year.

PRESIDENT.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, OF NEW-YORK.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

SAMUEL FESSENDEN, Maine.

GEORGE KENT, New-Hampshire.

ROWLAND T. ROBINSON, Vermont.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.

PELEG CLARKE, Rhode Island.

JOHN T. NORTON, Connecticut.

GERRIT SMITH, New-York.

WILLIAM R. WEEKS, New-Jersey.

ABRAHAM L. PENNOCK, Pennsylvania.

SAMUEL C. ANDREWS, Ohio.

JOHN NEEDLES, Maryland.

ZIBA FERRIS, Delaware.

NATHANIEL FIELD, Indiana.

DAVID NELSON, Illinois.

ROBERT STUART, Michigan.

SAMUEL F. PHOENIX, Wisconsin Ter.

JAMES A. THOME, Kentucky.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, New-York, }
ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jr., New-York, } *Corresponding Secretaries.*
HENRY B. STANTON, New-York, }

JOSHUA LEAVITT, New-York *Recording Secretary.*

JOHN RANKIN, New-York, *Treasurer.*

MANAGERS.**MAINE.**

SWAN L. POMROY,
DAVID THURSTON,
CALVIN NEWTON,
NATHAN WINSLOW,
SAMUEL M. POND,
GEORGE SHEPARD.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

DAVID ROOT,
N. P. ROGERS,
DANIEL HOIT,
CALVIN CUTLER,
JOHN FARMER,
TIMOTHY K. BLAISDELL.

VERMONT.

HARVEY F. LEAVITT,
KIAH BAILEY,
DAVID M. CAMP,
E. D. BARBER,
C. L. KNAPP,
O. J. FELLE,
O. S. MURRAY.

MASSACHUSETTS.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON,
SAMUEL OSGOOD,
WENDELL PHILLIPS,
SAMUEL J. MAY,
EDMUND QUINCY,
ELLIS GRAY LORING,
AMASA WALKER,
AMOS FARNSWORTH,
ORANGE SCOTT.

RHODE-ISLAND.

JAMES EAMES,
HENRY CUSHING,
WILLIAM ADAMS,
JOHN G. CLARKE,
WILLIAM BUFFUM.

CONNECTICUT.

MELVIN COPELAND,
GEORGE W. BENSON,
HORACE COWLES,
JEHIEL C. BEMAN,
LEICESTER A. SAWYER,
JOEL HAWES.

NEW-YORK.

BEBIAH GREEN,

ALVAN STEWAET,
WILLIAM GOODELL,
HENRY BREWSTER,
R. P. G. WRIGHT,
WILLIAM L. CHAPLIN,
ELON GALUSHA,
DANIEL FROST, JR.
GEORGE BOURNE,
EDWARD C. DELAVAN.

NEW JERSEY.

GEORGE W. ESTEN,
ALEXANDER N. DOUGHERTY,
JAMES COOK,
JAMES PARKHURST,
JAMES WHITE.
N. P. THOMAS,
SAMUEL AARON,
ALONZO WELTON.

PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN G. WHITTIER,
JAMES FORTEN, SEN.,
THOMAS WHITEON,
LEONARD FLETCHER,
PETER WRIGHT,
ROBERT PURVIS,
F. J. LE MOYNE,
WILLIAM A. ADAIR,
J. P. GAZZAM,
LINDLEY COATES,
NATHAN STEM,
DANIEL NEAL, JR.,
WM. JESSUP.

OHIO.

ROBERT STEWART,
LEICESTER KING,
JAMES C. LUDLOW,
ASA DRURY,
JOHN M. STERLING,
ASA MAHAN,
BENJAMIN STANTON,
WILLIAM W. BANCROFT,
GEORGE CAREY,
JAMES C. BROWN,
WILLIAM DONALDSON.

INDIANA.

TIMOTHY SPAULDING,
LUKE MUNSELL,

JOHN SAILER,
WILLIAM TWINING,
HERBERT WILLIAMS.
ILLINOIS.
JAMES M. BUCHANAN,
BENJAMIN LUNDY,
WILLIAM STEWART,
ASA TURNER,
GEORGE W. GALE,
F. W. GRAVES,
EDWARD BEECHER,
OWEN LOVEJOY.

DELAWARE.
CHARLES W. DENISON,
HURON JENKINGS,
SAMUEL M. GAYLEY.
MICHIGAN.
J. P. CLEVELAND,
ARTHUR L. PORTER,
WILLIAM KIRKLAND,
JAMES B. WHITCOMB,
MARCUS HARRISON,
CHARLES HASTINGS.
WISCONSIN.
D. S. HOLLISTON.

The Committee on the records of the Executive Committee reported,

"That they have found the books in good order, indicating great enterprise, activity and fidelity on the part of our Executive Committee, and marked and happy progress in the history of our cause.

"They would respectfully suggest the apprehension, that labors unduly severe have been imposed upon the Publishing Agent and Assistant Treasurer, and recommend that particular attention to this matter be given by the Executive Committee."

The report was adopted.

Resolved, That the prejudice against our colored brethren, so extensively cherished in the public mind, and presenting a barrier of direful efficacy to the advancement of our noble enterprise, is anti-christian and anti-republican, and demands our continued exertions for its entire abolition.

Resolved, That George Bourne, Charles W. Denison, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Beriah Green, Samuel J. May, Amos A. Phelps, O. Scott, John G. Whittier, and Hiram Wilson be a committee to prepare a declaration which shall announce the judgment of the American Anti-Slavery Society concerning the common error that our enterprise is of a political and not religious character.

Voted that when we adjourn, it be till 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The Society then adjourned to attend the public exercises of the Anniversary.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, Wm. BUFFUM, of Rhode-Island, was called to the chair.

The following resolutions were presented by the business committee, and adopted :

Resolved, That while we rejoice at the success of many hundreds of self-emancipated slaves, who by the exercise of their inalienable rights, have during the past year, gained a secure retreat under the protection of a government which holds no compromise with SLAVERY ; we yet cannot but regret the loss to our own country, of so many intelligent, industrious and valuable citizens, whose influence is needed in the great work of emancipation and elevation now before us.

Resolved, That any person who aids in restoring the fugitive to his master, and in reimposing the chains of slavery upon a fellow-being, whether acting as a public officer or otherwise, is guilty of a crime against freedom, humanity and religion—and should be regarded as the abettor of a base and cruel despotism.

Resolved, That we recommend to abolitionists, especially in the cities and larger villages and towns, to appoint committees of vigilance, whose duty it shall be to assist fugitives from slavery, in making their escape, or in a legal vindication of their rights.

Resolved, That our hearts have been cheered by the intelligence which has reached us, of the energetic measures adopted by our faithful coadjutors in England, for the complete emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies, and the overthrow of the system of apprenticeship; and that we rejoice in the evidence, which recent events have furnished us, that through the instrumentality of our eloquent friend, GEO. THOMPSON, and his associates and fellow-laborers, the people of Great Britain are rising in their might to destroy the last vestige of slavery in their colonies.

Resolved, That this Society highly approve of the plan of permanent quarterly subscriptions, as adopted by the New-York State Anti-Slavery Society, and recommend it to friends of the cause throughout the country for their immediate and general adoption.

Statements were made by LEWIS C. GUNN, recently returned from Hayti, showing the disadvantages and oppressions connected with the system of colonization and apprenticeship in that Island.

On motion of THOS. W. DORR, Esq., of Rhode-Island,

Resolved, That the project for the annexation of TEXAS to the American Union, and for establishing thereby the lasting preponderance of the slave interest in this country, has been embarrassed and rendered impracticable through the exertions of the friends to the cause of abolition, and that this fact is an encouraging proof of progress, and of the value and efficacy of the labors of our Societies, and should animate them to new exertions in the work before them, which can be terminated only by the downfall of the entire system of Republican Slavery.

The following resolution is added to the preceding, by vote of the Society:

Resolved, That we warn the American people not to be lulled into false security by the contemplated withdrawal, on the part of TEXAS, of her application for annexation to the Union, but to watch her every movement, and resist, by all constitutional means, any future similar application.

The business of the Society having been harmoniously brought to a close, this interesting meeting was adjourned *sine die*.

THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.

The Fifth Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society was held on Tuesday, May 8th, 1838, in the BROADWAY TABERNACLE, in the City of New-York. At 10 o'clock, A. M. the chair was taken by MR. ARTHUR TAPPAN, President of the Society.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. TIMOTHY MERRITT, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Lynn, Mass.

Selected portions of Scripture were read by the Rev. E. M. P. WELLS, of the Episcopal Church, Boston, Mass.

The Treasurer's Report was read by MR. JOHN RANKIN, Treasurer of the Society.

An abstract of the Fifth Annual Report of the Executive Committee, was read by H. B. STANTON, one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the Society.

The acceptance and publication of the Report was moved by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, of Boston, Mass., and seconded by R. P. G. Wright, of Schenectady, N. Y.

Said Mr. Garrison the report ought to be circulated through the length and breadth of the land, as a terror to evil doers, and to show to all mankind what abolition is, and what abolitionists are, and what, under God, abolitionists will do for the slave, until the atrocious indignity shall come to an end.

On motion of JAMES G. BIRNEY, Esq., one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the Society

Resolved, That our grateful acknowledgments are due to Almighty God for his smiles upon the Anti-Slavery cause the past year, and that we devoutly commend to Him the enslaved, with increased confidence in the speedy accomplishment of his promise that the rod of the oppressors shall be broken, and the oppressed go free.

Said Mr. Birney, I can only glance, in a few words, at *some* of the cheering facts which this resolution implies on which it is based. It is a question frequently heard, from those who will not take the trouble to inform themselves of the operations of the abolitionists, "What has this Society done? have any slaves been emancipated? are there any indications that the slaveholders are on the eve of breaking the rod of oppression? where is the evidence that encourages

you?" Now, I am confident that a calm, impartial consideration of the facts in the case will satisfy any candid mind, that we have ground for this gratulation.

In the first place, we were lately threatened with the annexation of Texas to this Union as a slaveholding state. But we now hear that the project of the annexation of Texas to the Union has been abandoned even by Texas herself; and the failure of the project is ascribed to the agitation of the Anti-Slavery question. If Texas had been added, as a slave-consuming territory, a new impulse would have been given to slave-rearing. If this new market had been opened, we cannot tell how long it would have taken to check the progress of this trade of rearing human stock for the slave market of the south-west. Had the Anti-Slavery agitation yielded no other result, this alone would have amply repaid us and warranted the language of the resolution.

But we are essaying to exterminate slavery, not by the means that are ordinarily relied on for such objects, not by force, not by power, not even by countenancing the oppressed in any way, in vindicating their own rights by physical violence, but by "a more excellent way," of moral influence. Among the numerous facts bearing *morally* on this great object, it may be mentioned that Great Britain, notwithstanding the Apprenticeship System is to expire in a little more than two years, seems about to determine that it shall be abolished in the course of the present year. Has it no important moral bearing, to find such a man as Brougham, the former advocate of the Apprenticeship System, acknowledging his mistake, and declaring that immediate emancipation is the only true doctrine, and defending himself in this position by the example of Antigua?

Again. What is the condition of France? In one of the political papers of this city, we find a communication from a man of great discernment, said to be connected with the American embassy to France; in which the writer declares, after seeing the manifestation of feeling on the subject in the Chambers, that the subject cannot be postponed even till 1840, the termination of the Apprenticeship in the British colonies. And if emancipation takes place in the French West Indies, will it be possible for Spain to resist its influence?

Another indication of the advance of our cause is to be found in the recent passage of the law proposing the Kentucky convention. I do not say that the abolition of slavery is the exclusive object of this convention, nor the principal one; but to act on slavery is *one* of the objects proposed. And it is to be remarked, that all the other causes for a convention had existed for years, and yet it had not been proposed. The passage of the law was an evidence of the advance of the Anti-Slavery feeling, which had evidently turned the scale in favor of the measure. I will not be too sanguine—perhaps the convention will not be called; and if called, perhaps the friends of freedom will be defeated by the power and influence of the leading slaveholders; yet the discussions which must necessarily arise, on the agitation of the subject, cannot fail to open the eyes of the people, and advance the cause of emancipation. The people of Kentucky will abolish slavery only when they are prepared, by honest conviction to abandon it. And that result will be accelerated by the discussions which will take place, whatever may be the fate of the present bill. While the sentiment of the whole world is hammering at the doors of the southern States for admittance, it will be in vain for the slaveholders or the convention to attempt to stop the onward march of the great and glorious principles of freedom.

It is often said that we shall never gain access to the South; that our principles will never gain ground there. We have no right to expect the full influence of our principles to be felt there, till the North is right. But just as soon as the North takes the right ground, the South will yield. Let the North yield her whole united influence in favor of Anti-Slavery, and then we shall find the line of separation between the North and the South disappearing, and not before.

It is well known, said Mr. B., how much we have been abused. After alluding to the bloody language used in the present Congress, by a member of the Senate, he said he held in his hand a communication of a different character. He had recently sent a pamphlet to Mr. Calhoun, developing the character of Anti-Slavery operations, with a letter, informing him why it was sent, and frankly proposing to give any information that was desired, respecting the operations of the Society. A short time after, he received a letter from the Hon. F. H. Elmore, in behalf of the delegation from South Carolina, in answer to this letter, asking a number of questions, requesting information covering the whole ground of the Society's operations, which have been replied to at length; and the same gentleman has sent for two sets of nearly all the publications of the Society, which have been sent agreeably to his request: by mail; for he seemed too deeply interested to wait for the usual conveyances.

This letter, said Mr. B., considering that all our proceedings have been as open as the day, and that we have taken so much pains to acquaint the South with our plans and operations, certainly evinces great ignorance respecting us. But it must also be conceded that it bears the impress of high general intelligence, as well as of distinguished courtesy. In conclusion, said Mr. B., I will read an extract of a letter from a gentleman in Louisiana, who has embraced Anti-Slavery sentiments, and declared his slaves free, and put them under pay. He said, that the pamphlet, "The Bible against Slavery," and the Emancipator, were exerting great influence there. He thinks we do wrong to discourage Christians from going to the South; and says that with a few more, they might form a church on the principle of excluding all slaveholders, which he thinks would exert a great influence.

On motion of EDMUND QUINCY, Esq. of Boston, Mass., seconded by the Hon. Seth Sprague, of Mass.,

Resolved, That the doctrines of civil and religious liberty which our Puritan ancestors transplanted to these shores, which were fostered and defended by our revolutionary fathers, are identical with those principles of freedom, the blessings of which it is the object of the Anti-Slavery enterprise to extend and secure to all our countrymen.

Mr. President:—The resolution which has been entrusted to me on this occasion, and which I have just had the honor to submit to the meeting, asserts the identity of the doctrines we maintain as abolitionists with those of republican liberty. It affirms that the faith which we hold is that which we have received from the elder and the later fathers. Can this be so? Can it be possible that that is the true faith which is despised and rejected of men,—which has made outlaws of its possessors in their native land,—which has covered them with popular scorn and hatred and reproach,—which has set a price upon their heads,—which has consigned one at least to a bloody grave? Or is that the sound creed which we see lived out in the lives of the vast majority of our countrymen, and

proclaimed in the public acts of our government, which has made the very name of free institutions and republican liberty a jest and a bye-word to the whole civilized world beside? It behooves us to know whether these much vaunted names have any original in the nature of things for which they stand, or whether they are mere sound and breath, signifying nothing.

The discrepancy, Sir, which has ever existed between the avowed principles of action and the conduct of men, has excited the sneer of the satirist, and the mournful regret of the lover of truth and of mankind in all ages. The laughing and the weeping philosophers of antiquity would find no less abundant food for merriment or for tears, were they to revisit the earth after the lapse of two thousand years, than was afforded them by the inconsistencies of their contemporaries. The follies and vices of the existing world would furnish inexhaustible themes for the gay railery of Rabelais, the grave irony of Cervantes, or the bitter sarcasm of Swift.—The professions and the conduct of our own countrymen form no exception to the melancholy picture of human weakness and folly which is portrayed on the pages of all history. The spectacle of a great people who profess the sublimest truths as the rules of their public and private conduct, who glory in the enjoyment of the purest and most universal liberty; trampling a sixth part of their countrymen under their feet, and living themselves, willing slaves, under the dominion of an iron Reign of Terror, would be worth our laughter, if it were not for the sad amount of human misery which it involves. We should mock at the folly of the mariner who having the compass in his hands, and knowing how to read his pathway on the ocean by the stars, should force the needle from its course, and refuse to take counsel of the eternal monuments of the firmament, did we not know that his mad career would soon end in fatal shipwreck. And should he load with opprobrious epithets and threaten with an ignominious death, the true friends who expostulate with his infatuation, we should regard him as the most extravagant of madmen. And yet his madness would be but a type of the fantastic tricks which we see daily played before high heaven, such as may well make angels weep. We see a people with the Gospel in their hands making loud professions of national piety, and boasting of a more abundant measure of the Christian graces than falls to the lot of other nations, openly avowing as part of their creed, that there are certain of their neighbors whom it is not their duty to love as themselves; that the impartial Father of all mankind has created one portion of his human family for the express purpose of being hated, despised, robbed and trampled upon by their brethren. We see a people claiming to be the only self-governed nation upon earth, scoffing at princes and hereditary aristocracies, and priding itself upon its pure democracy, tamely submitting, in all matters of government and public policy, to the dictation of a hereditary oligarchy, numbering in its ranks less than a sixtieth part of the population. We hear loudly vaunted the immortal declaration of the inalienable rights of man proclaimed by their fathers, and the glorious constitution which they framed, securing to all their posterity the free exercise of religion, the liberty of speech and of the press, the right of petition, the sanctity of person and property. We are then instructed in the interpretation which has been extracted by the better wisdom of later commentators from the seemingly simple language of those instruments:—that those inalienable rights only attach to men of a particular complexion;—and that those privileges are only granted on condition, that they be

not employed in the exposition or practical application of the treasonable and incendiary doctrines contained in the Declaration of American Independence, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We hear republican liberty defined to be, not the liberty of doing and saying what we please, subject to the laws of God and the laws of the land, but the liberty of doing and saying what it may please a brutal mob to allow and protect. This is the doctrine of republican liberty; this is the exposition of the privileges secured to us by our boasted charter,—as gravely set forth by veteran politicians, industriously disseminated by a multitude of preses, and piously proclaimed from the sacred desk by consecrated lips.

Such, Sir, is not the liberty which the abolitionists prize as the chief good of life. Such is not the freedom which they have struggled through a seven years' war to vindicate for themselves, and to extend to their enslaved countrymen. They do not seek to break the yoke which bows down their brethren in the dust that they may restore to them such rights as these. They do not thus propose

"To keep the word of promise to the ear,
And break it to the hope."

The liberty they love is not the possession of a particular conventional form of government, or the absence of certain odious names or superannuated institutions. It is no lifeless idol, however beautiful its proportions, or exquisite its workmanship, that they worship. The Freedom which is next their hearts and which they would fain extend to all mankind, is that true liberty,

"Which ever with right reason dwells,
Twinned, and from her hath no dividual being."

What is the crowning glory of our country, that makes her in the eyes of her sons the envy of all the world beside? It is the nominal possession of equal rights, the absence of artificial distinctions, perfect freedom in the pursuit of happiness, religious liberty, free speech and a free press, a government of laws by which the weak are protected against the strong, and the few against the many. What is the crime that has been laid to the charge of the Abolitionists? That they have been and are doing what in them lies to restore these rights and these blessings to millions of their countrymen who are unrightcously robbed of them. It is that they honestly and fairly carry out the fundamental principle of our institutions, that all men are created equal. It is that they acknowledge the brotherhood of the abject and sordid slave, to be a tie as dear to their hearts as that of his haughty lord. It is, in short, that they are striving to restore the corrupt and perverted text of the faith to which we all profess to subscribe, to its original simple and universal signification.

The liberty which we love, Sir, is the same which beckoned our fathers from beneath their happy ancestral roofs and led them across the ocean to a rock-bound and inhospitable coast, whispering in their ears that persecution and obloquy and exile were to be chosen before the sacrifice of their consciences and their rights.

In what respect, Sir, does the faith that is in us differ from that which cheered them on their stern and melancholy pilgrimage to a home in the wilderness?—What was the motive that urged their dreary flight from the hearth-stones and the graves of their ancestors to the wintry coast of New England? It was that they were denied the right of forming and uttering their own opinions. It was because they were forbidden to meddle with a time-honored institution, which to their

eyes reared its unhallowed front in impious defiance against the Most High. It was because they were prohibited from attempting, either by the press or by the lips to overthrow the pampered Hierarchy which stood a mighty stumbling-block in the way of salvation. It was, therefore, that they chose to exchange the land of their birth for a desert shore.

Why, Sir, have a portion of their descendants been condemned to the same universal obloquy and general hatred of which they were the objects in the land of their birth? It is because they have wished to undo the heavy burdens of others, and to raise them to an equality with themselves. Yes, Sir, it was because you, and he who first set this movement on foot, and the other early friends of this great cause, were the champions of universal freedom and equal rights—that you had been proscribed, a price set on your heads, and fraternal hands raised against your liberties and lives. This has ever been the fate of the pioneers of reforms. Such was the fate of Milton, the Patriarch of true republicanism—whose inspired vision foresaw the ultimate triumph of Truth,

"On evil days though fallen and evil tongues,
In darkness and with dangers compassed round
And solitude."

Such was the fate of our Puritan ancestors; such was the price at which they purchased the truths which they have bequeathed to us. Shall we hesitate to preserve for ourselves and to extend to others, the bright inheritance at the same cost? This is the temporal reward which ever awaits those who consecrate themselves to the defeat of error and the restoration of her rightful supremacy to truth. The consolations which support them under their labors, and the rewards to which they aspire, are not of this world.

Our fathers in maintaining their religious rights, discovered the inseparable connection between those rights and civil liberty. In the wilderness of New England, they erected the purest republics the world had yet known, and founded their governments upon principles which are fast subverting the ancient despotic dynasties of the old world. Where, Sir, did they discover these sublime, yet simple truths, which, like the laws that pervade and sustain the universe, had eluded the grasp of the elder world? Did they extract them from the lore of ancient and modern days which they loved? Did the discovery reward the patient thought of some Newton of the moral world? No, Sir. The fountain of inspiration was the source whence they drank in their love and nice sense of freedom. It was the Gospel of Jesus Christ that revealed to them the essential natural equality of man. They there learned the true principle of the social as well as of the moral state—"thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and they were there taught that their neighbors were all mankind. The simplicity and beauty of their institutions were the fruits of these truths. Whatever advances have been since their time made, in the science of government and the doctrine of republican liberty, are the results of a more perfect understanding of the divine law-giver of Nazareth. And, Sir, though clouds and darkness still overshadow us, we may hope that even now we see the dawning of that day when His laws shall give perfect freedom to the whole human race, when the fetters of the slave and the prejudices of the free, shall be broken, and we shall all stand up, without distinction of caste or color, free and equal, in the liberty of the sons of God.

It is but the first faint streak of that blessed day-spring that as yet gilds the edge of our horizon, and is the harbinger of that happy day. But its glimmering ray reveals to us the forlorn estate of our brother, created by God in his own image, crowned by him with glory and honor, and invested with the sceptre of delegated dominion over the lower world, fallen from his high estate, robbed of the insignia of his Godlike office, and trampled, a poor discrowned thing, in the dust. It shows us vast numbers of our countrymen, held down by chains to a brutish lot, coining their blood and their sweat into gold for others' use, and receiving the hire of their labor in stripes. Seeing these things, can we refuse to gird ourselves and go up to do battle for those that have no helper? Can we hold back from this holy war; no wild crusade to deliver the sepulchre of Christ from the infidel, but a sacred strife for the redemption of his brethren and his ransomed from slavery, barbarism and paganism in a free, civilized and christian land? This is a warfare, waged, not with arms forged by human hands, or tempered in earthly fire—not with devilish engines devised by perverted ingenuity, for the destruction of mankind; but with weapons fresh from the armory of God. In this contest, the green hills of our land are crowned with no mimic volcanoes, sending up from their summits, smoke and flame towards heaven, and pouring down their slopes lava streams of hideous death. In this conflict, no embattled hosts, with thundering tread, trample under their feet the hopes of the husbandman and the promise of the year, as they rush together

"With ruinous assault
And unextinguishable rage."

No, Sir, the kingdom for which we struggle and where we strive, is an invisible kingdom—its foundations are laid in the hearts and the souls of men. It is an empire whose limits reach beyond the flaming walls of the universe; its heights reach up to heaven—its depths descend to Hell—its origin is derived from God—its destiny is infinite—its duration eternal. The Macedonian roadman wept for a new world to conquer. This insane wish is grafted to us. The world in which we fight the battles of the Lord is full of famous fields and of victorious trophies. In this kingdom the scale of battle ever preponderates for the right. The conquerors of those fields are rewarded, not with empty titles or fading laurel-wreaths, but with the smile of approving Heaven, and with immortal crowns.

And what *are* the weapons which we wield in this heavenly conflict? Prayer, which takes Heaven by storm; faith, which grasps the palm of victory ere the battle is begun; the word of God, which makes straight the path to triumph—which fills up the vallies and brings low the mountains which obstruct our march. Clothed in this panoply, let us press onward to the rescue of our captive brethren, cheerful in the certainty of success, invincible in the justice of our cause, strong in the presence of the Lord. And at last, may our voices help to swell the triumphant shout, bursting from millions of hearts on earth, and answered from the battlements of Heaven, which shall proclaim that the victory is won, that the slave is free!

On motion of JAMES McCUNE SMITH, M. D., (a native of New-York, but a graduate of the University of Glasgow, whither, on

account of his *color*, he was obliged to resort for his education,) it was

Resolved, That we contemplate, with heartfelt satisfaction, the noble efforts that are making by the abolitionists in Great Britain and France, for the total cessation of slavery, and its concomitant the *slave trade*, and pledge to them our co-operation until, by the blessing of God, both these cruel customs shall wholly cease.

Dr. Smith said—

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I rise to offer a resolution expressive of our high satisfaction in the noble efforts of the abolitionists of Great Britain and France, who, although they are separated from us by the width of an ocean, and by distinct political insitutions, are nevertheless united with us in sentiment and exertion in the sacred cause of immediate and universal emancipation : and, Sir, whether we look at their position amongst the nations of the earth, the principles by which they seem actuated, or the measures which, in this cause, they have adopted, we have abundant reason to rejoice, and cannot but be thankful to Him who hath raised up for us in our time of need such devoted and efficient coadjutors.

With these two nations we are connected by ties of the closest amity, and enjoy greater reciprocal influence than with any others upon the globe. To these nations our struggle for independence gave the first impulse to the path of liberty, which, if they have trod with slower, they have trod with more consistent steps than we : for every step they have advanced, each measure they have gained, has been an advantage not only to themselves, but to all who are dependant on them. And whenever the people of Great Britain or of France have attained any portion of civil liberty, their first exercise of it has been to extend the precious boon to their fellow-subjects, held in the galling chains of West Indian Slavery. In the last century, the first Convention elected by the French people, immediately abolished slavery in two French colonies : and in the present, the passing of the British Reform Bill, has rapidly been followed by the abolition of British West Indian slavery. France, indeed, set the first, the most glorious and most instructive example. It was the most glorious example, because liberty was conferred without stint or restriction, without any lengthened delay to sicken hope, or purgatorial state to blast expectation ; it was sudden and entire : the man who until yesterday had toiled in the field, and had known no other incentive to labor than the cartwhip, was to-day raised to the dignity and privileges of a citizen of the republic ; the woman who until yesterday had sobbed over her youngling, and besought the grave to snatch it from the horror of existence, to-day held it towards the skies, and shrieked, *He is free!*

This example has proved most instructive, for when France again bent her neck to the iron yoke of a ruthless tyrant, and suffered her sons to be slaughtered at the altar of ambitious despotism, the men whom she had so suddenly liberated showed themselves worthy of their freedom ; for, against the veterans of Europe's conqueror, against an armament sent out by the empire which overwhelmed Napoleon, amidst the loathing and scorn of a neighboring republic, and the cold and bitter neglect of all nations, they have maintained their freedom, until now, when generous and consistent France, inspired with the genius of modern abolitionism, by acknowledging the independence of Hayti, completes the triumph which revo-

lutionary France began. France, then, has been the first to grant immediate and entire emancipation, and the first to acknowledge the right and capacity of a community of freemen to rank among the nations of the earth. And although she (France) still holds 260,000 slaves in some of her dependencies, yet recent movements nearly akin to her pristine efforts, promise these a speedy liberation. At the session of 1837, M. Passy gave notice to the French Chamber of Deputies, that he would, in the ensuing session, bring forward, and take occasion to discuss, the question of the emancipation of those slaves. When the next session arrived, that gentleman, in the fulfilment of his promise, brought forward a resolution to the effect that the children of slaves born after the promulgation of an act for the purpose should be free. After an able and interesting debate, which involved the whole question of slavery, not only was this resolution adopted, but the Deputies seemed very desirous that the gentleman should go still further, and propose a measure that might strike nearer to the root of the evil. M. Passy is the Vice President of the French Abolition Society, an association, by the way, which almost owes its existence to the remonstrances of the Glasgow Emancipation Society; and who can imagine the joy of his heart, when in presenting the resolution to the Legislature, doubtful whether they would even discuss the question to which it related, he found them not only willing for discussion, not only adopting his motion, but actually desirous to go beyond it! There was some opposition, certainly; and this, as usual, came from the ministry. Strange what a link there seems to be between ministry and slavery, that men in the possession of political power are such warm advocates for the continuance of slavery—yet the resolution passed, and the next session will probably witness a still more glorious movement in favor of abolition. Sir, this transaction is one of the most cheering that has occurred in the history of abolitionism. For we here find a legislative body, without any recurrence to the primary assemblies of the people, without being urged by petitions or bound by pledges, without being incited by the tales of horror that always accompany slavery,—for it is a remarkable fact that the slaves of Catholics are better fed and better treated than those of Protestants: I say we find a legislative body without any of the ordinary inducements, at the first discussion of the subject, not only adopting the measure proposed by the most sanguine of the abolitionists, but actually desirous of advancing still further. This was a manifestation of principle at which we may blush as Americans, but rejoice as men: and unwilling as I am to utter any remark, or draw any comparison, reflecting even the slightest discredit on

“My own, my native land,”

yet there is something in the facts, which, however humbling, may yet prove instructive. The very year that witnessed in your Hall of Representatives, the appalling spectacle of a venerable man, hooted and howled at when he sought even the right to petition in behalf of the slave, the same year beheld the legislature of king-ridden, priest-ridden, and, as some say, infidel France, cheering on an abolitionist in his measures for emancipation.

Mr. President, if we next turn our eyes toward Great Britain, on whose dominions the sun never sets, whilst they extend through every clime, we find her the neighbor of almost every nation, and therefore capable of influencing all: and this influence is regulated by those sound principles for which she is so justly distin-

guished, which are her shelter in the hour of danger, and her glory in the day of prosperity. Sound as these principles are on all other questions, they are pre-eminently so on that question which we are this day met to forward. For if, unwittingly, the British people became deeply imbued in the blood-guiltiness of slavery and the slave trade, yet as soon as they became aware of the enormity of the crime, and possessed the power to remove it, they made signal and instantaneous atonement by the immediate emancipation of their 600,000 slaves. And this great movement was distinguished by none of the bitterness of a political contest, none of the selfishness of a political victory. And when the battle was over and the victory won, the men who had gained it—the dissenters of England and Scotland—still heard the clank of chains, the groans of men, and the wail of women held in slavery by other nations. They heard these sounds, and they felt the principles by which they had recently been stirred still glow within them, and expand their benevolence beyond the limits of a single empire: they felt the force of that sentiment uttered nearly a thousand years ago by an African slave—*Homo sum, humani nil alienum a me puto*. They felt that their country was the world, their countrymen mankind, and were urged by motives that they could not resist to make the attempt to disenfranchise all their countrymen: and they bound themselves by solemn compact to begin a moral agitation that shall not cease until the last fetter shall fall from the last slave upon our earth.

They formed the British Society for the immediate and universal emancipation of slaves, and the consequent destruction of the slave trade throughout the world.

Sir, what are the means by which they hope to obtain so glorious a result?—The means are simple, but with God's blessing, they will prove efficient. With the Bible in their hands, and its precepts for their guide, they are determined calmly, but earnestly and incessantly, to remonstrate with all slaveholders, and to beseech them to liberate their slaves.

Their first effort was directed against slavery and the slave trade in our republic. They subsequently determined, by means of the same gifted and devoted agent whom they had sent here, thoroughly to abolitionize Great Britain and Ireland, in order that remonstrances might be sent from the great body of Christians of that empire, imploring the Christians of these United States to abolish American Slavery. Some of those remonstrances we have already received.—And although, at the present time, their efforts are devoted to another and more appropriate object, the entire abolition of the last vestige of slavery, which yet fingers in their colonies under the name of apprenticeship, yet as soon as they have abolished the apprenticeship system—and they will do so, even if it be but one hour sooner than its appointed expiration, yet they will obtain that honor, in order that the principles of immediate emancipation may, in their colonies, vanquish the chicanery of slavery in its very metamorphosis—then, Sir, with the renewed zeal, the additional experience, and the force of the complete example which this victory will give them, they will bring all their energies to bear upon slavery as it exists in these states.

We may rejoice then, Sir, in the present efforts of the British abolitionists, on account of the principle for which they are made. It is a struggle for immediate instead of gradual emancipation, and must, therefore, merit the sympathies, the good wishes and the co-operation of all who are in favor of immediate emancipation. We may rejoice in their efforts, on account of the proof which they give

to the world of the superiority, nay, the necessity of immediate instead of gradual emancipation. Should the apprenticeship, which works so badly, be permitted to continue until 1840, the evils which have resulted, and the insurrections which might arise from it, would be, to the slaveholder, an argument against emancipation in any form, and to many friends of liberty, an argument for very gradual emancipation. The position in which the British abolitionists are now placed, must convince slaveholders that they must grant, and abolitionists that they must obtain immediate emancipation, else they will be forced to "fight their battles o'er again."

We may rejoice in these efforts, on account of the renewed zeal which they will infuse into the abolition party of Great Britain; for it is the peculiar glory of abolitionism, as well as of all moral enterprises, that contest whets the mind, and invigorates it for other and more difficult undertakings. One moral victory gained, raises the mind to an eminence whence it perceives others that must be achieved, and inspires it with new energies for the struggle. The British slave trade being abolished, the British Anti-Slavery Society for Gradual Emancipation was formed; from this, sprung the Society for Immediate Emancipation; this, as it was thought, being obtained in the British Colonies, their (the abolitionists') views grew larger, their benevolence embraced the globe, and the Society for Immediate and Universal Emancipation was the result—and since, in this manner, each step advanced has increased their zeal and enlarged their views, we cannot doubt that their present efforts will be attended with similar effects. Indeed, sir, their present exertions have not only increased the zeal of the abolitionists, but they have added new and invaluable auxiliaries to their ranks. The flame of abolitionism is no longer confined to the dissenters of Great Britain; it has even penetrated within the walls of the church established by law: and bishops of the church of England have at length discovered that the advocacy of the cause of God's suffering poor is not inconsistent with apostolic order. Men of every rank and of every sect are gathering around the standard of abolition, and they forget the rancor of party and the clashing of creeds in their common anxiety to disenfranchise the slave; and the great principle from which this anxiety grows—that of loving all men—is, imperceptibly to themselves, diffusing its healing influence over the hostile parties for once united; Dissenter and Churchman, Protestant and Papist, standing on the broad platform of humanity and covered with the mantle of charity, are beginning to love one another whilst united to manifest their common love towards the crushed and bleeding slave. And when the apprenticeship is abolished, this mass of mind, animated by the principle which now unites it, and in the exercise of the same, will devote its entire energies to the emancipation of our slaves. And the Christians of Great Britain will call upon those of these states in one long and loud and incessant series of remonstrances, entreating them to follow the British example.

Sir, I admire this method of remonstrance. Judging from those we have already received, they seem to be of the right tone, and calculated to effect much good. I deem the method of remonstrance right, because it is warranted by the usages of nations in past and at the present time. In our own time, one government has freely remonstrated with another on the destruction of the African slave trade; why, then, may not one people—who are the source of all governmental power—remontstrate with another for the abolition of slavery? The people of

these United States, at least that very large and respectable portion of them which constitutes the American Temperance Society, have remonstrated with the British people on the sin of intemperance; have not the people of Britain an equal right to remonstrate with us on the equally heinous sin of slavery? But, Sir, not only has remonstrance, in other words, moral interference, been sanctioned by common usage and our own practice, but British interference in our slave question has actually been solicited, and solicited too by all the good and the great of our land, who are at this moment receiving pecuniary assistance from a few of the British people for the abolition of American slavery by means of colonization.— Can the good and the great complain then, if other British subjects, once solicited by the same agent, see fit to strive for the self-same object by remonstrating with the slaveholder on the justice, safety and expediency of immediate emancipation?

But, Sir, common usage may be wrong, the Temperance and even the Colonization Society may be wrong in sanctioning national interference in national sins. I still plead for the right of remonstrance on higher grounds than common usage, or the sanction of moral reforming associations. Christians are governed by the laws peculiar to the commonwealth of Christ, and which are independent of mere human laws imposed by human communities; the citizens of the Church Catholic of the Redeemer may be spread through many climes and subject to various forms of political government, but no difference in clime, no diversity in form of political creed can break the links which makes them fellow-citizens in Christ, or free them from obedience to the precepts of the Saviour. One of these precepts is, that they may rebuke one another in love; and another is, that they may exhort each other to "good works." Reposing on these precepts and obedient to them, the Christians of Britain have a right to call upon the Christians of these United States to desist from the sin of slaveholding. I have thus, Sir, imperfectly laid before you a few reasons why we may rejoice in the noble efforts of the Abolitionists of France and Great Britain. Of the latter, after five years' residence among them, during all which time I was favored with a seat in their counsels and marked their every movement, I may state it as my deliberate conviction that they are actuated in this cause by the purest benevolence, and the most sound discretion. And it is my firm belief that could their hearts be laid bare to the inspection of any southern slaveholder, he would find nothing there but Christian love toward the master himself as well as toward his slave.

Mr. President, the resolution which I hold in my hand, states that we not only rejoice in the efforts of the trans-atlantic Abolitionists, but also pledge them our co-operation in the cause. Sir, in order to co-operate with them, we must not only acknowledge their principles, we must also adopt their practice. If we look at the British example, we find that in their pursuit of the universal they omit no one of the particulars of which that universal is made up. Their abolitionism is thorough. It began at home. They first consecrated their own soil to liberty—so that "slaves cannot breathe" thereon. They next purified their colonies from the stain of slavery. Their principles now compel them, before they can call upon other sovereign people for immediate emancipation, first to practice immediate emancipation themselves by abolishing the apprenticeship. Mr. President, are there no apprentices around you? Are there not five hundred thousand apprentices to liberty not for one year or six years, but for a time not yet defined,

scattered throughout this and other states in which abolitionism almost reigns? How then can we co-operate with Great Britain, how can we emulate her example, unless we abolish the last vestiges of slavery in our own states before we send our remonstrances to other sovereign states? Or, how can we call upon the South for immediate and entire emancipation, whilst we permit gradual emancipation in the North? It may be said, Sir, that this Society is pursuing the great general object of the emancipation of all the slaves, and that when this is obtained, the elevation of the colored people of the North will follow of course. Sir, it was a similar train of reasoning and of conduct that has entailed upon the American people the necessity of forming an American Anti-Slavery Society. Our uncles—for they were mine as well as yours—fought for and obtained the precious boon of republican liberty—of equal rights—but they omitted to extend the same to those who had been slaves at the South, believing that the great object being obtained for all, liberty would as a matter of course be given to these unfortunate bondsmen. Sir, we now behold the consequences of that omission. Let us beware of following so disastrous a precedent, else we shall entail on the present generation, or those who may come after us, the necessity of a still more radical Anti-Slavery movement. Let us then, Sir, thoroughly do the work. Let us begin at home. Let us first purify our own soil and then may we call upon the South to follow the example. An eloquent gentleman who addressed you this morning observed, that if the whole moral and intellectual power of the North be brought to bear upon the South, it must accomplish the abolition of slavery. Sir, the North cannot collect nor concentrate its moral and intellectual power whilst there is slavery at the North—for semi-emancipation is slavery still—and it is my firm belief, a belief which springs from the deepest and strongest conviction, that that which will tell most, and do most towards the abolition of southern slavery, will be the sight of freed colored men, elevated in these northern white communities to the dignities and privileges of citizens of the republic.

On motion of GERRIT SMITH, of Peterborough, New-York :

Resolved, That a just and kind treatment of the colored people of the free states would contribute greatly to the termination of American slavery.

After expressing the fear that a very severe cold under which he was laboring, would not allow him to say all he wished to, Mr. Smith proceeded to remark, that the question is often put: "What have the free States to do with slavery?" We answer, said Mr. S., that there are still relics of slavery in the free states. We moreover answer, that there is an aggregate of tens of thousands of slaves in those portions of our country where the national Legislature—the Legislature of the free as well as of the slave states, has exclusive or paramount legislation. And we add, that our exhortations to our southern brethren to emancipate their slaves can never have their greatest effectiveness, as long as we are guilty of leaving those in slavery, whom it is in our power, and consequently our duty, to deliver. It may be well to say here, that were there no slavery in the slave states, the portions of slavery, which the North by herself, and which the North, in conjunction with the South, can abolish, are nevertheless so important, as to justify all the efforts which have been made to exhibit the wickedness of the system of American slavery, and to arouse the public mind to a sense of that wickedness. It is often charged that we have got up an excessive excitement on the subject of

slavery. But how utterly unfounded is this charge, may be seen in the fact, that the excitement has not been sufficiently great and wide-spread to secure the abolition of slavery even in the free states.

There is much more, however, that we at the North can do towards overthrowing American slavery. We can train up our children to hate every form, and especially the worst form of oppression. We can inculcate Anti-Slavery doctrines in all our schools and churches, in all our legislative halls, at home and abroad, rising up and sitting down;—and all this especially to the end, that persons emigrating from the North to the South, shall no longer turn slaveholders, and as the South informs us, the worst and most iron-hearted slaveholders. A friend of mine removed a few years since, from this State to the South. He soon became reconciled to slavery. He wrote a letter stating his change, and adding that in his judgment, the American Anti-Slavery Society, of which he had once thought favorably, could do no good, and had better be dissolved. In the reply to him the continuance of our Society was justified on the ground, that one of its important objects is to stamp northern minds so deeply, and so universally with Anti-Slavery truth, that persons emigrating hereafter from the North to the South, shall not be guilty of undergoing that change, which he confessed his own mind had undergone.

We at the North can aid in the work of abolishing American slavery, by making the northern literary and religious press, which as a whole, is now greatly and basely subject to pro-slavery influences, minister mightily to our cause. Our Harpers and other publishers of books, can cease to be afraid and ashamed to publish books tinctured with Anti-Slavery sentiments; our republishers of foreign Reviews can cease to apologize for reprinting articles, which are unfriendly to American slavery; and our New-York Observers and Advocate and Journals can venture to call slavery sin. The political papers of the North, have, with few exceptions, exerted their influence against our cause. How great is this influence, may be inferred from the fact, that there is no people on the face of the earth, who read political newspapers and are so much controlled by them, as this people. Now, this great influence should be transferred to the side of impartial and universal liberty.

The people of the free States can, with confessed propriety, endeavor to promote the abolition of slavery by calling on God in behalf of their poor enslaved brother—by moving the arm which moves the world. How consoling is the thought, that though every other way of labor in behalf of the millions of our enchained countrymen be hedged up and closed against us, the way of prayer is ever open. Its happy gates stand open day and night. And what great confidence in the righteousness and success of our cause are we inspired with by the fact, that whilst prayer for the deliverance of the slave is continually ascending from ten thousand hearts to him who declares, that “for the oppression of the poor and the sighing of the needy” he “will arise,” there is, all this time, no counter-prayer, no prayer for the continuance of slavery—no prayer, that God would restrain the oppressor from breaking every yoke and letting the oppressed go free! We have Anti-Slavery concerts of prayer. But who ever heard of a pro-slavery concert of prayer? Who ever heard of a pro-slavery prayer? Suppose that in one of those ecclesiastical meetings at the South, in which it is unanimously resolved, that slavery is a Bible institution, and that Abra-

ham, and Isaac, and Jacob were good old slaveholders,—some Divine, whose sleek portly person shows the good things of slavery—should be called on to lead in a prayer to God, that he would bless the institution of slavery, and give permanence and prosperity to that system, which forbids marriage and the reading of the Bible, which markets men as brutes, and which is saturated with the sweat, and tears, and blood, of countless millions;—his lips would fail of utterance—the assembly would be horror-struck; all would feel that this is carrying the Heaven-insulting mockery too far—all would feel, that, if they can be presumptuous enough to address their fellow-men in behalf of slavery, it nevertheless requires brows made of brass itself, and hearts of very iron, in order to look upward, and speak well of that guiltiest of systems—of that master-piece of Satan—to Him, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and who cannot look upon sin.

And there is still another way in which we at the North can labor for the abolition of slavery. It is that referred to in the resolution—a just and kind treatment of the colored people amongst ourselves. A year or two since, a little colored girl came to my house. A child in my family asked her if she knew what abolition meant. She promptly replied: “it means kindness to colored people.” Kindness to colored people! A beautiful and happy definition! and if there be in our ranks, any whose whole hearts do not respond to this definition, let them be assured that they are not imbued with the spirit of their holy calling.—Let them be assured, that they are abolitionists but in word and in name—not in deed and in truth.

The great justifying doctrine of American slavery is, that the man of color is unfit to take care of himself; unfit to be a freeman;—fit to be a slave and a slave only. Hence, what the South wishes of us, is such a treatment of the colored population amongst ourselves, as will serve to show that this doctrine is well founded. Hence is it, that the South would have us persevere in our past efforts to degrade and make vile our own colored people; since, in the degradation and vileness of our own people of color, is the most plausible and triumphant argument of the South, for keeping the like class of their own population under the yoke of slavery.

If the south were to enact a law, by the terms of which all her men not attaining to a given stature, were to become the absolute property of her men who rise above that stature, all she would desire of us at the North towards justifying herself before the world would be, that we show our contempt and abhorrence of the men of like inferior stature amongst ourselves; or, in other words, that we gratify the South in that event by outraging one portion of our fellow-men, as we now gratify her by outraging another portion of them.

I will very briefly advert to a few of the ways, in which we chime in with the southern policy of degrading and making vile the colored man. In this state for instance, we make color a disqualification for the right of suffrage.* The foreigner, however ignorant and ragged and drunken he may be, can, after a very brief residence on our shores, vote to fill our highest offices: whilst the colored man, though he may abound in personal property—though in respect of mind and vir-

* A freehold of \$250 is required to constitute a colored man an elector.

ture he may be an ornament of human nature—though he may be a native born citizen—and though he may have rendered perilous and essential services to his country, is nevertheless excluded from the ballot boxes. In this state too, whilst we accord to a man the right of a trial by jury, when a shilling of his property is claimed; we suffer this right to be withheld from our colored brother, when a demand is made for his perpetual enslavement. Thus do we virtually declare, that a shilling is of more consequence than the sum total of the rights and interests of the colored man. In this state too, we suffer colored men to be hunted and run down like wild beasts; and to be hurried off to the great southern prison house, without even a form of trial. Such was the fact, in the case of Peter John Lee, of the county of Westchester, who, at midnight, was seized, manacled, and taken on his way to those fields of tears and blood, which cry day and night to an avenging God. And yet, enormous as was this wrong, scarcely a political newspaper in this state remonstrated at it. Public indignation, at the abduction, a few years ago, of a white man from the western part of this state, was thought to be a virtue: but the like indignation at the abduction of Peter John Lee, would be regarded as fanaticism and folly. But, notwithstanding this unprincipled and wicked distinction, to the great heart of Him who is no respecter of persons, the rights and interests of Peter John Lee, and of his wife and children, are as dear as the rights and interests of William Morgan, his wife and children. In this state too, we virtually declare, in our law, which authorizes the existence of slavery within its limits, that the colored man is fit but to be a slave.

Another way we have at the North to debase the colored man, and to justify the doctrine of the South, that slavery is his only suitable condition, is to shut the doors of our schools against him, and to forbid him mental cultivation. For proof of our spirit on the subject of educating persons of color, witness the great and successful efforts against the project of a colored school to be established in New Haven. Witness also the violent breaking up of the colored school in Canterbury. Witness further the wrath which burst upon the academy in Canaan, New Hampshire, for its having presumed to receive youths irrespectively of complexion. Witness every where this war, which we are waging against the upward tendencies, the aspirations and the thirstings for knowledge in the colored man's soul. And yet, though we are the guilty authors of his ignorance, we are base and mean enough, and cruel and hypocritical enough, to assign this very ignorance as a justification for despising him, and even for countenancing his enslavement.

Whilst on the topic of our fierce and bitter opposition to the enlightenment of the colored man's mind, let me remark that as it was concluded, that the presence of our truly eloquent colored brother,* who has just addressed you, would pollute an American school, he was obliged to seek an education in a foreign land. And let me further remark, that, notwithstanding he had just received the highest honors in the University of Glasgow, American hatred of the colored man was so strong, as to forbid him a return to his native land in an American vessel.

Again, we degrade the colored man and stamp him with vilness by refusing to eat with him; and, as is sometimes the fact, by refusing to travel with him. We deny him a berth in the steamboat, and a seat in the omnibus. And, worse

* Dr. J. McCune Smith.

than all the other processes by which we degrade and make vile the colored man, we exclude him from the house of public worship—from that place, in which, more than in any other, men might be expected to cultivate a sense of their essential equality with each other. I say we *exclude* him. I admit, that this is not literally true, in the case of all, or even of a large share of our colored brethren. All that is meant is, that our treatment of our colored brethren in the house of public worship is such, that it should constitute in the judgment of their self-respect and views of religious duty, a sufficient ground, in ordinary cases, for excluding themselves. It is much to be regretted, that so many of our northern people of color are found willing to attend churches, where separate and odious seats are assigned them. Indeed, it would seem, that, in cases not a few, they have not even a preference for churches of an opposite character. But, is it not manifest, that by attending churches, where the aristocratic and pharasaical spirit is so rampant, they not only sanction a spurious and caste religion, but justify their own degradation? In my humble judgment, the colored man should be willing to go miles, and walk them all to worship with the disciples of an equal religion—with the disciples of a religion, which “is no respecter of persons”—rather than to enter a negro pew, even though he should have but to cross the street to enter it.

Now, if we will purge our hearts of this base and wicked prejudice against our colored brother; and if, instead of trampling upon his rights, we will justly and generously stand by him, and vindicate his rights, and plead his cause—then we shall be throwing down, in the place of holding up, the great prop of American slavery. If the fifty thousand southern people, who annually visit the North for purposes of business, health or pleasure, shall find us treating the colored man as a man, as a fellow-man, and our fellow-christian—if they shall find colored persons employed in our stores and workshops, welcomed to our streets and respected in the house of public worship—if, in a word, they shall find the avenues to wealth, honor and happiness, as wide and as clear to our colored as to our white people—then they can no longer return to the South, carrying with them, as heretofore, the suffrages of the North in favor of slavery. Then, in view of these new and impressive scenes, these fifty thousand southerners will be brought to pause, and at least to suspect, that the colored man on all of whose holy hopes and sympathies and rights and interests, they have spent life in trampling, is, after all, a man, and entitled to the treatment of a man. And who can say, that in many of these fifty thousand persons, conscience will not continue her searching work so thoroughly, that when they shall return to the South, with their new trains of thought and feeling, it will be, not to renew their tyranny, but to lift up the plundered and crushed ones out of the dust and gore; to speak words of comfort to their broken hearts; to let the rod of the oppressor fall to the ground, and to let the oppressed go free?

It is said, that this feeling of our hearts, under which we worry and outrage our colored brother, is an innocent feeling; that it is a mere preference for our own color—a preference as innocent, as is the preference of a hilly to a level, or a level to a hilly country. It is my own belief, however, that this feeling is hatred of our brother: and, if this be its character, then it is for our life, for the life of our souls, that we know it:—for, if we love not our brother, whom we have seen, how can we love God, whom we have not seen? Let us, to learn most certainly the character of this feeling, subject it to the test of its own fruits. Is it an inno-

cent feeling, which under the name of prejudice against color, has heaped well known insults and cruelties upon our estimable colored brother, Rev. Theodore B. Wright, of this city? Is it an innocent feeling, which, refusing his wife a shelter from the storm, killed her? Is it an innocent feeling, which led the keeper of a place of public resort in this city to strike with his cane an esteemed friend, Mr. Thomas Van Rensselaer, simply because Mr. Van Rensselaer had the presumption, notwithstanding his colored skin, to propose to enter that place of resort? Is it an innocent feeling, which inserts in all the deeds of lots in a cemetery of a certain Presbyterian church in Philadelphia the clause that "no person of color, and no person who has been the subject of execution, shall be interred in this lot?" Is it an innocent feeling, which thus pronounces the crime of wearing a colored skin to be so great, that he, who wears it, deserves to be thrown into the same class with murderers? No, this feeling or prejudice is not innocent.—A little son of our excellent colored friend, Rev. S. E. Cornish, whose sensibilities had just been wounded by this prejudice, went to his mother, and inquired, "Mother, what makes the white people *hate* us so?" Though philosophers and divines hesitate and blunder about the character of the feeling in question, it seems, that this little sufferer was at no loss to interpret it. He, into whose soul the iron of this prejudice has entered, will not fail, even though he be but a child, to understand its nature. He will know, that it is not love, but hatred, which impelled the iron. If we knew the heart of the colored man—for, generally speaking, white men are ignorant of it—we should not fall into so many gross errors on the subject of our duties to our colored brethren. I well recollect, how, in common with the other members of the Colonization Society, I used to wonder at the opposition of the colored people to our Society. But this wondering proceeded from ignorance of the colored man's heart. Had I communed with him, instead of those, who, though they were scheming about him, nevertheless stood entirely aloof from him, I should not have been the victim of colonization delusions for so long a time; for, as soon as I came to commune with him; to enter into his sympathies and sufferings; to put my soul in his soul's stead; and, in a word, to make myself a colored man—I saw how crushing and murderous to all the hopes and happiness of our colored brother is the policy of expelling the colored race from this country.

Having shown, that this prejudice against people of color is hatred, let me add, that it is hatred, not of complexion merely, but mainly of low condition. It is, in other words, a proud, aristocratic contempt of the poor. They, who possess this prejudice, though it be in the highest degree, do not object to having colored persons about them, if those colored persons are obviously in the capacity of servants. It is only when there is danger that colored men will rise above this humble capacity, that this prejudice is aroused, and begins to hiss, and to whet its fangs. I said, that this prejudice is hatred of low condition rather than of a colored skin. It is true, that a colored skin is despised and abhorred amongst us; but, it is only because it denotes and is associated in the mind with low condition. The unhappy victims of slavery in this country are exclusively colored persons; and hence it is, that color is the badge of the degradation and poverty, which slavery inflicts.

It is my unhesitating belief, that should our colored people be removed to a foreign land, and this nation refuse to repent of the prejudice in question, the poorest

class of whites amongst us would, in that event, soon come to be as much despised and trampled on, as the colored people now are. For the feeling, which now tyrannizes over our colored brethren, would then spend its pride and malignity on the humblest class of whites.

I have referred to a few extraordinary cases of suffering from this prejudice.—Let not the great mass of persons, who cherish this prejudice, flatter themselves, that they are not responsible for these cases, because they would not themselves indulge the prejudice to the extent of these cases. They are as clearly responsible, as those who contribute to maintain the custom of rum drinking, are for the worst consequences of that custom.

Our enterprise is stigmatized as radical. I confess to you, that it is of a most radical character. It threatens our religious and social institutions with turnings and overturnings. The Anti-Slavery Society is inculcating doctrines, the practical recognition of which has hitherto been very limited. They are the doctrines, that men are created equal, and that man has rights, which are inalienable and never to be invaded. The prevalence of these doctrines will give a new face to society. It will revolutionize the world. It will be fatal to slavery. It will be no less fatal to war:—for it will overthrow the only plausible principle on which war is commended to the world's approbation—the principle, that individuals may be sacrificed for the supposed good of communities and states. And when these doctrines shall prevail, the pure and impartial religion of Jesus Christ shall prevail: and then shall cease forever, the spurious christianity which turns men into slaves and mere appendages of their fellow-men; which drives them by thousands of thousands to the battle-field and to destruction, to promote the glory or some other ideal interest of a nation or chieftain: and which substitutes aristocratic distinctions and the contempt of the humble and poor for that mutual love, which should, and which yet will bind up all the children of Adam—the master and the servant, the employer and the employed, the occupant of the parlor and the occupant of the kitchen, the owner of the field and the laborer in the field—in one blessed and indissoluble brotherhood.

On motion of ALVAN STEWART, Esq., of Utica, N. Y.

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, in laying the petitions of hundreds of thousands of petitioners on the subject of slavery, upon the table, "without debate, reading, reference, or printing, and with no farther action whatever thereon," has been guilty of an alarming violation of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Stewart said he was not unaware of the difficult situation of the speaker whose lot it was to occupy the latter part of the 4th hour of a confined meeting. But remembering that we come together but once a year for this object, he would request those who might feel a little weary, to draw once more on their patience, while we consider still further the claims of suffering humanity. He did not intend to inflict upon the audience a dry disquisition on constitutional law, with precedents and authorities running back to the first forenoon of time to support the sacred right of petition. The life of every individual is a perfect illustration of the whole subject of petitioning. The first cries of infancy are but petitions of a sufferer who cannot by language, express his wants. Petition is the language of want, of pain, of sorrow, of man in all his sad variety of woes, imploring relief at the hand of some power superior to himself. Petitioning is the foundation of all

government, and of all the administrations of law. Whatever be the form of the government, whether a republic, monarchy, despotism or universal mobocracy, it has to be carried on by a series of petitions and requests, that are either granted or denied. From the family to the school district, and from the school district to the Capitol at Washington, it is all done by petitions. The father of a family does not *grant* all the petitions of his little subjects, but he *hears* all, or he is unworthy of the name of father. Your Common Council here in New-York, sit almost the year round, to hear and dispose of petitions. Your County Supervisors, even your Commissioners of Excise, the sources of the mighty RUM-POWER, act as they are moved by petitions. Go into the Court of Common Pleas, the Supreme Court, to Chancery, where millions of dollars are changing hands by their adjudications, it is all by petition. Our rights of the most sacred character are constantly gained and secured by petition. The legislatures of twenty-six states sit from three to six months yearly, to hear all petitions, however unreasonable or absurd. None goes away unread or unheard. When, until this memorable case of slavery came up, did Congress ever refuse to receive and act upon a petition?

There was a man who lost a horse during the revolutionary war, and he undertook to get paid for it out of the United States treasury; so he petitioned, and petitioned, as long as he lived, and after his death his widow petitioned, from year to year, and all their petitions were received, and read, and referred, and considered, and reported on, and after many years, they got their money.

There was a man who lost a slave's limb in the last war, by exposure around the ramparts of cotton bags at New Orleans. This man petitioned, not for the slave, but for the mere portion of a slave, and his petition was received, read, referred, reported on, debated, and finally decided on by the united wisdom of that august assembly.

But in the year 1837, Congress ventured on this bold and tremendous step,—a step which would overthrow the Autocrat of Russia, or cost the Grand Signior of Constantinople his head—of refusing to consider the petitions of the people. It has been reserved for a republican government, in a land boasting of its freedom, to set the first precedent of refusing petitions. I say refusing petitions, because it is an insult to say that petitions are received when by your rule they are neither read nor considered, but laid down to commune with mahogany or pine wood of which the congressional tables are built. No man can be found so low in pettifoggery as to say, that such a paltry piece of chicanery as this will save the constitution.

The manner in which this act of violating the constitution was done, at open noonday, has in it something of boldness and daring that stands alone in the annals of free government. It was discovered by those who were determined to put down Mr. Slade, who had just begun his argument, that there was another great constitutional principle standing in the way; and that was the liberty of speech, which the constitution has equally secured to every man in and out of Congress. They understood very well that before the sacred right of petition, so solemnly guaranteed by the constitution could be broken down, the liberty of speech must be destroyed. The sixty-four noble hearts, who finally voted in the negative on Mr. Patton's gag law, having the constitution, and the right, and the good sense of the nation, all in their favor, would have protracted the debate till this hour.

The object was to suppress *all* discussion, and therefore the parliamentary GAG was applied, not to cut short a protracted debate—which is its only legitimate use, but in the beginning of the business, to fore^sall debate altogether. Slavery could not endure the light that would have rolled over the land from the discussion. The gag was placed in the mouth of Congress, and now, speechless and silent, the deed of darkness was committed at noonday, and this right, hitherto supposed to be so old, so heaven-deeded, so unquestioned and unquestionable, that our fathers did not think it necessary to place a guaranty of it in the first draft of the Federal Constitution—because they said no man who was out of an insane hospital, would ever have the hardihood to deny it—this sacred right was at one blow denied, destroyed, and trodden under the feet of slavery.

See, now, from all quarters of the world, petitions pouring into that ear which is never dull of hearing. And then see the American Congress close its ear and its heart against the cry of distress. O, that 21st of December, the shortest and darkest day of the year, let it not stand on my country's calendar. Let the imprecation of holy Job rest upon it. Let that day be darkness, let darkness and the shadow of death stain it, let it not be joined to the days of the year, let it not come into the number of the months. For on that day was the constitution of our country publicly immolated. To do what? Not to resist or keep out some insidious proposal, calculated to subvert the first principles of our republican institutions, and turn our free government into a monarchy. Bold measures may sometimes be well adopted in a great exigency. There is a law higher than the constitution itself, the law of national safety. But no such thing had occurred. The object was simply to get rid of the petitions of some two or three hundred thousand American men and women in behalf of human liberty! praying Congress to do, what nobody really doubts they have the power to do. Last year they rejected the petitions of slaves. This year they have rejected the petitions of us all. I don't know but that is the way they intend to make us all free and equal alike, by placing us on the same level with the slaves.

Many who never had their petitions denied a hearing before, were now roused. And finding their own paper dishonored, they applied to their state legislatures to endorse for them. But Congress is not moved. As they have treated us, they treat sovereign states.

There has been a sort of moral cowardice among our rulers, and I do not know but I ought to say, physieal cowardice too. I am sorry to say it before an American audience, but truth compels me. I have no doubt there are many men among them who long to do what we ask, but they dare not act, for fear of assassination. When such a man as John Quincy Adams, who seems to stand as the solitary representative of all that is left of the republic,—when such a man says, as he said, "I shall make such a motion to-day, because I know not that I shall be allowed to live to make it on another day,"—when Mr. Slade made his motion, and it was said by a slaveholding member of Congress, that if any body should repeat that, he should swing for it, we may see that Congress itself needs to be emancipated from the power of slavery, as much as the slave himself.

I regard this as a just retribution on our guilty nation, that has become so recreant, so lost to liberty and to honor and justice, that the only hope of its being reclaimed is in the loss of some of her own rights, that she may at last sympathize with the downtrodden slave.

Let us look again at the reason why the South will not have the petitions referred. Suppose, now, that the petitions were referred, and that a committee was appointed for the purpose of a real and thorough investigation into the nature and effects of slavery. Let that committee be friendly to justice, and determined to do their duty, and clothed with power to send for persons and papers, all over the United States.—Do you believe slavery could bear such an investigation? Do you believe it could stand under the withering glare of such a report? Could the apologists for slavery, the reverend and learned authors who are employing their time and talents to make books, and fill the religious papers with defences of "southern institutions,"—could they bear the light of this report? No, never. What would be the judgment of that committee, and of the world? That report would not be made in a pamphlet of seven or eight pages, just to give the subject a go-by. It will be a volume of hundreds of pages, and when that report appears, slavery will instantly die.

What will be in that report? How will it be made up? What are the materials of such a report, and how are they to be obtained? Let us look at it a little.

In the first place, this committee should send for all the codes of slave laws, of the several states, and of the United States. Bring up, now, those statute books of blood and crime, and you will find them full of high treason against God and against humanity. Laws made by the very men who claim this property under those laws. And what do they establish? Why, power, irresponsible power, of man over man. This is the beginning and the end, the pervading spirit of the whole code, from beginning to end. Name the civil right which these laws secure to the slave! There are none, there is no recognition of a single right in the slave.

What is the sustenance which these laws claim for the black man, as the only legal compensation for a life of compulsory toil? Read the words—"one peck of corn per week"—that is, two shillings a week, or about six mills for each meal. Our northern horses [a laugh] pardon me, I do not intend to be low; it touches humanity, and cannot be low;—I was saying our northern horses must have at least twenty-five cents *per day* in oats—or fourteen shillings per week. The keeping of one northern horse is equal to that of fourteen southern slaves. There is no man in a laborious employment here, who does not pay a dollar and a half to two dollars a week for his board. Does a northern man eat fourteen times as much as one at the South? No, but the saving is in the quality and cost of the food. Figures will tell you, that in the article of keeping alone, the master of 200 slaves will make a saving of \$314 a week, barely by the deductions from the poor slave's stomach. This in a year would make the pretty sum of sixteen thousand dollars, pinched out of these wretched men! The whole world would cry out, "O, inhumanity!" But until such an investigation can be made, I fear this nation will not believe the fact, although we show it in the very statute books of the South. Very probably there are numbers here to-day, who will set all this down as abolition slang, not worthy of belief or regard. But if they could see the evidence brought out in a congressional report, the whole nation would cry out, in a voice that might almost rend the rocks, for the speedy abolition of this detestable system.

There is another thing which we should find in these statute books of the slave states. No black man can, in any circumstances, be a witness against a

white man. Hang that fact up before the nation and the world. Add to it, that by the slave code no marriage can be binding between a slave and his wife, but may be dissolved at any moment by the arbitrary will of the master. Then again, the parent has no authority over the child, to train or govern him according to the law of God. Hang that up to view. Go on, now, and make a full synopsis of these laws. You will find, however, that they have made provision for hanging the man who shall murder a slave. Now, then, let the committee summon all the clerks of the counties throughout the slave region, to bring their records, and certify whether there has ever been a single instance of a master being hanged for the murder of a slave. Yet, in North Carolina, not long since, two white men were hung for merely coaxing a slave away from his master. And I suppose a single sheet would contain a list of all the cases on record, of punishment inflicted on masters for cruelties or injuries inflicted on their slaves.

Next, I would have the committee of Congress call up ten experienced planters from each of the slave states, to testify, what is the political economy of slavery. I would require them to state, as honest men, whether the question has not been often discussed among them, which is the most profitable,—to work slaves to death in five years, when cotton is fourteen cents per pound, or to work them twenty years, with cotton at ten cents. Inquire of them, whether one-third of the plantation slaves are not let out to tenants, whose only interest is to get out of those poor creatures the greatest possible amount of labor with the least possible expense for subsistence and comfort. And yet we have men among us, who have rolled through the South in the public conveyances, and seen the well-fed servants at the hotels, and who tell you they know all about slavery, for they have been there, and the slaves are the happiest class of beings in the world.

Next I would send for some men of a class that I believe it is Patrick Henry describes as the *feculum* of creation, the scrapings of humanity,—the slave drivers, northern men who have sold themselves, body and soul, to carry on this dreadful business in the detail. I would interrogate them as to the various modes of subduing a refractory spirit, of finding out whether a slave is sick or feigns sickness, and all the various expedients of cruelty by which an overseer tries to build up the reputation of a great labor-getter.

Let our Congressional committee then send for a hundred free men from the slave states, who have never owned a slave, themselves, nor their relations, and let them tell what they know about the cruelties and the pollutions incident to the system of slavery.

Then I would send for a hundred free colored men, who should be allowed for the first time, under the security of the strong arm of the nation, to testify of their wrongs. Let each one tell how often and by what hair-breadth escapes he has avoided being kidnapped into slavery. Let him turn to that law which allows the magistrate to exile a free colored man from his country, on ten days' notice, unheard, untried, without cause, without compensation, as passion or caprice may dictate, with confiscation of his estate, and if he refuses to go, to be sold as a slave, and his children after him forever.

Then I would have them call for a hundred of the ten thousand fugitive slaves, that have found a refuge in Canada, under the government of a hereditary monarch, from the tender mercies of our republican institutions. Let them tell of hopes crushed and hearts broken, of what they endured in slavery, and of the

sufferings and anxieties through which they have passed while in the pursuit of liberty.

Then I would have brought up before the committee a hundred slaves from the cotton-fields and the sugar-houses, who should give ocular demonstration of what slavery is. I would have them freed, and protected by a strong force, and then they should show their persons abused, their limbs mutilated, their brands and gashes, their backs cut from the shoulders to the heels with republican stripes.

When the committee have gathered all the information in their power, let it be embodied in a report. It would make a volume of a thousand pages. Then send that report through the land. Let the mails burst and the stages groan with the mighty load, telling the naked truth on this subject, in an official and authentic form;—and I tell you, slavery never lifts its abominable head again. All that the nation wants is to have a case once made out to their conviction, that slavery *is what abolitionists charge it to be*, and our work is done. Hitherto we have not been able to make out what the nation would acknowledge as a case. They want it demonstrated by evidence under the great seal of a national inquest. Only give us that, and the slaveholders will turn and hide themselves, if possible, in the dens and caverns of the earth, for shame.

As to those petitions, now piled up in monumental security, the slaveholders doubtless hope we shall forget them. Shall a mother forget her sucking child? Shall a Christian forget his God? Then may Anti-Slavery men forget these petitions. They are the entombed philanthropy of this nation. They are the enshrouded glory of our age. They cannot be forgotten. They will be saved. If another general deluge were to sweep the earth, these petitions would rise above the flood and float over the wreck of all human affairs, as the sacred ark of freedom and mercy. They will rise again from their tomb. They will yet appear before Congress, and Congress will recoil at their presence. We have heard of the great library in Egypt, of seven hundred thousand volumes; but here is a library of seven hundred thousand authors, and all on one subject, all for humanity, and there is not a trifling thought or an insignificant word in all that vast collection.

We have been altogether too cold on this subject. We once had six hundred and forty—(thousand? no, six hundred and forty men) impressed by the British on board their men-of-war. And the whole nation cried, "To arms." Probably many of these men were in fact English. They were none of them in the bonds of irresponsible power. They were always under the protecting care of British law; and British humanity looked on and stood ready to procure redress if they were used with cruelty. But the nation would not have even six hundred and forty citizens deprived of their liberty and compelled, against their own free choice, to serve a foreign power. And not less than twenty thousand lives were lost, and a hundred and thirty millions of money expended—and it was thought to be all proper for the defence of human rights. Those of this assembly who were then on the stage of action, will remember when the array of arms, the long line of death stretched from Chicago to Castine, and the whole nation was arranged to fight for those six hundred and forty seamen, whose only injury was in doing duty against their will on board of British ships.

[Mr. Stewart here added a graphic description of the origin of the Florida War

and Osceola's revenge, and closed by urging, with much force, the zealous prosecution of the business of petitioning, to be followed up, with constancy and perseverance, on all occasions, from year to year, until the end is gained.]

During the meeting several letters were read from gentlemen who had been invited to take part in the Anniversary, among which was the following,

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

"WASHINGTON, April 7th, 1838.

"LEWIS TAPPAN, Esq., New-York :

"*Dear Sir*,—I have duly received your letter of the 29th of last month, communicating to me the invitation of the Committee of Arrangements of the American Anti-Slavery Society, of my attendance at their fifth anniversary on the 8th of next month at New-York.

"I feel myself honored by this invitation, and however the operations of my own judgment have brought me to conclusions, with regard to the expediency of certain measures deeply interesting to the Union, and anxiously favored by them, different from theirs, I entertain a sincere respect for their intentions, and welcome in the purposes of their association the most efficient means prepared by Providence for the preservation of the freedom of our country from the contamination of slavery.

"My public duties will detain me here probably through the whole month of May. During the session of Congress, I do not hold myself at liberty to absent myself voluntarily from the service of the House, a single day : Such is my estimate of the representative's duty, confirmed by a positive rule of the House itself, not the less obligatory for being little observed. It will not, therefore, be in my power to attend the meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society upon their anniversary, but my best wishes will be with them, that their institution may be blessed with the smile and approbation of Heaven for the promotion of the general cause of human liberty, and for the extermination from the face of the earth of the doctrine fit to have issued from the head of Caligula, or the heart of Nero, that *bondage* is the appropriate corner-stone to the *temple of freedom*.

"I am, very respectfully, dear Sir,

"Your friend and servant,

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS."

AUDITORS' REPORT.

NEW-YORK, May 2, 1838.

We hereby certify that we have examined the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers and found the same correct, and a balance due the Treasurer of Eleven Hundred and Sixty-nine dollars and Forty-eight cents.

A. F. WILLIAMS,
 JAMES McCUNE SMITH, M. D. } *Auditors.*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Managers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, May 8, 1838, JOHN T. NORTON, Vice President, in the chair, the following persons were unanimously appointed as the Executive Committee for the ensuing year, viz :

ARTHUR TAPPAN,
 JAMES G. BIRNEY,
 JOHN RANKIN,
 S. E. CORNISH,
 LEWIS TAPPAN,
 DUNCAN DUNBAR,

S. S. JOCELYN.
 LA ROY SUNDERLAND,
 JOSHUA LEAVITT,
 ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jr.
 H. B. STANTON,
 THEODORE S. WRIGHT.

Attest,

JOSHUA LEAVITT, *Rec. Sec.*

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT.

THE Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society present their Fifth Annual Report with renewed confidence that the enterprise which has been committed to their care, enjoys the favor of Almighty God. The seal which He has always set upon every successful and glorious reformation, He has suffered to be enstamped upon this. Our principles now speaking through the blood of the martyred LOVEJOY, partake visibly of that efficacy which eighteen centuries ago smote into dust the chains of idolatry; and which has in later times made the rulers of Christendom the servants instead of the lords of their people.

Though far less labor has been expended by the Committee than heretofore in extending the organization of Auxiliaries, the reports which have reached us show 340 Societies organized since the last anniversary; making the whole number upon the list 1346.

State Societies have been organized in ILLINOIS, DELAWARE, and CONNECTICUT, and measures are in progress for another in INDIANA. The nine State Societies previously in existence, have continued in energetic and successful action. That of Vermont has paid to the American Society during the year, double the amount of its pledge at the last anniversary. That of Massachusetts has exceeded its munificent pledge of \$10,000; and that of New-York has commenced and is successfully prosecuting a plan for establishing a select Anti-Slavery Library in every school district in the State. The Societies of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New-York and Ohio, support each a newspaper of its own, devoted to the common cause. That of Pennsylvania supports two; one on each side of the mountains.* The number of important Conventions, embracing numerous delegates from states, or parts of states, has been much larger than in any former year.

* The Liberator, which was last year under the patronage of the Massachusetts Society, commenced its eighth volume as an independent establishment.

Although the unprecedented commercial embarrassments of the country have cut off or greatly diminished many of the sources from which the Society has hitherto derived its funds, it will be seen from the reports of the Treasurer and Publishing Agent, that the receipts during the year have been \$44,000, being an increase over the receipts of last year of \$5,000. Those who have examined the detailed acknowledgments in the *Emancipator*, will have perceived that a much larger proportion of the donations than in former years consists of small sums contributed among the mass of the people—a fact which clearly indicates the solid advancement of our cause.

The issues from the press during the year have been as follows :—

	Copies.
Human Rights,	187,316
Emancipator,	193,800
Circulars & Prints,	42,100
Bound Volumes,	12,954
Tracts & Pamphlets,	72,732
Slaves' Friend,	97,600
Anti-Slavery Record,	40,000
	<hr/>
Total,	646,502

Of these publications the Committee cannot forbear to characterize two as marking an era in the Anti-Slavery cause. The work on emancipation in the West Indies, the joint production of Rev. JAMES A. THOME of Kentucky, and the late JOSEPH HORACE KIMBALL, Esq. of New Hampshire, (over whose grave the friends of humanity have good cause to weep,) leaves nothing to be wished for in the way of testimony and experience in favor of the safety and profitableness of *immediate emancipation*, and its superiority on all points of expediency over any *gradual* method, in any possible condition of the slave. We have too much confidence in the candor of our countrymen at large, to believe that they can withstand such statements of fact, or withhold their co-operation from an enterprise which is borne out by the now settled results of sufficiently large and varied experiments, while it is opposed only by unsubstantial hypothesis or the fantastic products of the imagination.

The other work to which we allude, is an essay on "the power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia," first published in the form of letters under the signature of *Wythe*, in the N. Y. Evening Post. The writer of this essay, bringing the light of history in a focal blaze upon his question, has not only shown that Congress has power under the constitution to abolish slavery in the District, and annihilated the position of Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Clay, that this power cannot be exercised consistently with *implied good faith* towards the States that ceded the

District ; but has demonstrated that implied good faith required of the States themselves that slavery should long since have been abolished within their own limits.

Another publication of much interest, is the narrative of James Williams, a fugitive from slavery in Alabama, giving a view of the interior of southern institutions. It is sufficient to say that no pains were spared to apply to the veracity of the narrator every test that the circumstances of the case admitted, and a large number of gentlemen were well satisfied that there could be no imposition in the story without attributing to its author such powers of mind, as few men, either white or black, could justly lay claim to. It was published in connection with abundant facts, showing its statements to be at least within the bounds of probability. So far as any contradiction has yet been made at the South, it is of a nature to confirm rather than shake belief.

The Committee have taken measures, which, they hope, will result in placing these works in the hands of all our fellow-citizens throughout the land.

There have been in the service of the Society during the last year, 33 travelling agents, the aggregate of whose time in the employment of the Society, has been 27 years.

Three of these agents, as heretofore, have devoted themselves to the interests of our free colored brethren. This labor and expense have been repaid a thousand fold, by the laudable, and to some extent successful efforts of our colored brethren, to conquer by good conduct the prejudice that has so cruelly oppressed them. In Ohio, they are, in large numbers, purchasing new land, and applying themselves to the clearing and cultivation of the soil. Encouraging progress has also been made in that State toward the abolition of the iniquitous laws under which they suffer. The agent who has labored east of the mountains, has published a valuable collection of facts and arguments in regard to the disabilities of colored men, which cannot fail to aid in the restoration of their rights. We might easily submit proofs, that temperance, industry, and education, are doing their proper work among our colored friends. A still stronger indication that they will soon look out of countenance the supercilious pride of color, is the fact that a weekly newspaper, "The Colored American," established, supported, and edited altogether by themselves, can challenge comparison, both in a moral and literary point of view, with newspapers of the highest class among us.

Aware of the importance of meeting the call for information from the lips of the living lecturer, and that not one of a hundred, or perhaps thousand, of such calls could be answered by the travelling lecturers who were or could be employed, the committee has resorted to the employment of local agents. These are pro-

fessional and other gentlemen, well qualified to lecture, who make short excursions in their own vicinity as their other engagements will permit, the Committee furnishing them gratuitously the Society's publications, and paying their expenses incurred in the service of the Society. About seventy-five individuals have accepted this office, and the amount of labor performed has been incalculably great, at a very moderate expense to the Society.

In pursuance of the resolutions of the Society at its last annual meeting, the Committee has turned much of its attention to the subject of petitioning Congress and the State Legislatures; and it is with unfeigned thanks to God that we refer to the noble response of our fellow-citizens. Petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the territories, and of the slave-trade between the States, have been poured into Congress beyond any precedent. And since, by the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 21st, 1837, all such petitions have been laid upon the table, "without being debated, printed, read, or referred," remonstrances have been forwarded to that branch against this violation of the constitutional right of petition. Petitions and remonstrances have been addressed to Congress, from all parts of the North, against the annexation to the United States of the slaveholding republic of Texas, or any new slaveholding State. The Committee has been able to ascertain the number of petitioners on these various subjects only in the House of Representatives, the Clerk of the Senate having refused their agent permission to enumerate those who addressed that body. The petitioners to the House of Representatives, from the commencement of the extra session to the 1st of May, were as follows:

	Men.	Women.	Total.
For abolition in the District,	51,366	78,582	130,188
Against the annexation of Texas,	104,973	77,419	182,392
Rescinding the gag resolution,	21,015	10,821	31,836
Against admitting any new slave State,	11,770	10,391	22,161
For abolition of the slave trade between the States,	11,864	11,541	23,405
For abolition of slavery in the Territories,	9,120	12,083	21,212
At the extra session for rescinding the gag resolution of Jan. 21, 1837,	3,377	_____	3,377
Total,	213,485	201,137	414,571

The number in the Senate is estimated to have been about two-thirds as great as that in the House.

Petitions have also been presented to the several State Legislatures of the free States, whose sessions have occurred since our last annual meeting, praying for the abolition of such laws as make distinctions among citizens on account of color, for the extension of the right of trial by jury to persons claimed as fugitive slaves, and for resolutions on the subject of the annexation of Texas—

the right of petition, slavery in the District of Columbia, &c. The State action thus called forth, has been, in a high degree, cheering. Vermont and Massachusetts have, with scarcely any reservation, responded favorably to the prayers of the petitioners, and taken decidedly abolition ground. Favorable action has also been had in one, if not both branches of the Legislatures of Maine, Rhode Island, New-York, Ohio, and Michigan, on the questions of Texas and the right of petition.

William Jay, Esq. having resigned the office of Corresponding Secretary, to which he was appointed at the last annual meeting, the vacancy has been supplied, and the number of Secretaries increased to three, by the appointment of James G. Birney, Esq. and Mr. Henry B. Stanton. The business of the three Secretaries is so arranged as to admit of their attending meetings and conventions in various parts of the country, while each has committed to him a distinct department of service at the office. The editorship of the *Emancipator*, and the office of Recording Secretary were vacated soon after the last annual meeting, by the resignation of Rev. A. A. Phelps. Both vacancies were filled on the 10th of August, by the appointment of Rev. Joshua Leavitt.

Among the facts and events touching the Anti-Slavery cause, to which we refer with most interest, are the expressions in relation to slavery of the various christian bodies. This is pre-eminently a question of morality and religion. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Till it has been proved that the slave is not our brother, it will remain true that an interest in his welfare, and a desire for his deliverance from bondage enter into the very essence of the christian religion. And to those who believe that religious principle is the only foundation of permanent salutary changes in human affairs, there can be but little hope of the deliverance of the slave, till immediate abolitionism becomes a part of the religion of the country. We believe it is rapidly becoming so; and that the individuals and bodies of individuals, which, under various names, walk most closely in the footsteps of our Saviour, are beginning to feel that the principles of our Society are but the principles of the Gospel applied to one of their legitimate objects. The last year has added a multitude of testimonies to those already recorded, of which we have room but for a few.

The General Conference of the Free Will Baptists, representing a body of 35,000 members, passed the following resolutions, on the 10th of October last, with perfect unanimity, all voting except a single member, on the last.

Resolved, That slavery, as it exists in our country, is a system of tyranny—more cruel and wicked than the oppression and wrong practiced by any other

civilized nation in the known world, upon any class of its citizens: That it is a system murderous in its nature, its tendencies, and its actual results:—A system of robbery, robbery most aggravated—robbing man of all his rights, personal, civil, and domestic—his rights corporeal and intellectual—his rights temporal, spiritual and eternal;—robbing God of souls which he has made, that they might glorify and enjoy Him, and for whom Christ has died that they might live unto Him.

Resolved, That we concur in the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as expressed in their Declaration of Sentiments, and that we approve its measures for the removal of slavery, as those measures are set forth in its constitution, viz: by promulgation of moral truth in relation to the sin of slavery, and the righteousness and practicability of immediate emancipation.

The Presbyterian Synod of the Western Reserve, Ohio, assembled at Painesville, Sept. 28, 1837, passed the following resolutions with but *one* dissenting voice:

Resolved, 1. That although this Synod, in former years, has passed resolutions on the subject of slavery, yet the constantly increasing developments of this system of oppression, while they fully prove the correctness of the positions heretofore assumed by us, call for a farther expression of our sentiments.

2. That we deeply lament the attempts made by some professed disciples of Christ, both in and out of the ministry, to find a justification for this sin in the Holy Scriptures, whereby the sanction of a supremely benevolent God is claimed for a supremely selfish system, and occasion is given to men to deny the divine origin of the Bible.

3. That the sin of holding men in slavery, like all other sins, should be immediately repented of and forsaken by those who are guilty of it.

4. That all Christians not directly guilty of this sin, who would be on the side of God and truth, are called upon to bear their solemn testimony against it; and that any connivance on their part makes them accessories to it in the sight of God.

5. That the common prejudice which exists in this country against our colored brethren, is an obstacle which must be removed before the system of slavery can be effectually demolished.

6. That the gospel ministry, in faithfulness to their office, are called upon in the exercise of their own judgment, to exhibit the heinous guilt of a system which converts men into property; subverts the family relation—forbids its victims to read the word of God which he has commanded all to search, and thus sealing up their immortal minds in the darkness of heathenism in the midst of an enlightened community; and which, until repented of and forsaken, will bring upon us, as a nation, the righteous frowns of Him who holds all our destinies in his omnipotent hand.

The following is from the last Annual Report on the state of Religion in the Synod of Michigan:

"The cause of Anti-Slavery, especially, has gained a noble triumph within our bounds. Our ministers generally, so far as our information extends, have espoused the cause of immediate and universal emancipation, and the subject is awakening a very general interest, and getting a deep hold upon the hearts and consciences of the members of our churches."

The Fairfield (Vt.) Congregational Association has passed thorough resolutions, from which we extract one:

Resolved, That we can hold no fellowship with ministers or churches, now adhering to the principles, or practicing the abominations of slavery.

The following is among the resolutions of the Windham County (Vt.) Association:

Resolved, That under the guidance and by the help of Almighty God, we will do all that in us lies, consistent with the Gospel, to overthrow this detestable and

God-dishonoring system of slavery, and to secure to the colored population of the United States, all the rights and privileges which belong to them as men and as Americans.

The following are from the resolutions of the Oneida (N. Y.) Congregational Association:

Resolved, That American slavery in all its relations and influences, is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and is therefore a sin of the most flagitious character.

Resolved, That it is the duty of ministers of the Gospel, to give this sin a prominent place, in that catalogue of crimes which they are laboring to destroy.

Resolution of the Berkshire (Mass.) Congregational Association, June, 1837.

Resolved, That the existence of American slavery is opposed to the natural rights of man, to the law of God, and to the spirit of the Gospel; and therefore is a sin which ought to unite the efforts of all Christians for its speedy extermination.

The General Association of the Congregational ministers of Massachusetts, at its meeting in June, 1837, UNANIMOUSLY adopted the following expression of sentiment:

Whereas, Slavery as it exists in our country is a great moral and social evil, and

Whereas, No man should feel indifferent respecting that which the God of heaven disapproves, therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That the assumed right of holding our fellow-men in bondage, working them without wages, and buying and selling them as property, is obviously contrary to the principles of natural justice and the spirit of the Gospel, offensive to God, oppressive to man, and ought to cease with the least possible delay.

2. *Resolved*, That we approve of the free and candid discussion of the subject of slavery, and also all other methods of diffusing light and promoting correct moral sentiment which may have an influence to do away the evil.

It should be borne in mind that, one year before, this body of ministers adopted as their own, from Connecticut, the resolutions first passed by the General Association of the latter State, and designed as it was believed, to obstruct Anti-Slavery agents and lecturers from getting access to the congregations. Although the last resolution is somewhat guarded in its phraseology, we cannot but consider it as a generous and substantial repudiation of the doctrine of the former year, to wit: that the discussion of the subject of slavery by lecturers and agents, was "dangerous to the influence of the pastoral office."

From numerous public expressions of late, we may also fairly conclude that we are, hereafter, instead of being opposed, to be cheered on our way by the clergy of Connecticut. The public accession to our ranks of several of their number, distinguished for their usefulness and influence, is strong proof that any future attempt to disconnect *humanity* from religion, and exclude it as a profane thing from the pulpit, will be unsuccessful.

The Primitive Methodist Conference assembled in New-York, September 7, 1837,

Resolved, That no person shall be a minister or member of our Society, that

holds, buys, or sells human beings as goods or chattels, or countenances the same.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the northern States is rapidly coming upon abolition ground. In six out of sixteen Conferences there is already a majority of abolitionists, and, in four, a very large majority. In the other Conferences there are many abolitionists, so that in all there are supposed to be no less than *eight hundred* travelling, besides about as many local preachers, who are abolitionists. In many of these bodies strong expressions of Anti-Slavery sentiment have been offered, but have not been passed, because the Bishop presiding has refused to put them to vote. We find, however, that the following preamble and resolution were passed, *nearly unanimously*, at the late session of the Pittsburgh Conference, held at Steubenville, Ohio.

"Whereas the rule which prohibits 'the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them,' has recently been subjected to various constructions, not only differing from each other, but in the judgment of many of the ministers of our Church, neutralizing the force and bearing of this plain and important rule: We, therefore, consider it a privilege, and, above all, our bounden duty, to offer the following resolution, as the sense of this Conference respecting the rule in question:—

"Resolved, That in the judgment of this Conference, ALL TRAFFIC in the souls and bodies of our fellow men, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, which either originates or PERPETUATES SLAVERY, is a *direct violation, both of the spirit and letter of our general rule on this subject.*"

The following resolutions are said to have passed *unanimously*, at the late session of the Genessee Conference, held at Perry, N. York.

1st, That in the judgment of this Conference, our Discipline, in declaring that slavery is a "*great evil.*" is to be understood as pronouncing, not upon its civil and political, so much as upon its *moral* character.

2d, That "the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them," are terms that, in their obvious import, relate as well to the *internal*, as to the *foreign* traffic in human beings; so that the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention either to originate or *perpetuate* their enslavement, is a violation of the disciplinary interdict.*

We proceed to speak of some of those outrages upon humanity to which the polluted religion of the South lends its sanction. It is well known that members of all the larger sects of Christians participate in the abomination of slaveholding. Bishops,† Ministers, Elders, Deacons, and private professors, of the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian denominations, may be found buying and selling their fellow men as *property*, and extorting unrequited labor by the whip. In none of these denomi-

* See the Wesleyan Anti-Slavery Review, by Rev. O. Scott, page 135.

† We are happy to be credibly informed that this is not the case with the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

nations, as a general fact, can a member be subjected to Ecclesiastical discipline for any of the inhumanities allowed by law and custom to be perpetrated upon the slave.* As illustrative of this point, we quote from the published testimony of Rev. Samuel Heuston, of Utica, N. Y., given in answer to questions by Rev. George Storrs. Mr. Heuston is a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who has resided at the South, and did not at the time profess to be an abolitionist:—

Question. Do ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church buy and sell slaves for the sake of gain; or do they buy only; and that in cases where it is the evident design to better the condition of the slaves?

Answer. "I know that members of the M. E. Church sell slaves at auction, to the highest bidder; and it is not considered a disciplinary offence. I know of Methodist preachers buying slaves with no apparent design to better their condition, but evidently for the sake of gain."

Question. "How extensively do ministers and members of the M. E. Church hold slaves and trade in them?"

Answer. "I should think nearly one half, at least, of the ministers of our Church hold slaves and trade in them; and nearly all the members who are able to own slaves, not only hold them, but buy and sell them."

"I know an official member of the M. E. Church, Col. ———, that bought in one purchase about *fifty thousand dollars* worth of slaves."

"Esq. ———, of G——, S. C., an official member of the M. E. Church, who made it a business to buy and sell slaves in lots to suit the purchasers, has become rich by his speculation in them, and still continues the trade in human beings—trading, not only for himself, but as an agent for others. His house is head quarters for Methodists—a home for the preachers. He is a chief man in the Church; very benevolent."

The following is extracted from a letter received by one of our Secretaries a little more than two years ago from a clergyman of very high standing in the Presbyterian Church.

"This Church is the largest in the State, and far ahead of any other in its views on this subject (abolition)—yet some of its members still *sell their brethren*. I have recently had a case of *one member selling another*. I have been considerably perplexed with it, and have felt strong inclination to make it the ground of an overture to the General Assembly by way of inquiring as to what should be done in such a case. One or two of the elders, as well as myself, think it a matter for which a man should be excluded from the Church—but *such an act of discipline has never been performed*—and when we commence we must be prepared for a conflict which will agitate all our slaveholding churches."

Two sessions of the General Assembly have passed away since this crime was committed, and the "overture" has not been heard of. At the next session after, the subject of slavery came before the body on numerous memorials, praying that the ancient standards of the Church should be restored to their full efficacy, &c.—

* After diligent inquiry we are aware of only one Church in the slaveholding States, which has disciplined its members for wrongs that could be *lawfully* inflicted upon the slave. That is the Presbyterian Church of Madisonville, East Tennessee, under the pastoral care of the late Rev. Elijah M. Engleton. That Church, we think, in 1836, cut off two of its members for the crime of selling slaves.

and it was "*indefinitely postponed.*" This was urged by leading men at the North for the *peace of the Church!* The last session showed what sort of *peace* it was that slavery was likely to disturb—the Assembly being divided into two nearly equal parties, whose conflict engaged the attention of the whole community.* Here, then, is a Church which retains in full fellowship men who openly buy and sell and flog their own fellow-members, robbing them of wages, and often cruelly separating parents and children; husbands and wives,—and yet refusing, *for the sake of peace*, even to discuss the question whether the thousands of such delinquents shall be subjected to discipline!! The attitude of the Presbyterian Church is not peculiar. The great religious organizations which have bound up large masses of northern Christians with those who make merchandise of their fellow-men, all sustain the same pernicious relation to slavery. In days when discussion was blinked, and over-credulous philanthropy was deluded by promises of amendment on the part of the slaveholders, these organizations fostered and strengthened the system, till the most abominable crimes came to be regularly and systematically committed, by a large and powerful portion of their members. The bare silence of these bodies, must now overwhelm them in the guilt and disgrace of the atrocities which they allow to be perpetrated within their respective pales unrebuked. The tables are turned, and instead of adding any authority or sanctity to the crime of slaveholding, they must, by silent acquiescence, lose their moral power, and become as loathsome as that "body of death" to which they are attached.

We cannot here forbear to express our expectation from a careful survey of the progress of things for the last two years, that the common cause of religion and our oppressed countrymen will be speedily promoted by the utter confusion and overthrow of

*It is said by some that the real design of the proceeding in regard to certain synods, was, to take away from the Assembly the disposition to rebuke the sin of slavery. However this may be, it is certain that the six synods cut off were those in which abolitionism is most abundant. But it is painful to observe that the Convention held by these excided synods at Auburn (N. Y.) seemed studious to conceal any symptoms of decided abolitionism. Was this policy caused by a desire to get back into a Church which holds fellowship with slaveholders? If it was, its success will be more shameful than its defeat. The following extract from the Southern Religious Telegraph, the new school organ at the South, shows that new schoolism and abolitionism are not synonymous:—

"*The Abolition Act of 1818.*—Two Southern ministers (and we presume many more would unite in the request, if they had the opportunity) request that the attention of the Presbyteries be called to this act. As it now stands in the statute book of our Church it is in full force. It pronounces slavery to be '*utterly inconsistent with the laws of God*'—and authoratively requires all Presbyterians '*to do all in their power to obtain its complete abolition.*' Ought our Churches to bear the imputation longer, of violating the laws of God in this matter? If not—will not the Presbyteries see to it, that this act be repealed?"

every large church organization which shall continue to afford within its precincts an asylum for slavery.

It is in the political changes of our country, however, that the power of Anti-Slavery principles has been most signally illustrated during the past year. It is often said that religion has nothing to do with our republican politics, and hence it is inferred that a cause which is based upon and inseparable from religion should not presume to meddle with political affairs. But to make the proposition true, we must read instead of *religion, sectarianism*.

Sectarianism truly has nothing to do with politics. It is utterly excluded by the constitution, which, while it honors the common religion by borrowing its sanctions to bind the servants of the people to their duty, permits no preference to be given to any *sect*, great or small. Neither have the religious principles of abolitionism any thing to do with *sects*. They are principles that cannot be peculiar to any sect, but must exist wherever man is considered as the *image* of his Creator. *They are but the thoughts and opinions of all who truly love God, in regard to the claims of THEIR COUNTRYMEN upon the government of their country.* Therefore, unless in this republic religious men are to be outlawed and refused a voice in making the laws by which they are governed, abolitionism *must* have much to do with politics. In accordance with these sentiments abolitionists have resolved, from the first, to act upon slavery politically, not by organizing a new political party, but by making it the interest of the parties already existing to act upon abolition principles. Abolitionists are to be found belonging to all parties and all sects, but in one thing they agree, that their suffrage shall not go to elevate a man to office who refuses to use the legitimate power of that office in favor of emancipation. During the year this principle has produced the happiest results. The candidates of the opposing parties have been questioned, and their answers published, and, in cases too numerous to mention, the election has resulted in favor of those who most decidedly pledged themselves to Anti-Slavery measures.

A fact or two will suffice to show the efficacy of a judicious use of the right of suffrage.

In January, 1836, Gov. Marcy, of New-York, in his annual message to the legislature inveighed against the abolitionists with great vehemence and asserted the power of the legislature to enact penal laws against them. And subsequently a committee of the legislature in reporting some resolutions responsive to those of the Southern States, ventured to say :—

“ But in justice to themselves, and to the *occasion*, the committee must express their *accordance* with the opinion of his excellency the Governor, ‘ that **THE LEGISLATURE HAS POWER** to pass such **PENAL LAWS** as will have the effect of *preventing the citizens of this state*, and residents within it, from avail-

ing themselves with impunity of the protection of its sovereignty and laws, while they are actively employed in exciting insurrection and sedition in a sister state, or enterprises intended to be executed therein."*

The men who were thus to be made felons for the free expression of their conscientious opinions, immediately applied to the legislature for an opportunity to vindicate themselves from the charges of the Governor, *but it was denied!* In 1838, the same men applied to the popular branch of the same legislature for the use of their hall for an abolition lecture, and it was *granted* by a vote of *sixty-nine to two!* The reason of this change will be found in the history of the last election. Mr. Van Buren is far from having exhausted the causes of the general democratic defeat when he has attributed it to the influence of the banks.— Many of the most zealous opposers of monopoly remembered that the leader of their party had sold himself to the slaveholders for the presidential chair, and they refused to be included in the bargain. They were abolitionists, and they resolved to vote only for men who would pledge themselves to be true to human rights. The opposite party took advantage of this, and in many counties, strong anti-bank majorities could not save the disciplined candidates of Mr. Van Buren's pro-slavery democracy from signal defeat. The democratic politicians of Washington may continue yet awhile to charge abolitionism upon their opponents, but those of Albany are beginning to tire of the game, and Gov. Marcy will be as content to leave his *penal laws* in the abstract power of the legislature, as is "the gallant Beardsley" with the glories won on the 22d of October, 1835, in the Bleeker-Street Church of Utica.†

The respect paid to abolition votes is by no means confined to what is called the Whig party. This is evinced by the vote of

* It was matter of special wonder at the time, why the New-York resolutions which were as harmless as they were unmeaning, should have been so well received as they were at the south, especially in Virginia. But the solution is doubtless this:—the legislature took care to send with the resolutions the *report* of the committee which drafted them, but *not to publish it here!*

† The *Federal Union*, an administration paper of Milledgeville, Georgia, said of its northern mobocratic friends:—

"Many generous spirits at the North have volunteered to vindicate southern character, and to repel aggression on southern rights, with a zeal and energy, which should have won for them the ardent affection of the South. Of this, we have an instance in the gallant Beardsley. When the active abolitionists of New-York had assembled in order to hold a convention, in which they were to unite their counsels and mature their schemes for assailing the peace of the South, Beardsley, directing the indignation of his fellow-citizens against the conspirators, entered the unholy conclave, and forbade their proceeding. Alarmed at the just and spirited rebuke, they fled from the place which had been selected as the seat of their convention. We feel that honor is due, and we readily award it to this bold and generous friend of the South."

the Ohio delegation, on the resolution of Mr. Patton. The democratic members here, with one exception, broke the lines of party. In the legislatures of both Massachusetts and Vermont, the friends of the present administration have not been behind its opponents *in support* of the measures urged by the abolitionists.

The following resolutions, passed by large majorities in the legislature of Vermont, were transmitted to Congress early in the present session :

1. *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested to use their influence in that body to prevent the annexation of Texas to the Union.

2. *Resolved*, That, representing as we do the people of Vermont, we do, hereby, in their name, SOLEMNLY PROTEST against such annexation in any form.

3. *Resolved*, That as the Representatives of the people of Vermont, we do solemnly protest against the admission into this Union, of any state whose constitution tolerates domestic slavery.

4. *Resolved*, That Congress have full power by the constitution, to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and in the Territories of the United States.

5. *Resolved*, That Congress has the constitutional power to prohibit the slave trade between the several states of this Union, and to make such laws as shall effectually prohibit such trade.

6. *Resolved*, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to present the foregoing Report and Resolutions to their respective Houses in Congress, and use their influence to carry the same speedily into effect.

7. *Resolved*, That the Governor of this State be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing Report and Resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Executives of the several States, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

IN SENATE, NOV. 1, 1837.

Resolutions numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, passed by the Senate.

Resolution numbered 7, amended by striking out the words, "to the Executives of the several States," and passed by the Senate.

N. WILLIAMS, *Secretary*.

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, }
Nov. 1, 1837. }

Resolutions numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, passed by the House.

A. L. MINER, *Clerk*.

These resolutions were presented by Mr. Swift, in the Senate, on the 19th of December, and withdrawn before any action upon them. The Senators from the South professed to wish time to determine what course they would pursue. The well known opinions of the leading statesman of South Carolina, in regard to the sacredness of *state rights*, required from him a respect for these resolutions singularly conflictive with the established tactics of the South ; and it was probably difficult for him to decide whether his principles would be more deeply violated by their reception or their rejection. In this serious perplexity of this and other distinguished Senators, it was, perhaps, more polite than wise in the Senator from Vermont, to afford relief by the humiliation of his constituents. The sovereign State of Vermont had *instructed*

her representatives in the Senate to use their influence to obtain the *speedy* action of Congress for the exclusion of Texas and the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the national domain; in this state of the case, it may be questioned whether they had a right, submissively to withdraw its solemn resolutions because the champion of Texas and perpetual slavery was taken by surprise, and had not yet made up his mind whether the resolutions should be received or spurned from the threshold!* There was a pledge on the part of Mr. Swift, to bring up his resolutions at a future time; but before that time arrived, Mr. Calhoun had forestalled them by a set of resolutions of his own, so that the voice of a sovereign state had the honor to lie silent in the pocket or desk of its Senator, till preparations had been made for giving it a final resting place on the table of the Senate! Perhaps the northern states deserve to be the subjects of such statesmanlike management, till such time as they choose wholly to represent themselves by men who are not ashamed of the humanity of their constituents. It deserves to be said, however, of Mr. Swift, that in spite of the threats of Mr. King, of Alabama, and others, he maintained his determination to present the memorial which his state had committed to his care.

It was on the next day, Dec. 20th, that a scene occurred in the House of Representatives, unparalleled perhaps in the annals of deliberative assemblies, and reflecting upon our country a disgrace which, if it had been branded upon us by some foreign power, we should instantly have resolved to wash out with blood. Let us suppose even that Gov. Butler, at the head of the well disciplined militia† of South Carolina, had entered Washington,

* It may be urged that the withdrawal of the resolutions was a necessary resort to save them from being at once *rejected*. It was Mr. Clay of Kentucky, who suggested their withdrawal, and from his subsequent participation in the measure of Mr. Calhoun, it is to be suspected that he feared they would *not* be rejected—and would bring up the debate in a point of view quite embarrassing to himself. But what if they had been rejected? Sovereign states would then have known what to expect.

† It will be seen from the following paragraph, published in the *Charleston Mercury*, that our supposition is not wholly unwarranted. Military force is relied upon by the advocates of perpetual slavery as "the only security" of their rights against abolition arguments and petitions!

"MARION C. H. 4th May, 1837.

"On yesterday, His Excellency Gov. BUTLER reviewed the 32d Regiment at this place, and fully sustained his high military character, and the dignity and honor of his distinguished station. The Brigade Encampment having just terminated, he was attended by the Adjutant General and their Staff, together with Brig. Gen. Wheeler and his—all of whom, particularly the Adjutant General, officiated, whenever necessary, in imparting instruction to the Company officers and others.

"After a few evolutions were executed, which consumed some time, in consequence of the rather contracted space the Public Square afforded, the Regiment

ascended to the left wing of the Capitol, and, driving thence the honorable representatives, had pitched the petitions of all sorts out at the windows. And suppose further that the routed representatives had assembled in their hall the next morning, and, every lisp of debate being cut off by the *previous question*, had adopted the following preamble and resolution, viz :

Whereas, it is displeasing to the State of South Carolina that this house should, in any way, exercise its constitutional power touching the subject of slavery,

Resolved, That hereafter, not the slightest attention whatsoever shall be paid by this house to any petition, memorial or paper of any sort, which immediately or remotely, directly or indirectly, has reference to slavery or to buying, selling, and transferring men as property, in any State, District or Territory of the United States.

Would northern representatives have dared, in such a case, to record their "*ayes*" after a resolution like this? Yet the entire transaction we have supposed, would not have been more disgraceful to the country at large, nor its result, to the people of the North, than what actually took place in the Capitol on the 20th and 21st of December, 1837. The constitution was as clearly violated in the one case as it could have been in the other; and if the northern men who voted to prostrate the right of petition at the dictation of the South, were not impelled to the act by the fear of southern bayonets, they were allured to it by a still baser motive.

Our great charter of self-government was, in fact, permitted to give way, and we now live under the dominion of a tyranny which makes our humanity a crime, and tramples in the mire the *humblest* of our rights. If we are still well fed and clothed, and feel no lack of bodily comfort, it is on precisely the same principle that the same thing is true of *some slaves*—to wit: the sufferance of the master.

was drawn up, when it was addressed in a soldierly, frank, and impressive manner, by His Excellency. Of the failure of the officers to perform their duties, and particularly their not attending Brigade Encampments for instruction, he spoke with a becoming rebuke, and made an earnest and eloquent appeal to their patriotism, urging them to a stricter application to, and practice of the military tactics, in order to be prepared themselves, and to prepare others to meet the impending shock which avarice and fanaticism were machinating against us. He remarked, that *we of the South were a peculiar people, having almost the whole world against our institutions*, and necessarily our peace and safety; and that he most solemnly believed, before God and his country, that the time was not far distant when it would be necessary for us *to stand to our arms* to protect our household gods and our family altars—therefore it was, (he urged in an impassioned manner which did honor to his head and his heart,) a duty on the part of the officers and privates to be prepared and efficient, as it was the best and **ONLY** security to our rights, &c."

The facts of this matter are these. On the 25th December, Mr. Slade of Vermont, presented certain memorials from his constituents, praying Congress to abolish slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. He was proceeding to speak of the nature of slavery, on a motion to refer these memorials to a select committee, when the chair warned him that it was not *in order* to go into the merits of the question on a motion to refer without instructions. Mr. Slade, to the honor of his courage and decision of character, immediately modified his motion by adding, "*with instructions to report a bill abolishing slavery and the slave trade within the District of Columbia.*"—Amidst continual interruptions he proceeded calmly to define and expose to view the system of oppression which is permitted to exist and flourish under the exclusive legislation of Congress. The motion opened to him, according to the admission of the Speaker, a wide field of debate, and he accordingly adduced, as he had the most undoubted right to do, the testimony of southern state laws, and the sentiments of distinguished individuals at the South in former days. He was about to read from an act of the Continental Congress,* when he was interrupted by an objection which required him to obtain leave of the House. Had this been refused, he might still have proceeded in his speech, as he had been at no time out of order. But the slaveholding members were already goaded to fury by having been compelled to listen to the sentiments of Franklin and their own Jefferson; and they began vociferously to invite each other to leave the hall and concert measures of defence. Mr. Rhett of South Carolina, raised a question of order, whether the gentleman from Vermont had a right to discuss the question of slavery in Virginia. "The Speaker," we quote from the authentic report, "again recapitulated, and vindicated the correctness of his own course, as being dictated by the rules of the house. What his personal feelings had been might easily be conjectured. *Had it been in his power to restrain the discussion, he should promptly have exercised the power; but it was not.*" Mr. Slade explained that the document which he had inadvertently announced as an expression of the feeling of Virginia, was in fact an expression of the feelings of the whole country. Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, inquired whether it would be in order for the House to vote that the gentleman from Vermont be not permitted to proceed. The

* This act was the solemn declaration of October 20th. 1774, signed by all the delegates of twelve colonies, binding themselves and their constituents to the following among other things:

"We will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next; after which, we will wholly discontinue the slave-trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it."

chair replied that it would not. Whereupon "Mr. McKay, of North Carolina, said that *the gentleman had been pronounced out of order*, in discussing slavery in the states; and the rule declared that when a member was so pronounced by the chair, he should take his seat, and if any one objected to his proceeding again, he should not do so, unless by leave of the house. Mr. McKay did now object to the gentleman from Vermont proceeding any further." Here were two falsehoods thrown flatly in the face of the Speaker, first that he had pronounced Mr. Slade out of order, and second that the latter had been "discussing slavery in the states." Yet so far from taking this audacious contradiction as an insult, the Speaker seized the idea as a drowning man seizes a rope. The report proceeds, "The CHAIR read the rule referred to, and said that, as an objection had now, for the first time, been made under that rule to the gentleman's resuming his speech, the chair decided that he could not do so without leave of the House"!!

Mr. Slade being thus arbitrarily choked down, at two o'clock, P. M., a slaveholder immediately took the opportunity to move an adjournment, which was carried by a vote of 106 to 63. The southern members had already in considerable numbers left the hall.

We have stated the case particularly, to show that the House in voting for Mr. Patton's resolution of the next day, stood in the same predicament as if Mr. Slade had been silenced and that resolution introduced at the point of the bayonets of South Carolina and her confederates. The "dough faces" of the North are stripped of every plea. The South had forfeited all claim to concession by a gross infraction of the rules of the House,—open, flagrant, and undeniable, and it mattered not whether she had done it by falsehood and stentorian clamor or by polished steel and musket balls. Concession to her in such a case, was treason to the country. The House was either triumphed over and trampled on by a factious minority, or else there are northern representatives who, of their own accord and independently of all political motives, regard the interests of slavery as paramount to their constitutional obligations. In either case the rules of the House and the freedom of debate were utterly set at naught.

The seditious members from the South assembled immediately in the room of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and after discussing the matter till late at night, resolved to present a resolution to the House for its adoption on its opening in the morning, by which the right of petition should be effectually nullified. Accordingly the following resolution was presented to the House by MR. PATTON, of Virginia, chairman of the insurrec-

tionary meeting, who before resuming his seat moved upon it the
PREVIOUS QUESTION!

“Resolved, That all petitions, memorials and papers touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling, or transferring of slaves, in any State, District, or Territory of the United States, be laid upon the table without being debated, printed, read or referred, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.”

The call for the previous question was sustained. As the freedom of debate had already been cut off *contrary to rule*, now that it was to be crushed forever by rule, the venerable Ex-President of the United States, when called on for his vote on the passage of the resolution, thought himself justifiable in making the following memorable declaration instead of either. Amidst and above the deafening and demoniac yells of “*order! ORDER!! ORDER!!!*” from all parts of the House, his words were firmly uttered:

“I CONSIDER THE RESOLUTION A VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—OF THE RIGHT OF MY CONSTITUENTS, AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO PETITION—AND OF MY RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AS A MEMBER OF THIS HOUSE.”

The well-named “infamous resolution” passed by a vote of 122 to 74,—not counting the noble protest of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. FIFTY-TWO of the votes in the affirmative were from the *North!* Had these votes been given in the negative the resolution would have been rejected by a majority of the whole House, or a vote of 70 to 126. Of the members from the slaveholding states 29 were absent, and it is thought that many of them were so because they were not prepared to take so high ground against the right of petition as the fifty-two from the North. There were abundant indications that if the House had insisted on the right of free discussion, if it had protected Mr. Slade, and even passed his resolution, the insurrectionary meeting would have stopped far short of a dissolution of the Union. The slaveholding members were by no means unanimous, and nothing but the pusillanimity of the northern members emboldened them to propose a violation of the Constitution to shield their “peculiar institutions” from free discussion. Said the Washington correspondent of the *New-York Journal of Commerce*:

“A very prominent man among them remarked to a friend immediately after

their adjournment—'We have seen our weakness; we have seen in our disagreement, the unconquerable attachment of all the South, with the exception of one or two men in South Carolina, to the Union.' 'Why?' said the friend. A slaveholder then said: 'Let slavery be abolished in the District of Columbia; let the Capitol be given to the free negroes, the District of Columbia be sacked and sunk, *I shall never give up the Union but with my life.*' He proceeded to say, 'Calhoun would be glad to keep on foot a southern caucus, and proposed a southern convention on this subject, but we will be caught in no more nullification or quasi rebellion.' "

It was on the heel of this proceeding in the House of Representatives, and before Mr. Swift had again presented the resolutions of Vermont, that Mr. Calhoun introduced his celebrated resolutions in the Senate. We give them below as originally presented, enclosing in brackets the parts struck out by amendments, and in a parallel column the counter resolutions presented by Mr. Morris, of Ohio.*

MR. CALHOUN'S RESOLUTIONS,
Moved Dec. 26, 1837.

1. "Resolved, That in the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the states adopting the same, acted, severally, as free, independent, and Sovereign States; and that each, by its own voluntary assent, entered the Union with the view to its increased security against all dangers, domestic as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages, natural, political and social.

Passed Jan. 3, 1838.—Ayes 32, Noes 13.

2. "That in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the states retained, severally, the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police, and are alone responsible for them, and that any intermeddling of any one or more states, or a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions and police of the others, on any ground, or under any pretext whatever, political, moral or religious, with the view to their alteration, or subversion, is [an assumption of superiority] not warranted by the Constitution; insulting to the states interfered with, tending to endanger their

MR. MORRIS'S RESOLUTIONS,
Presented Dec. 29, 1838.

1. "Resolved, That in the formation of the Federal Constitution, the states acted in their sovereign capacity; but the adoption of the same was, by the people of the several states, by their agents specially elected for that purpose; and the people of the several states, by their own free and voluntary assent, entered into the compact of union proposed in the Constitution, with the view to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and to their posterity; and that the means of obtaining all these important objects are fully provided for in the grants of powers contained in the Constitution itself.

2. "That the people of the several states, in delegating a portion of their power to the Federal Government, which they had formerly exercised by their own legislatures, severally retained the exclusive and sole right over their domestic institutions, which they had not, by the Constitution, granted to the Federal Government, and they reserved to individuals, and to the states in their sovereign character, the full liberty of speech and the press, to discuss the domestic institutions of any of the states, whether political, moral, or religious; and that it would be the exercise of unauthorized power on the part of this Government, or that of

* It deserves to be remarked, as a proof that Mr. Van Buren had not power to include his whole party in the bargain by which he sold himself to the slaveholders, that Mr. Morris is a thorough democrat.

domestic peace and tranquility, subversive of the objects for which the Constitution was formed, and, by necessary consequences, tending to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

Passed Jan. 3.—Ayes 31, Noes 9.

3. "That this Government was instituted and adopted by the several states of this Union as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the Constitution for their mutual security and prosperity; and that, in fulfillment of this high and sacred trust, this Government is bound so to exercise its powers as to give, as far as may be practicable, increased stability and security to the domestic institutions of the states that compose the Union; and that it is the solemn duty of the Government to resist all attempts by one portion of the Union to use it as an instrument to attack the domestic institutions of another, or to weaken or destroy such institutions, [instead of strengthening and upholding them, as it is in duty bound to do.]

Passed Jan. 6.—Ayes 31, Noes 11.

4. "That domestic slavery, as it exists in the Southern and Western States of this Union, composes an important part of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the Constitution by which it is recognized as constituting an essential element in the distribution of its powers among the States, and that no change of opinion, or feeling, on the part of the other States of the Union in relation to it, can justify them or their citizens in open and systematic attacks thereon, with a view to its overthrow; and that all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States, respectively, on entering into the Constitutional compact, which formed the Union, and as such a manifest breach of faith, and a violation of the most solemn obligations, moral and religious."

Passed Jan. 9. Ayes 34; Noes 5.

[5. "That the intermeddling of any State or States, or their citizens, to abolish slavery in this District, or any of the Territories, on the ground, or under the

any of the states, to attempt to restrain the same; and that any endeavor to do so would be insulting to the people and the states so interfered with; for each state alone has the power to punish individuals for the abuse of this liberty within their own jurisdiction; and whenever one state shall attempt to make criminal, acts done by citizens of another state, which are lawful in the state where done, the necessary consequence would be to weaken the bands of our Union.

3. "That this Government was adopted by the people of the several states of this Union as a common agent, to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the Constitution; and in fulfillment of this high and sacred trust, this Government is bound so to exercise its functions as not to interfere with the reserved rights of the states over their own domestic institutions; and it is the duty of this Government to refrain from any attempt, however remote, to operate on the liberty of speech and the press, as secured to the citizens of each state by the constitution and laws thereof. That the United States are bound to secure to each state a republican form of government, and to protect each of them against invasion or domestic violence, and for no other purpose can Congress interfere with the internal policy of a state.

4. "That domestic slavery as it exists in the southern and western states, is a moral and political evil, and that its existence at the time of the adoption of the constitution, is not recognized by that instrument as an essential element in the exercise of its power over the several states, and no change of feeling on the part of any of the states can justify them or their citizens in open and systematic attacks on the right of petition, the freedom of speech, or the liberty of the press, with a view to silence either, on any subject whatever; and that all such attacks are manifest violations of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, and as such a manifest breach of faith, and a violation of the most solemn obligations, both political, moral, and religious.

5. "That it is the indisputable right of any state, or any citizen thereof, as well as an indispensable duty, to endeavor, by all legal and constitutional means, to abolish whatever is immoral and sinful, and that Congress alone possess the power to abolish slavery, and the slave trade in this District, or any of the terri-

pretext, that it is immoral or sinful; or the passage of any act or measure of Congress, with that view, would be a direct and dangerous attack on the institutions of all the slaveholding States.]

This resolution was set aside by the Senate, and the two following, offered by Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, were passed.

1. "Resolved, That the interference by the citizens of any of the States, with the view to the abolition of slavery in the District, is endangering the rights and security of the people of the District; and that any act or measure of Congress designed to abolish slavery in this District would be a violation of the faith implied in the cessions by the States of Virginia and Maryland, a just cause of alarm to the people of the slaveholding States, and have a direct and inevitable tendency to disturb and endanger the Union."
Passed Jan. 10. Ayes 36; Nocs 9.

2. "Resolved, That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory of the United States in which it exists, would create serious alarm and just apprehensions in the states sustaining that domestic institution; would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of any such territory who have been permitted to settle with and hold slaves, because the people of any such territory have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because, that when any such territory shall be admitted into the Union as a state, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question exclusively for themselves."
Passed Jan. 11. Ayes 33; Nocs 9.

[6. "That the union of these states rests on an equality of rights and advantages among its members; and that whatever destroys that equality, tends to destroy the Union itself; and that it is the solemn duty of all, and more especially of this body, which represents the states in their corporate capacity, to resist all attempts to discriminate between the states in extending the benefits of the Government to the several portions of the Union; and that to refuse to extend to the Southern and Western States any advantage which would tend to strengthen, or render them more secure, or increase their limits or population by the annexation of new territory or states, on the assumption or under the pretext that

teritories of the United States; and the right of petition, of speech, and of the press, to accomplish this object, is not to be questioned, and that an act of Congress on this subject, would be within its constitutional powers.

6. "That the union of these states rests upon the virtue and intelligence of the citizens in supporting the constitution of the United States, and not upon any supposed advantage it may afford to any particular state; and that it is the solemn duty of all, more especially of this body, which represents the states in their sovereign character, to resist all attempts to discriminate between the states; and that it would be unwise, unjust, and contrary to the constitution, to annex any new territory or states to this confederacy, with a view to the advantage of any state, or its peculiar domestic institutions; that such an attempt would be contrary to the equality of rights which one object of the constitution was to secure alike to all the states, and if done to favor the slaveholding states, for the purpose of giving those states a preponderance in this government, would, in effect, be to establish slavery in all the states.

7. "That to regulate commerce among the several states is an express power granted by the constitution to the Congress of the United States. That, in the exercise of this power, Congress may rightfully prohibit any article, though made property by the laws of a state, from being used in such commerce, if the same would be detrimental to the general welfare.

8. "That Congress have possessed the power since the year 1808, to prohibit the importation of persons into any state as articles of commerce or merchandise.

9. "That the political condition of the people within the District of Columbia is not subject to state regulation; and that Congress, in the exercise of legislative powers over the district, are bound by the will of their constituents in the same manner as when legislating for the people of the United States generally.

10. "That this government was founded and has been sustained by the force of public opinion, and that the free and full exercise of that opinion is absolutely necessary for its healthful action; and that any system which will not bear the test of public investigation, is at war with its fundamental principles; and that any proceeding on the part of those who ad-

the institution of slavery as it exists among them, is immoral or sinful, or otherwise obnoxious, would be contrary to that equality.]

On motion of Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, the 6th resolution was laid on the table.—Jan. 12. Ayes 35; Nocs 9.

minister the government of the United States, or any of the states, or any citizen thereof, which is intended or calculated to make disreputable the free and full exercise of the thoughts and opinions of any portions of our citizens, on any subject connected with the political, moral, or religious institutions of our country, whether expressed by petitions to Congress, or otherwise, by attaching to the character of such citizens odious and reproachful names and epithets, strikes at the very foundation of all our civil institutions, as well as our personal safety; poisons the very fountains of public justice, and excites mobs and other unlawful assemblies to deeds of violence and blood. That our only safety is in tolerating error of opinion, while reason is left free to combat it."

These resolutions were offered as amendments to those of Mr. Calhoun, but were not accepted by the Senate.

The last of Mr. Calhoun's resolutions was set aside at the instance of the more cunning advocates for the annexation of Texas. They had discovered by this time that their most hopeful policy was, *secretly* to labor for the ill-starred adjunction by *diplomatic craft*. The propositions of Mr. Calhoun being thus disposed of, an additional expression was brought forward to save the right of freedom of speech, and of the press, and the right of petition.— This had been promised early in the debate, and it is probable that some Senators voted for the hurricane generalities of Mr. Calhoun, in the delusive hope that they should be able to satisfy their constituents with a snug exception in favor of some of their most precious rights. Let us see distinctly how the effort turned out.

"Mr. Allen, of Ohio, submitted, as an independent resolution, his former amendment, which had been by consent postponed, as follows:

Resolved, That nothing in the foregoing resolutions is intended to recognize the right of Congress to impair in any manner the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of petition, as secured by the Constitution to the citizens of the several states, in the states respectively.

To this amendment, Mr. Smith, of Indiana, offered the following amendment:

That nothing in these resolutions shall be construed or understood as intended to impair, or in any manner abridge the freedom of speech or the press, or the right of petition, which is hereby expressly declared to include the duty on the part of the Senate to receive and determine upon the petitions.

In offering his amendment, Mr. Smith said that the gentleman from Ohio did not go far enough. He contended that the Senate ought to declare that the right of petition included the right of the petitioners to be heard; that these petitions should be received, discussed, and decided upon, even if they should ask a palpable violation of the Constitution.

Mr. Niles, of Connecticut, moved to lay the whole on the table; on which the yeas and nays being ordered, were as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bayard, Black, Brown, Calhoun, Clay, of Alabama, Clay, of Kentucky, Crittenden, Cuthbert, Fulton, King, Lumpkin, Merrick, Nicholas,

Niles, Norvell, Pierce, *Preston, Rives, Roane, Sevier, Strange, Walker, White*—23.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, *Benton, Buchanan, Clayton, Davis, Hubbard, Knight, Lyon, McKeon, Morris, Prentiss, Robbins, Robinson, Smith, of Connecticut, Smith, of Indiana, Swift, Tallmadge, Tipton, Webster, Williams, Young*—21.

Absent from the question, Messrs. Grundy, Linn, Morton, Ruggles, Spence, Southard, Wall, Wright."

He must be hopelessly sceptical who requires further proof that the slaveholders generally, demand the sacrifice of our constitutional rights on the altar of slavery. The occasion which called forth the resolutions of Mr. Calhoun, was nothing else than the *speaking, printing and petitioning* of the free states in regard to slavery. These acts, and these only, are the "*intermeddling*" which is denounced by Mr. Calhoun as a "dangerous attack on the institutions of all the slaveholding States"—these, and these only, are the "*interference*" which is denounced by Mr. Clay, as "*endangering the rights and securities of the people of the District.*" Had it been otherwise, the three northern Senators, NILES, NORVELL and PIERCE, might have been spared the disgrace of laying down the birthright charter of their constituents at the feet of a domineering minority.

Neither humanity nor patriotism will permit us to pass over this proceeding of the Senate without setting it in what seems to us its true light. We pronounce it a *bootless usurpation*; an act equally *unconstitutional and impotent*. If these expressions should seem disrespectful towards the highest branch of the national legislature, let it be remembered that that officially august body can claim to be respected only, while it respects the primary act of the people by virtue of which it exists. When it oversteps the limits of the constitution, for the attainment of any object whatever, its authority is forfeited. But when it oversteps those limits for the attainment of an object which is in itself essentially absurd and impossible—when it essays to do by mere resolutions what it would be ridiculous to attempt by statutory enactment—it must sink to the level of contempt.

It did not please the parties to the constitution, whether they were the states or the people of the United States, to insert among the grants of power to Congress any thing like the following, to wit:—"that Congress shall have power to declare on what subjects the citizens of the several states shall be permitted to SPEAK, PRINT, and PETITION"—much less that Congress shall have power, to decide on what subjects pertaining to, or with what institutions belonging to one state, it shall not be lawful for the citizens of another state to "*intermeddle*" or "*interfere.*" If the thought of such a grant had occurred to one of the framers of the constitution, it would doubtless have occurred to him also, that it would be giving to Congress the power to condemn all the states

to eternal fixedness, for better or worse, not only in regard to slavery, but in regard to internal improvements, banks, schools, and all other things which can be called institutions, inasmuch as the citizens of any state could hardly in any supposable case, meddle or make with their own institutions, without to some extent, *intermeddling* and *interfering* with those of some other.— And of this very thing do the resolutions in question complain, for they charge the states at large, when acting upon an institution existing in the *common territory* and under the *common laws* of all, with *interfering* and *intermeddling* with the peculiar institutions of particular states. Now if the Constitution contains no grant of power to the effect described, (which is precisely the effect of Mr. Calhoun's resolutions,) it cannot *legislate* to such effect. Can it *resolutionize* on ground where it has no power to legislate? Obviously not, unless its resolutions are incidental to the consideration and denial of the prayer of petitions, which, without regard to their objects, it is bound to receive. But the action of the Senate in the present instance was not of this sort. It was spontaneous and independent. No petitions were under consideration. The resolutions were designed to effect by bare authority or moral suasion, either upon the states or the people, what in case of a penal enactment, would have been effected by the power of the United States Court and the batons of its marshals. We contend that the constitution gives no more warrant for the one way of proceeding than for the other. The honorable Senators in the Capitol are by no means analogous to the Doctors of the Sorbonne. They are not appointed either as the spiritual guides, censors morum or schoolmasters of the people. Neither are they the constitutional expounders of the Constitution itself. It may be replied to us that the legislators of the several states do constantly pass resolutions on subjects over which they have no power of legislation. And when these resolutions have for their object to communicate to the servants of the people in the federal legislature, the sense of the people in regard to subjects which are within the control of Congress, they are certainly consistent with the theory of our government, but when they are directed towards the people themselves, they are liable to the same objection as similar action on the part of Congress. We are not aware that any state constitution has clothed its legislators with the authority of teachers, in either politics, morals, or religion.

If we are correct in these views of the nature and force of our federal constitution, the Senate of the United States was employed from the third to the thirteenth of January, 1838, in enacting a farce well adapted to turn legislation into a mockery. Forgetting that they were but servants of the *people*, they gave themselves the airs and entered into the work of those high dignita-

ries, who, under other forms of government, do the *thinking* of what they call the "vulgar herd." Intelligent republicans will smile to think how soon the real *masters* in our case, will dissolve the dream of their servants and the mighty frostwork of their resolutions, by pointing them to those old bulwarks of our federal and state constitutions, which they seem utterly to have forgotten, to wit:—*that the freedom of speech and the press shall not be abridged, nor the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition for the redress of their grievances.*

The institutions which Mr. Calhoun would enslave or destroy to save those which are deemed so precious by the South, are in no sense amenable to the Senate. They are the institutions of sovereign states—never by any constitution or compact chained or gagged, or shorn of their claws or muzzled of their teeth; but left at large in the open field with all their natural organs, powers, appetites and propensities unrestrained. Their peculiar ways, habits, and dangers were known to all parties, hence if they have fallen foul of certain other institutions, the two must be left to fight it out as they best can. To change the figure, when our fathers poured into the compact the *acid of free discussion* along with the *alkali of slavery*, they distinctly foresaw the inevitable result, and now that the effervescence has commenced, and the mixture waxes warm, the blind fury of the pro-slavery party against the laws of nature, apart from the unutterable oppression with which it is connected, is supremely ridiculous.

Considering the resolutions of the Senate in a light purely didactic, there is little need that we should expose their conflict with truth and the welfare of the human race farther than has been already done by setting over against them the sound and enlightened resolutions of Mr. Morris of Ohio. We will take a parting look, however, at this monument of pro-slavery wisdom, principally for the sake of illustrating the influence of slaveholding upon the human mind. The second resolution, passed by a vote of 31 to 9, lays it down as a doctrine, political, moral, and religious, *that no person or combination of persons have a right to INTERMEDDLE in any way with any institutions whatever, out of their own state, with the view to their alteration or subversion!*—Here is a complete paralysis of social life; a total stagnation; a reduction of human affairs to the dead level of the dead sea!—The institutions of every state are human institutions.* As such they are not capable of confinement by state lines. The interest of every state institution, however peculiar, travels abroad. It becomes a subject of thought and feeling to the people of other

* That is, they pertain to *men*. The word *human* does not stand opposed to *divine*.

states, and as such necessarily modifies the institutions of those states—for the institutions of states have their foundations in the thought and feeling of the people. It follows, therefore, that it is a possible, if not a very probable case, that to preserve their own institutions, the people of a state *must* intermeddle with those of another with a view “to their alteration or subversion.”—There is a law of constant and mutual moral action and reaction throughout the whole mass of human society, relative to the divided and subdivided communities of which it is composed. To prevent the operation of this law, between different states, they must be insulated from each other by heaven-high barriers, impenetrable even to the imagination—they must be to each other absolutely as though they were not. The sublime generality of the Senator from South Carolina, is inapplicable to human nature—inconsistent, not only with the progress of society, but with the law of self-preservation. The very vitality of human society for these six thousand years, has consisted in the victories of certain institutions over others—of the new over the old—of the better over the worse—just as the heart by successive tides of regenerated blood, chases corruption and death from the bodily system. Tyranny in all ages, has striven to carry this moral non-intercourse law into practice, but never with success. Had it succeeded, where would have been our Christianity and its successive reformations? Where the political liberty, of which we boast as loudly as if we had never dishonored it by oppression? To come down to smaller interests of the present time in these United States, on Mr. Calhoun’s beautiful abstraction, no citizen of New York shall either *speak, write, or print*, with a view to the *alteration or subversion* of the bank, or lottery, or grog-shop-license system of any other State. Taxes may be levied for the support of the Gospel in Massachusetts, and he may think it a dishonor and an injury to the Gospel, but he shall keep his opinion to himself. The right of suffrage may be denied to half the people in Connecticut or Rhode Island, and he may think it anti-republican, but as he respects the profound wisdom of the United States Senate, he must not say so. Excellent humanity! Glorious liberty!! And who brought into the world this delightful emanation of the intellect? Who tenderly nursed, and with more than maternal solicitude bore into the august presence of the Senate this bantling which the little potentates of Germany would be ashamed to dandle on their knees? It was the HON. JOHN C. CALHOUN—educated at a New England college—brought up at the feet of that most enlightened champion of free discussion, DR. TIMOTHY DWIGHT! If there be any thing which can more forcibly reveal the depths of infamy to which slavery will compel a noble intellect to stoop, it is the additional

fact that there were found *thirty* other senators to support this outrage upon the right and the true.

In his third resolution this champion of state rights and eternal slavery, has laid down a doctrine which is far less profitable to the slaveholders or terrible to the abolitionists than it seems to be. According to his own principles of strict construction, it is but little the Federal Government can do, or abstain from doing, to increase the "stability and security" of any state institution. But whatever that little may be, his resolution, (as his colleague Mr. Preston, whose appetite for generalities is not so keen, did not fail to remark,*) gives the benefit of it as much to abolition, as to pro-slavery institutions. Mr. Calhoun's generality has served him, in this case, as it is said certain lion-hunters were served by a peculiar contrivance for capturing their dangerous prey. They carried a cage, or small house, which was to be let fall over the lion if he could be found sleeping, or over themselves in case of attack—unfortunately in its first fall, it enclosed both!

In the latter part of the same resolution its author pronounces it "the solemn duty of the Government to resist all attempts by one portion of the Union to use it as an instrument to attack the domestic institutions of another, or to weaken or destroy such institutions, instead of strengthening and upholding them, as it is in duty bound to do." And yet with the singular consistency which belongs to all republican slaveholders, he urges, in his sixth resolution, that to refuse to extend the limits of slavery indefinitely would be "contrary to that equality of rights and advantages which the Constitution was intended to secure alike to all the members of the Union." Was not the southern Senator aware that *free-labor* is as much an "institution" in some of the states, as slave-labor is in others? and that a large portion of the people of some of the states, to wit, the free-laborers, have a strong interest that this institution shall not be weakened, either relatively or absolutely—both of which it will be by the admission of Texas? The third resolution, with slight curtailment, was passed? but the sixth was declined. Should Mr. Calhoun again rise in his place to advocate the weakening and destruction of our free institutions by the extension of their antagonist institutions over 200,000 additional square miles, we hope he will be pointed to his own resolution.

* Mr. PRESTON.—"The resolution calls for active interference. If it only said, 'not interfere,' he should then assent to the proposition. As it was, the resolution was too vague in its language, for it goes to support abolition societies, colonization societies, negro education societies, and any thing and every thing, North or South, under the sweeping title of domestic institutions. Who is to be the judge of what is intended? If to-day the South may be protected, to-morrow it may be ruined by the self-same proposition."

Leaving the great doctrine of "implied faith" for a subsequent page, we bid adieu to these famous resolutions, not expecting to meet them hereafter, except in the moral museums of the curious as the relics of a barbarous age.

The Vermont memorial and resolutions, which, like ghosts at cockcrow, had vanished from the troubled presence of the Senate before these strange proceedings commenced, after all was over were again presented, *received and laid upon the table*, on the 16th of January.

Against the arbitrary and unconstitutional rule adopted by the other branch of Congress, remonstrances have been passed by the legislatures of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Ohio—and by the popular branches of those of Maine and New-York.

The great measure by which the slaveholders hope to secure forever the control of the national government, even after abolitionism shall have gained entire possession of the North, is the annexation of Texas. It is their only hope. They well know that if slavery cannot possess itself, in reality or in prospect, of a majority of the states and white population of the country, abolitionism will in a few years be able to present motives to the parties concerned, which will overthrow their system. The scheme is to open to slavery 200,000 additional square miles of fertile territory which shall rapidly be cut up into from six to eight slaveholding states. The moment this territory is annexed the South will be able to throw an attractive bait to the enterprising speculators of the North. Thus will she at once prodigiously strengthen that mysterious bond of Union, whereby she has always controlled a sufficient number of northern senators in Congress, and whereby she has succeeded in introducing her peculiar code of law into our peaceful cities and villages. This will serve her purpose against the rising tide of Anti-Slavery influence, till her new Texian States are sufficiently peopled to come in and turn the balance of the Union in her favor. Then we may expect the hidden germ and vitality of Mr. Calhoun's resolutions—that dagger of Lynch law concealed in a besom of generality—to be thrust out in statutory enactment. Then will our national legislature, for the safety of slavery, doubtless, requires it,

" ——— bring back
The Hall of Horrors, and the assessor's pen,
Recording answers shrieked upon the rack."^{*}

And then will the southern plains smoke with the mingled blood

* The following facts from the debates of the United States Senate, during the last and present session, indicate what the South will do when it has the power. The Hon. Senator White, of Tennessee, openly defended, in his place in the Senate, the lynching of Dresser, at Nashville.

His colleague, Senator Grundy, also advocated a *summary* disposal of such

of the oppressor and the oppressed, till the tables of bondage shall be turned.

The desire of the South to procure the annexation for the express purpose of perpetuating and protecting slavery is not concealed. The House of Representatives of the Mississippi legislature unanimously resolved "that the annexation of Texas to the republic is essential to the future safety and repose of the southern states of this confederacy," and in the report of the Committee which drafted the resolution, we find the following language:

"But we hasten to suggest the importance of the annexation of Texas to this Republic upon grounds somewhat local in their complexion, but of an import infinitely grave and interesting to the people who inhabit the Southern portion of this Confederacy, where it is known that a species of domestic slavery is tolerated and protected by law, whose existence is prohibited by the legal regulations of other States of this Confederacy; which system of slavery is held by all who are familiarly acquainted with its practical effects, to be of highly beneficial influence to the country within whose limits it is permitted to exist.

"The committee feel authorized to say, that *this system is cherished by our constituents as THE VERY PALLADIUM OF THEIR PROSPERITY AND HAPPINESS*; and whatever ignorant fanatics may elsewhere conjecture, the committee are fully assured, upon the most diligent observation and reflection on the subject, that *the South does not possess within her limits A BLESSING with which the affections of her people are so closely entwined and so completely enfibred, and whose value is more highly appreciated, than that which we are now considering.*

"Under the influence of this system, the rich forests of the South and West have given way to the cultivated fields, beaming with the richest products of agriculture. Villages, towns and cities have sprung up as if by magic. The arts and sciences have been made to flourish where the voice of the barbarian would have been heard to resound, or where savage beasts of prey would yet find a quiet asylum. *To this system we owe more than we can well estimate of domestic comfort and social happiness.** To it are we chiefly indebted for the lofty spirit

abolitionists as should venture into Tennessee. Senator Morris, of Ohio, asked in a tone of indignation and astonishment, "*Does the honorable and venerable Senator then approve of LYNCH LAW!*" The Senator from Tennessee nodded his head in assent.

Mr. Young put the case of an abolitionist being unconstitutionally punished in one of the slaveholding states, and asked whether the protection of this Government ought not to be extended to him. He declared that his only design was, that the express provision of the Constitution should on this subject be duly carried into effect.

Mr. Lumpkin, of Georgia, replied, "He had no objection to men's expressing their opinions—but if abolitionists went to Georgia *they would be caught.*"

Mr. Preston, of S. C. is also reported to have said, "*This much he would say, let an abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina, if we can catch him, we will try him, and notwithstanding all the interference of all the governments of the earth, including this Federal Government, WE WILL HANG HIM.*"

* A man may enjoy considerable health and many domestic comforts, while suffering from a dangerous cancer, but it would be with singular fatuity that he would ascribe his health and comforts to the cancer. We are able to set this matter right by the best of Southern testimony, that of Mr. Senator Preston, in a speech delivered at Columbia, S. C., less than two years ago. South Carolina, be it observed, has tried slavery longer than Mississippi, and hence she furnishes a better test of its merits. We quote from the Columbia Telescope, pleading the conclusiveness of the testimony as an apology for its length:

"Mr. Preston, in his speech concerning the rail-road, on Monday last, drew a

of liberty which so eminently distinguishes the proud and high minded inhabitants of this happy region. *By this system the happiness of the white man has been augmented beyond calculation*; and by means of it also, has the condition and comforts of the black man been greatly amplified: providing for them both, more of all the blessings of civilization, than could be possibly enjoyed, were the rude hands of the infuriate fanatics once made strong enough to uproot it from our midst.

Again the committee remark, that by the annexation of Texas,

very striking contrast between the difference of character of the people of the Northern and Southern parts of the Union, and the consequently opposite condition of the countries they inhabit.

"He said that no Southern man can journey (as he had lately done,) through the Northern States, and witness the prosperity, the industry, the public spirit which they exhibit—sedulous cultivation of all those arts by which life is rendered comfortable and respectable—without feelings of deep sadness and shame, as he remembers his own neglected and desolate home. There, no dwelling is to be seen abandoned, no farm uncultivated. Every person, and every thing, performs a part toward the grand result, and the whole land is covered with fertile fields, with manufactories, and canals, and rail-roads, and edifices, and towns, and cities. Along the route of the great New York canal (that glorious monument to the memory of De Witt Clinton,) a canal, a rail-road, and a turnpike, are to be seen in the width of perhaps a hundred yards, each of them crowded with travel, or overflowing with commerce. Throughout their course, lands that before their construction would scarcely command five dollars the acre, now sell for fifty, seventy-five, or a hundred. Passing along it, you see no space of three miles without a town or village, and you are never out of the sound of a church bell.

"We of the South are mistaken in the character of these people, when we think of them only as peddlers in horn flints and bark nutmegs. Their energy and enterprise are directed to all objects, great and small, within their reach. At the fall of a scanty rivulet they set up their little manufactory of wooden buttons or combs—they plant a barren hill-side with broom corn, and make it into brooms at the bottom—and on its top they erect a wind-mill. Thus at a single spot, you may see the air, the earth, and the water, all working for them. But at the same time the ocean is whitened to its extremities with the sails of their ships, and the land is covered with their works of art and usefulness.

"Massachusetts is perhaps one of the most flourishing of the Northern States. Yet of natural productions she exports but two articles—granite and ice. Absolutely nothing but *rock and ice!* Every thing else of her commerce, from which she derives so much, is artificial—the work of her own hands.

"All this is done, in a region with a bleak climate and sterile soil, by the energy and intelligence of the people. Every man knows that the public good is his individual advantage. The number of rail-roads and other modes of expeditious intercommunication, knits the whole country into a closely compacted mass, through which the productions of commerce and of the press, the comforts of life and the means of knowledge, are universally diffused; while the close intercourse of travel and business makes all neighbors, and promotes a common interest and a common sympathy.

"In a community thus connected, a single flash of thought pervades the whole land, almost as rapidly as thought itself can fly. The population becomes, as it were, a single set of muscles, animated by one heart, and directed by a common sensorium.

"How different the condition of these things in the South! Here, the face of the country wears the aspect of premature old age and decay. No improvement is seen going on—nothing is done for posterity—no man thinks of any thing beyond the present moment. Our lands are yearly tasked to their utmost capacity of production, and when exhausted, are abandoned for the youthful West. Because nature has been prodigal to us, we seem to think it unnecessary to do any thing for ourselves. The industry and skill that have converted the inclement and barren hills of New England into a garden, of the climate and fertile soil of the South would create almost a paradise. Our natural advantages are among

“an EQUIPOISE of influence in the halls of Congress will be secured, which will furnish us a *permanent guarantee of protection*.”

A committee of the Legislature of Alabama, in reporting resolutions, urging the delegation of that State in Congress, to press the annexation of Texas, say: “It needs but a glance at the map to satisfy the most superficial observer, that an *over-balance* is produced by the extreme North-East, which, as regards territory, would be happily corrected and *counter-balanced* by the annexation of Texas.” The resolutions were passed without opposition.

The Charleston Mercury, in noticing similar resolutions, passed by the Legislature of South Carolina, remarks:

“Every day that passes, strengthens and multiplies the arguments in favor of this great measure. The very reason so intemperately urged by the North against it, that it will increase the political weight of the Southern States, and perpetuate and extend the ‘*curse*’ of slavery, are our best reasons for it. But what signifies *reasons of State* in a matter of this kind? To the South it is a question of safety, of existence. We are assailed on every side, with the most hostile spirit, and the deadliest weapons; and there is no hope, while human nature remains the same, of truce or amnesty. *The moral sentiments of the world have been armed against us.* Shall we stop, under such circumstances, to prate about speculative ethics, or hang our judgment on the horns of a metaphysical dilemma? We are no such fools. We claim no exemption from the strong instinct of self-preservation, and that points unerringly to the *annexation of Texas*. The slaveholding interests, wherever spread, must join their forces and stand in a body, or they will be hewn down and trampled under foot. We trust our statesmen, in and out of Congress, will not let this matter sleep, but press it with all the determined energy, courage, and *obstinacy*, its great importance so eminently demands.”

From such motives, and with such zeal, is urged a scheme of outrage and fraud, which would stain the history of Tunis or Algiers. And with shame it must be said, that the Executive of this Republic has been from the first deeply implicated in it. We will briefly recapitulate the facts which fasten upon the Executive department of the United States, the guilt of having entered into and prosecuted the scheme of wresting Texas from Mexico, in violation of the faith of treaties, for the extension of slavery.

Immediately after the settlement of what is called the Missouri Compromise, limiting slavery in the new States, by the parallel of 36 deg. 30 m. of north latitude, the slaveholding States began to cast about for territory which might counterbalance

the greatest with which Providence has blessed mankind, but we lack the spirit to improve and enjoy them. The rich ore is beneath our feet, yet we dig not for it. The golden fruit hangs from the bough, and we lift not our hands to gather it. The cask of delicious liquor is before our eyes, but we are too lazy even to broach it. In thinking, in writing, in talking, we are equal to any people on the face of the earth—but we do nothing but think, write, and talk.”

And yet Mr. Preston is the prime leader of the enterprise of extending over the vast plains of Texas this same woful *curse* which makes his own State so slovenly and barbarous! We pray that when he next rises in the Senate to advocate the darling measure of the South, some Senator may hold up before him this picture of his own pencil.

the growing political influence of the North. Having in that celebrated debate openly stood forth the champions of slavery, they from that time bade adieu to the good resolutions of reformation which had hung about them since the revolution, and made it a chief concern to fortify their dark and cruel system against the approaches of light and liberty. They began at once to be dissatisfied with the treaty which had given up all claim to territory west of the river Sabine in consideration of Florida. The settlement in the Spanish Province of Texas had commenced under Austin an adventurer from Missouri. It became the rendezvous of the restless and roving of the United States, chiefly from the South, carrying with them, more or less slaves, till in the year 1832 they amounted to about 20,000, or one fourth of the population of the two provinces of Texas and Coahuila. The Mexican authorities held out the most liberal terms to migrants actually effecting settlement. Said David G. Burnet, one of the principal emigrants, in a letter to the Trustees of the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company, in 1830: "No country promises a more ample remuneration to the industry of the inhabitants than this, *and the laws of none hold forth a stronger protection to the labor of respectable emigrants.*"

But as early as 1824 the Mexicans, having successfully raised the standard of independence, took measures for the abolition of slavery, and in 1829 it was totally abolished throughout the republic by a decree of President Guerrero. On the change of administration which soon followed, the Texians obtained a dispensation from this decree so far as to be allowed to hold slaves under the name of apprentices. The emigrants from the United States took care to have the *indentures* drawn for *ninety-nine* years, but the state government of Coahuila and Texas, composed chiefly of native Mexicans, interfered and limited the apprenticeship to ten years, and made the children free at the age of fourteen. In the disturbed state of the Republic this law was easily evaded and the emigrants introduced slaves at pleasure, looking forward to the time when they should form a part of the United States of the North.*

* The following are some of the notices of the slave-piracy going on in Texas :

"The British brig of war *Racer*, is cruising in the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of watching certain Spanish smugglers, supposed to be engaged in carrying slaves from Cuba to Texas. What would be the result if *certain distinguished personages* in New Orleans were detected?—*Planter's Banner*, (La.) June 7, 1837.

"Texas, if annexed to the United States, would have to depend mainly on Virginia and her neighbors for working hands. Remaining independent and untrammelled by national compacts, laborers could be obtained from Africa at one half or one third the expense. This would at once give them a great superiority. We are told that previous to the invasion of 1835, thousands of new [i. e. African] negroes had found their way to Texas."

"A MONSTER.—Such is Pedro Blanco, a Spaniard, who has established him-

It is plain that these events could not but be exceedingly interesting to the slaveholding states. In their eagerness to prevent Florida from becoming a refuge of their runaway slaves, they had neglected to provide against the juxtaposition of a free empire on their western border. Such an event was now inevitable unless Texas could be procured. Confident that the poverty of Mexico would render their object easily attainable, they prevailed upon Mr. Adams to undertake it by negotiation. Mr. Poinsett, of South Carolina, was selected a Minister Plenipotentiary to Mexico, who, as a southern man, and a political opponent of Mr. Adams, could not be suspected of any taint of "Missouri restrictionism." The South could not have had a more adroit agent. His extensive travels in Europe, Asia and South America, and a previous mission to Mexico itself, had given him not only a thorough acquaintance with men, but a perfect familiarity with the language and character of the Hispano-Americans. His instructions were to purchase Texas, *if it could be had*; and, that he labored diligently to obey them, is to be inferred from the fact that he made himself, and for four years continued to be, the nucleus of political agitation in Mexico; and so notoriously did he stand in connection with one of the *parties* of the country, that he excited the disgust of his diplomatic colleagues of England and France. His personal friends were numerous and among the leaders of the popular party. Yet he did not succeed, either in purchasing Texas, or in getting into the treaty, by which our common boundary is settled, a stipulation whereby Mexico should obligate herself "to deliver up fugitive slaves who sh^d seek a refuge within her border."* On the accession of C. Jackson to the Presidency, in 1829, Mr. Poinsett, being instructed to ply his suit for Texas with more vigor, went so far as to offer a loan

self at Gallinas, a little north of Monrovia, as a slaver. A number of the *Liberia Herald* recently received, states that this man has within the last six months exported EIGHTEEN HUNDRED slaves.

"Dr. Hall, late Colonial Agent, now in this town, informs us that he recently saw Blanco at his establishment. Blanco has a million of money invested in the slave-trade. He is worth five millions. He has now 19 brigs plying on the ocean in the traffic. He had just sent out four brigs, and said, 'If de British gee tree, I do well enough wid de fourt. De market for slave vara good now—Havana good market, and dat Galvezton (Texas, you know) be one vara good market.' And well he may hold language of that sort, when four dollars' worth of powder, and ten dollars' worth of tobacco will buy a slave, which in Havana will sell for four hundred dollars."—*Vt. Chronicle*.

* Says the *United States' Magazine and Democratic Review*, [Vol. I. page 455] "Mr. Poinsett had earnestly pressed this provision as essential to the peace of the two countries, and it had been acceded to in making the treaty. The House of Representatives, however, [whose consent is required by the Constitution of Mexico] struck it out, and it was so finally ratified." And perhaps it was so, because the treaty-making power of the United States expected to remove the immediate necessity for the stipulation by making Texas its own.

of \$10,000,000 to the then deeply impoverished Mexican government in consideration of *certain privileges* in Texas! The proposal was indignantly rejected and the minister was recalled. The *Chargé des Affaires*, who replaced the minister, though authorized by the President, found no opportunity to renew the negotiation.

It was precisely at this period that Texas had become an object of more intense desire at the South on account of the entire abolition of slavery in Mexico. The presses throughout the slaveholding states opened in full cry for the acquisition, led by a series of able articles published in the *St. Louis Beacon*, in the spring of 1829, and unanimously at the South attributed to the pen of Mr. Senator Benton, of Missouri. This individual, it will be recollected, was, at the time, the warm political and personal friend of Gen. Jackson, and had been a colleague with him on the committee of *Military Claims* in the Senate of the United States. It is quite impossible that he should have "set this ball in motion" without the knowledge and consent of the President. It must have been well understood at that time, by those at the head of our affairs, that there was, at least, no *certainty of acquiring Texas by purchase*, and such a man as the President could not but have foreseen that, in the event of a failure, the step of Benton could produce no other effects than it has done. Had it not been his deliberate design that the citizens of the United States should be excited to violate our neutrality and take Texas by force, if it could not be had for money, he would probably have restrained his special friends from taking the lead in the business.* The administration presses at the South promptly responded to the move of Benton.

Remarks like the following, from a Charleston paper, constantly aroused and directed public expectation:—

"It is not improbable that he [President Jackson] is now examining the pro-

* It is, we suppose, to a period in the history of General Jackson, either previous to, or not long after his first election, that the following paragraphs must refer.

"It is stated, on unquestionable authority, that a letter was found among the papers of the late Hutchins G. Burton, Ex-Governor of North Carolina, from a *person high in authority*, stating that Texas would certainly be annexed to the United States.—at the same time offering to make him (Burton) Governor of said Territory."—*U. S. Telegraph, Washington City, 1836.*

"I have very strong reason to believe, further, (said Mr. Adams,) that at one time the late Executive of the United States was deluded into an expectation that the Mexican Government were ready to make a cession of territory to the United States; and, indeed, in one of the documents lately communicated to this House, the Minister from Texas affirms to the Secretary of State, that the late Executive of the United States was so confident of the acquisition of Texas, that he offered to Mr. Hutchins G. Burton, of North Carolina, the commission of Governor of that Territory. [Mr. Adams was here reminded by the Speaker that he was transcending the proper limit of debate upon a mere question of printing papers.]—*Speech of Mr. J. Q. Adams, in H. R. Oct. 9, 1837.*

priety and practicability of a retrocession of the vast territory of Texas, an enterprise loudly demanded by the welfare of the west, and which could not fail to exercise an important and favorable influence upon the future destinies of the South, by increasing the votes of the slaveholding states in the United States Senate."

The next year we find the design still more distinctly developed. For example of the editorial prognostications, take the following from the Arkansas Gazette:—

"As the subject of the purchase of Texas has engrossed much of the attention of our politicians for a year or two past, it may not perhaps be improper to state that we are in possession of information, *derived from a source entitled to the highest credit*, which destroys all hope of the speedy acquisition of that country by the United States. Colonel Butler, the Charge d'Affairs of the United States to Mexico, was specially authorized by the President to treat with that government for the purchase of Texas. The present predominant party are decidedly opposed to the ceding any portion of its territory. No hopes need therefore be entertained of our acquiring Texas, until some other party more friendly to the United States than the present, shall predominate in Mexico, and *perhaps not until the people of Texas shall throw off the yoke of allegiance to that government, which they will do no doubt so soon as they shall have a reasonable pretext for doing so*. At present they are probably subject to as few exactions and impositions as any people under the sun."

This paragraph published among the relations and friends of the Texian emigrants, and not far from the borders of Texas itself, reveals not only the incipient conspiracy, but the *cause* of it. It was not to secure rights denied them by the Mexicans, or to escape "exactions and impositions" that the emigrants rose in rebellion. It was at this period, the winter of 1829—30, that Samuel Houston, made the city of Washington the head quarters of his operations. It was suspected at the time, and afterwards fully known that these operations had for their object the conquest of Texas. But what concerns us at present to say, is, that if Houston was not the *tool* of General Jackson at this time, the latter was at least aware of his movements and designs, long before they had begun to take effect. The evidence of this is contained in a pamphlet entitled "a chapter of Sketches on Finance; with an Appendix, &c." published by "Robert Mayo, M. D." He publishes a letter which he affirms was addressed to President Jackson on the 2d December, 1830, and returned by him in 1836, in which he disclosed the designs and measures of Houston as he had learned them from himself and one of his agents. He states that being in Washington in February, 1830, in the same boarding house with Houston, the latter solicited him to join him in an expedition against Texas, which he was then organizing, and to promote which, he had adopted the Indian costume, and resided among the Indians for some time. He stated his design to be, *to wrest Texas from Mexico by recruits from the United States*, and to establish an independent government. As Dr. Mayo did not meet the overture with favor, the intercourse was broken off. Subsequently, he fell in with a person who had been

dismissed from West Point, who disclosed to him that he was a recruiting officer in the service of Houston, and at length went so far as to communicate a *Secret Alphabet* which was used in correspondence between the agencies established in all the principal towns and cities of the Union. Of this alphabet Dr. Mayo gave the President the diagram and explanations. What use President Jackson made of this information we are not informed, but results have shown that the Texian conspirators had less use than they anticipated for their "*secret alphabet*."

At this date, 1830, the grants of land made by the Mexican Government to various individuals and companies on condition of introducing a certain number of settlers, were purchased by companies located in the United States. By these grants nearly the whole of Texas and the adjoining provinces were covered. The new companies, by the sale of "stock" and "scrip," contrived to raise funds and pour into Texas the refuse of our population, with *arms and ammunition*. So indulgent, however, were the Mexican authorities that it was not till March, 1836, that they found a "pretext" for throwing off "the yoke of allegiance" to Mexico, a "pretext," when found, sufficient only for *Lynchers* from the United States. The few troops under General Cos, who had been sent to reestablish the Custom Houses, and enforce the laws in regard to the introduction of slaves, had proved insufficient.—General Santa Ana now invaded Texas, to vindicate the insulted laws of Mexico, but with a force, the smallness of which argued full faith in the neutrality of the United States. This faith was his error. On the 21st of April, 1836, he was defeated and taken captive. The emigrant banditti remained masters of the whole field.

Whence came the troops by which this famous victory of San Jacinto was achieved? They were openly recruited, armed and equipped in the United States. And openly did they march from Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee and Mississippi, and set sail from New-Orleans and New-York, on their avowed enterprise. Yet under the energetic administration of the most prompt and efficient Chief Magistrate we have ever had, nothing was done to restrain these unhallowed crusaders, except the issuing of sundry empty proclamations and the sending of letters to the District Attorneys which were never heeded. The remissness of these functionaries would have cost them their places long before it had become habitual, on every supposition except that the Executive favored the violation of our neutrality. The proclamations and letters were for the special perusal of the Mexicans and their Envoy Extraordinary—and the honest portion of our own people.

But this negligence was not all. General Gaines, the commander of the western division of the United States' army was

That this step was a premeditated and flagrant violation of neutrality on the part of our government is sufficiently proved by official correspondence. And that it was designed, in the event of Houston's defeat, to put an end to the war by a *coup de main*, of which Gaines was to *take the responsibility*, is almost equally certain. He who has any doubt of this, has only to ask himself what would have been the result if Gen. Scott had taken a similar march into Canada on a late occasion?

It is easy to perceive how the capture of the Mexican President should paralyze not only the remainder of his army, but the military operations of Mexico itself. His disaster left the parties at home too equally divided to admit of any decisive measures to retrieve it. From the mediation of President Jackson and the return of Santa Ana through Washington, nothing need be argued. But it deserves to be remarked, that the conduct of Santa Ana after his return, which was loudly complained of by some of our opposition presses as perfidious, called forth no expressions of dissatisfaction from the organs of the administration. The inference is, that it was what they expected. The fallen chief had no power to treat for the independence of Texas. What he agreed to do and what thus far he has done, was, probably, first to regain as much of his influence as he could, by professing as great desire as ever for the recovery of the revolted province, and then to use it so as to prevent efficient action on the part of the present government of his country. To prevent the military operations of Mexico was obviously a most important part in the grand scheme.

Another link which must not be left out of our chain, is the mission of the Mexican Envoy Extraordinary, Mr. Gorostiza. Before the close of 1835, the invasion of Texas by Santa Ana being then expected, the conferences between Mr. Forsyth and the Mexican Chargè, Senor Castillo, as well as the President's Message had given just alarm to the Mexican government.* Without

regiments, without duly considering the heinousness of the crime, for which their longer absence will render them liable to all the pains and penalties of *Desertion*; and not doubting that the prospect of immediate active service will prompt all such absentees who have the spirit of United States soldiers, gladly to avail themselves of the interesting occasion which now offers to wipe off the stain and stigma they are suffering under, by returning to their companies, and flying with them to the protection of the bleeding frontier of Florida! The General hereby offers a full pardon to all such absentees and deserters who shall return to their regiments, or to Jefferson Barracks, on or before the 18th day of September, 1837.

EDMUND P. GAINES.

Major General U. S. A. Commanding.

* Mr. Forsyth had said in the name of his government, as appeared from the memorandum written on that day, by Sr. Castillo, 'that the United States were resolved to defend their frontier, which they considered threatened by reason of the approaching campaign in Texas; and in order thereto, the beligerents should ac-

loss of time they despatched Mr. Gorostiza to Washington to take charge of the *neutrality* question. He arrived at New-York on the 27th of Feb., 1836, so that he was in Washington at least one month prior to the instructions given to Gen. Gaines to march, on a certain contingency, "as far as the old fort Nacogdoches, which was within the limits of the United States as claimed by them." Against the pretences and conduct of our government he laid the reclamations of Mexico, based upon a definite treaty, which fixed the boundary by an accurate map. It was to be expected that our government would at least attempt to meet the case on its merits as a question of the interpretation of a treaty. But no such thing was done. *The Mexican Envoy was left in undisputed possession of the field of argument on the score of the treaty.* The President of the United States confined himself to the assertion of his right to cross the line of Mexico, in defence against the Indian tribes. The high matter of a "*contested territory*" was left to rest as it might, on certain ingeniously contrived manuscript maps, and the stories of Texas land speculators about some half dozen rivers which are sometimes called the *Sabine*—showing that the whole was a contrivance not for scrutiny but for effect. But even the plea of defence against the Indians was stripped of all force by the disclosure that Gen. Gaines had acted on a false alarm.*—Still in the correspondence of the War Department the territory lying west of the Sabine continued to be spoken of as the "*contested territory.*" Mr. Gorostiza pressed for an explanation. Mr.

knowledge as *neutral*, all that part of the Mexican territory which *might belong to the United States, after the demarcation of limits should be made.*'

"And in the Message, in reference no doubt to this verbal communication, was found the following sentence: 'It has been deemed necessary to make known to the government of Mexico, that we shall require the integrity of our territory to be scrupulously respected by both parties;' without Mr. Castillo's being able to obtain from Mr. Forsyth the explanation which he desired in writing of what was really understood therein by *territory of the United States.*"—*Document of Mr. Gorostiza translated for the National Enquirer.*

*The opinions of General Macomb and the Gov. of Louisiana were clearly given to the government to the effect that apprehensions from the Indians in Texas were *absurd*. And so much respect was the government obliged to pay to their representations and those of intelligent men on the spot, that Gen. Gaines was strictly charged to be more cautious in future. A letter from an officer in the army, published in the *Army and Navy Chronicle* contains the following admission, which plainly shows the *connection of things*:—

"It is to create the impression in Texas and Mexico, that the government of the United States takes a part in the controversy. It is in fact lending to the cause of Texas all the aid which it can derive from the countenance and apparent support of the United States, besides placing our troops in a situation to take an actual part in aid of the Texians, in case a reverse of their affairs should render aid necessary. The pretext of the anticipated invasion from the Indians in that quarter is unsupported by the least probable testimony, although Gen. Houston has issued a proclamation, dated at Nacogdoches, ordering out a body of 200 Texian militia 'to sustain the United States force at this place, until reinforcements can arrive from Gen. Gaines.'"

Forsyth, by order of the President, *refused to enter into any kind of explanation*, and the Mexican Envoy, at last, on the 15th day of Oct., 1836, required his passports and departed. These statements, it is true, are made partly on the authority of Mr. Gorostiza himself, but let it be understood that in the point in which they are most disgraceful to our government they remain uncontradicted! Nay, contradiction has been sought for in vain!

The next link in the chain consists of the Messages of President Jackson and his successor in relation to the recognition of Texas and our relations with Mexico. On the 21st of Dec., 1836, President Jackson made the recognition of Texian Independence the subject of a special message, in which he ably expounded the law of nations touching the question, and solemnly dissuaded from the act till there should be no longer any reasonable probability that Mexico would succeed in reestablishing her authority. This, by those who put faith in the honesty of the Executive, was considered as settling the question, at least so far as that session of Congress was concerned. There was no reason to doubt that Mexico had both the will and the power to continue the contest. At that very time troops were collecting for a fresh invasion of Texas. Indeed these preparations evidently called forth another message from the President on the 6th Feb., 1837. News had just arrived that Mexico was preparing a fleet to blockade the Texian ports, and upon the instant the President recollects that we have certain claims upon Mexico for spoliations of commerce, and he recommends to Congress to pass an act authorizing *reprisals*. Congress did not pass such an act, but a squadron was nevertheless immediately ordered to the Mexican coast, and several captures were the result. The captured vessels were afterwards restored, it is true, and the capturing officers *censured*, but the movement had its effect. It helped in some measure to bring about the condition of things in which according to the President it would be proper to recognize the independence of Texas. The precaution, however, was scarcely necessary. Things had ripened already. The opposers of the recognition had been thrown off their guard by the message of Dec. 21st. An occasion was sought just at the close of the session,—when those who would have most hindered such an act were absent from the Senate chamber, and the resolution was passed by which the leaders of a band of self-exiled profligates, fighting for the establishment of perpetual slavery, were recognized as the government of a free and independent nation! That is to say, on their behalf, an act was committed against Mexico, which, on the principles of the President himself was good cause for war!

Against this outrage Mexico protested with a dignity which became her. But President Van Buren had already appointed a

minister to "the ridiculous republic" and all the customary international relations had been fully established.

We have gone into this detailed history of the origin and progress of the Texian war, that the present position of our government might be clearly perceived. The importance of this question has only begun to be developed, and it behooves the people to understand on what line of conduct and under what impulses their national servants are acting in regard to it. Mr. Van Buren found the government involved in a scheme for obtaining Texas, partly by force and partly by fraud. Is there any reason to believe that he obtained the vote of the South without pledging himself to pursue the same policy? If there ever was, the Message of last December must have destroyed it. In that Message there are two strong proofs that Mr. Van Buren is carrying out the plans of his predecessor. 1st. *The absence of any allusion to the annexation of Texas.* Had the President been opposed to the annexation, he would not, of course, have neglected to lay before Congress his views on a subject so important which was sure to occupy much of its attention. Had he been in favor of bringing about the annexation by legitimate means, in a way which should be satisfactory to the majority of the people, it is difficult to conceive what motive he could have had for silence. But on the remaining supposition that he intended to gratify the South, at the expense of our national character, and in opposition to the wishes and interests of a majority of the people, it is easy to account for his silence. In the latter case it would be his obvious policy to avoid discussion and excitement and the appearance of committal, and not to attract public observation to the measure till it had become sure of the favor of a majority of the people.*

* In the House of Representatives on the 9th and 10th of October, 1837, there was a debate on the motion of Mr. Elmore, of South Carolina, (a friend to the annexation) to print an additional number of copies of the correspondence relative to the annexation, together with extracts from the diplomatic correspondence with Mexico since 1824. The object of Mr. Elmore was, doubtless, by printing certain parts of that correspondence to convict Mr. Adams of inconsistency in regard to the question of annexation. In pursuing it, he received a *hint* from Mr. Howard, of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of *Foreign Affairs*, which is worthy of close attention as disclosing the real policy of the Executive. We quote from the full report in the *Richmond Enquirer*.

"The proposition to print this additional number of the document he [Mr. Howard] considered as an appeal to the people from the decision of the President upon the question of the annexation of Texas; and he would suggest to the friends of that measure, whether it would be prudent to assail the President upon what he (Mr. H.) considered to be an impregnable position. There were three classes of opinions in the House and in the country upon this subject.

The Speaker interposed, and said, the debate was likely to take too wide a range.

Mr. Howard observed that he would not discuss these several opinions, but merely remark, that it was entirely for those who were considered as *the especial*

2d. *The prominence given to the claims on Mexico.* In the long struggle between the former Spanish colonies and their mother state, and the subsequent internal commotions, law and order were in a great measure overturned, and consequently there occurred numerous spoliations upon our commerce which have given rise to claims upon the southern republics—claims from their nature very difficult of settlement, inasmuch as nations fighting for existence are not careful to preserve documentary evidence of the wrongs committed by their individual citizens, nor after emerging from such a struggle, are they very forward to pay for such wrongs on the testimony of foreigners. The message speaks of claims, pending these twenty years, against no less than six of the southern republics including Mexico, none of which are said to be any nearer a settlement than those against the latter, yet the claims on Mexico are exalted into an importance which throws the others out of sight. For the same reason that President Jackson had singled out these claims as just cause of reprisals, we are obliged to believe that President Van Buren here makes their *immediate settlement* the *sine qua non* of our peace with Mexico. But in all conscience and honesty, is this the time to press the collection of our claims against Mexico? She said to our government in 1836, "Your citizens have crossed my boundary with arms in their hands and wrested from me immense domains with which they are now attempting to hire every mercenary cut-throat under heaven to carry on the war against me.* These aggressions are carried on from the United States—I demand that you interpose

friends of the annexation to say how far they were forwarding their own views by pressing this appeal. If they chose to take this course, he had no objection, and would cheerfully vote for any number of copies they might propose. He felt very confident that the nation would sanction the position taken by the Executive Department of the Government, and if the Texas question should be now pressed, it would inevitably become mixed up with extraneous matter, the result of which would be *inauspicious to the cause which a portion of this House so zealously advocated.* This, however, was a question entirely for them to consider."

The Speaker, no doubt, had good cause to interpose. It would have been scarcely "prudent" for Mr. Howard to specify that of the "three classes" one was opposed to the annexation at all events, another in favor of it at all events, and another, which must necessarily include the President, in favor of bringing it about by cession from Mexico, after repeated, solemn and even indignant assurances from her government, that she would never cede it! Though Mr. Howard was checked in his development, his *hint* was sufficiently broad; and though in that instance the friends of Texas had proceeded too far to profit by it, they have certainly done so since.

* "Texas, proper, exclusive of the Indian Territory, contains about 350 millions of acres. All grants heretofore made, and all outstanding claims, will not exceed twenty millions, leaving her resources, in her public domain alone, more than sufficient to support the war, however protracted it may be."—*Letter of Hon. James Love, formerly member of Congress from Kentucky, to the editors of the Louisville Journal, July 11, 1837.*

your authority to prevent them." "I acknowledge there is justice in your complaint," replied our Executive. "I regretted, but could not prevent the aggressions of my fellow-citizens. I acknowledge my obligations to preserve the strictest neutrality in this contest, and my best endeavors shall be used to that effect. I will maintain an army on the border which shall prevent *my* Indians from hurting you, or *yours* from hurting me, and for that purpose, whether you will or not, I will march into your territory so far as I deem necessary." Well, Mexico in the person of her Envoy Extraordinary retires. The work of stripping her of her fertile domain proceeds. The United States acknowledges as an independent nation her own self-exiled citizens, headed by fugitives from her own prisons and still loftier villains unwhipt of justice!* Emigrants by thousands pour into the Mexican territory. And while she is rallying her forces to bring them into subjection to her law, our Executive comes forward with a budget of fifty-seven claims, partly raked up out of the Mexican revolutionary war, and partly *growing out of the recent perfidious conduct of our own citizens*, (in all amounting not to the one hundredth part of the spoiliations of our citizens upon Mexico herself,) and despatches them to Mexico by a special messenger as *the last call!* And to all this is added a complaint to the Mexican Government against its Envoy, Mr. Gorostiza, for publishing a pamphlet in the Spanish language, in which he charged our Government with having done what, by every thing except its professions it is clearly proved to have done—violated its neutrality. If the Mexican Government did not disavow and disapprove the conduct of its minister, our Chargè, Mr. Ellis, was to return, bringing with him the archives of the legation. The Mexican Government agreed to settle the claims as soon as they could be duly examined, but they expressly sanctioned the act of Mr. Gorostiza. Thus our diplomatic intercourse came to a close.

* The only native Mexican in the so called Texian Cabinet is Lorenzo de Zavala, a land speculator. Of the principal dignitaries of the republic, *Robert Potter*, of North Carolina, was expelled from the legislature of that state and became a tenant of its prison for a crime too disgusting to be mentioned. He was a Secretary of one of the Departments! *Mosely Baker*, was once a leading state rights' man in the legislature of Alabama. He committed forgery, was arrested, broke jail, and fled to Texas, where he has become a Senator! Houston, the Generalissimo, Hero and Father of the Republic, married a respectable lady of Tennessee, greatly his junior in years, and abandoned her under the most heartless circumstances. Apprehending, and justly, an outburst of public indignation, he resigned the office of Senator of Tennessee, which he then filled—left civilized life—took up his abode among the south-western Indians, and became in every filthy and forbidding respect *as one of them*. He then repaired (in his Indian costume) to Washington, where he was reprimanded by the Speaker of the House for a ruffian assault on a member for words spoken in debate. It should be stated that, in Tennessee, where the deserted wife of Houston was well known, her character suffered nothing from his treatment.

Can stronger evidence be needed, to prove, that the present Executive has entered into the quarrel, which is really not between Houston's despicable Congress and Mexico, but between the slaveholding States and Mexico? We think not. Blindness itself can see that Texas has been favored, deliberately and systematically, at the expense of Mexico, and the slaveholding States have been led to hope that Mexico would at last be *forced* to cede her just claim, to the United States. In this way the slaveholders hope that the opposition of the North may be circumvented. The plan of the President is now the popular one of the South.* Treaties dictated by the guns of our West India squadron, are the means by which it is hoped to lay a prize at the feet of Northern cupidity, which shall prove more than a match for Northern interest or Northern honor.†

Such being the aims of the slavery party, backed by the present Chief Magistrate, it is plain that nothing can save the country from the two great and inseparable evils, the annexation of Texas, and a war with Mexico, but the prompt and decisive action of the people of the North. We rejoice to say, that the North has acted in some measure as became the crisis. An expression has been made, which if followed up with decision and energy, will arrest these disgraceful proceedings so far as our government is concerned. Besides the resolutions of Vermont, already quoted, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New-York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, have spoken out decidedly by their legislatures, against the measure. In Ohio and Massachusetts, the resolutions were accompanied by able re-

* Mr. Calhoun, in his sixth resolution, brought forward the annexation as a *principle*, but he was obliged by his friends to give way, and the rallying ground is now as follows :

Thursday, Jan. 4.

"Mr. Preston laid before the Senate the following preamble and resolution :

"Whereas the just and true boundary of the United States under the treaty of Louisiana, extended in the south-west to the Rio Grande del Norte, which river continued to be the true boundary line until the territory west of the Sabine was surrendered to Spain by the treaty of 1819—and whereas such surrender of a portion of the territory of the United States is of evil precedent, and of questionable constitutionality,—and whereas many weighty considerations of policy make it expedient to establish the same as the true boundary, and to annex to the United States the territory occupied by the State of Texas, with the consent of said State,

"Resolved, That with the consent of that State previously had, and whenever it can be effected consistently with the public faith and treaty stipulations of the United States, it is desirable and expedient to annex the said Territory to the United States."

† For much of the information in the foregoing pages, we are indebted to the very valuable pamphlet entitled "The war in Texas," by BENJAMIN LUNDY, whose travels in Texas and Mexico, and thorough acquaintance with the subject, give his facts perfect authenticity, and his opinions great weight.

ports of committees, taking the ground that the Constitution grants no power to Congress, to annex a foreign State, and that the annexation of Texas as a slaveholding territory, would prove destructive to our liberty. We quote the unanimous resolutions of these important States :

“Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio,—That in the name and on behalf of the people of Ohio, we do hereby protest against the annexation of the Republic of Texas to the Union of these States, as unjust, inexpedient, and destructive of the peace, safety, and well-being of the nation; and we do, in the name and on behalf of the said people solemnly declare that Congress has no power conferred on it by the Constitution of the United States, to consent to such annexation; and that the people of Ohio cannot be bound by any such covenant, league or arrangement, made between Congress and any foreign State or Nation.

“Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives, in General Court assembled, do, in the name of the people of Massachusetts, earnestly and solemnly protest against the annexation of Texas to this Union, and declare that no act done, or compact made, for such purpose, by the government of the United States will be binding on the States, or the People.

Those who believe that the North can exert no influence on the South to curb or destroy slavery, may see a refutation of their error in the effect of these resolutions. The South has already been brought to pause in her career, and she will pause long before she finally prefers a union with Texas to that which she now enjoys with the North. The Northern slave-states will not hastily suffer themselves to be placed on the south side of a line dividing a slave empire from a free. They know that the rearing of slaves for the market is not a business which can be made profitable in such circumstances. If they cannot hold between themselves and freedom the shield of a misinterpreted Constitution, they will relinquish their merchandise in men; and avoid ruin by placing themselves on the free side of the line.

Among the events of the year pertaining to our subject, are several important judicial decisions. The principle which had been settled in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the slave Med, was in June last recognized in Connecticut by the decision in the case of Nancy Jackson against her master, James S. Bullock, of Georgia. “It is now settled in Connecticut, by the Supreme Court of Errors, that the owner of a slave born in a slaveholding State, has no right by comity to hold such person in slavery there [here]”—and that, “there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States applicable to slaves voluntarily brought into this State [Conn.] by their masters.” It may seem strange to some that, since the abolition of slavery in Connecticut, it should have been regarded otherwise. A history of this trial shows a sympathy for slaveholders among a certain class in Connecticut which stood ready to do more than neglect the laws for their accommodation. The expression of feeling was in-

deed so remarkable that we cannot forbear to describe it in the language of Mr. Bullock himself, in a letter to his Southern friends published in the Savannah Georgian:—

"I do not believe a gentleman in this city had any hand in enticing my servant to leave me. It was some of the colored people, with a Mr. E. R. Tyler, an agent of the New-York Anti-Slavery Society. Had I been surrounded by friends in Savannah, I should not have experienced more good feeling towards me, and indignation expressed at the whole course of procedure, than was manifested by the citizens here—the most respectable and influential of all parties.

"It would be improper to mention names, (I shall never forget them) but many of the citizens of influence and property tendered me their names, as surety, if required, and any other service! In truth, nothing but a sense of what is due to good order and law, prevented the leaders being furnished with a coat of tar and feathers! Suffice it to say, in proof of the good feeling here, and opposition to these abolitionists, E. R. Tyler, in giving his account of the result of the case in their paper, the *Emancipator*, printed in New-York, animadverted freely upon the citizens for their conduct displayed towards me. I have the best legal advisers in the State, both employed as counsel and volunteers.* Connecticut is by no means an abolition State at this time; the views of her leading men are adverse to those of the Anti-Slavery Society, and say it is a matter left altogether to the slave States to regulate. All her members of Congress are anti-abolitionists—her Governor, as much so as the Governor of any Southern State, and he makes no secret of his opinions—and if I mistake not, some of her judicious, talented and Gospel men, (and she has not a few) will soon come out and take a stand against, and arrest the movements of the reckless immediate emancipationists. Connecticut has on more than one occasion thrown herself into the breach on great and perilous occasions, and I have no doubt on this exciting and difficult subject, will signalize herself again."

Remembering that it was simply an appeal to the *law* of Connecticut which called forth the indignation of "influential" and "Gospel men" as here described, it may well be supposed that there was need of a reformation of opinion in Connecticut on the subject of slavery. We have reason to believe that the aid and countenance given to this slaveholder in his efforts to exercise his peculiar prerogatives in the old nursery of freedom, have done much to arouse Connecticut to her duty. Her honest yeomanry and others who love the substance as well as the name of the Gospel, have been awakened by finding themselves in the leading-strings of men as much opposed to the freedom of the laborer as "the Governor of any Southern State." A large and efficient State Anti-Slavery Society, supporting an Anti-Slavery paper, and pouring out its funds to help the general cause is a good proof of this. The voice of Connecticut juries against mobs, is another proof. Connecticut will yet "throw herself in the breach," but it will be only in favor of "*free speech, a free press, and FREE MEN.*"

Another important decision, though not reaching to the same length, has been given by the Supreme Court of Ohio, in the case

*The cause was argued before the Supreme Court of Errors on the 15th June, 1837, by W. W. Ellsworth and Wm. Hungerford, Esqrs., for the petitioner, and Charles Chapman and Roger M. Sherman, Esqrs., for the master.

of James G. Birney advs. the State of Ohio. Mr. Birney had been indicted in the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County for having "unlawfully harbored and secreted a certain mulatto girl by the name of Matilda, then being a *slave* and the *property* of one Larkin Lawrence, and convicted and fined. The indictment was pursuant to a statute of Ohio dated in 1804, which makes it a penal offence to "harbor or secrete any black or mulatto person, being the *property* of any person whatever."* The case was carried to the Supreme Court by a writ of Error. The object of the writ was to test the constitutionality of the enactment, and the legality of a conviction for harboring a person brought into the State by the person claiming to be his or her owner. To the very able and masterly argument of Salmon P. Chase, Esq., in behalf of Mr. Birney, we shall have occasion to refer hereafter. The decision of the Court did not, so far as we have learned, express an opinion of the constitutionality of the enactment, or settle the effect upon the legal rights of the master of bringing a slave into the State, but it reversed the judgment of the Court below on the ground that in a State whose Constitution declares all men to be free and equal, which expressly interdicts slavery and even involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, *COLOR affords no presumption of condition.*

Though in defiance of her Constitution the barbarous laws of Ohio which degrade the colored man, yet stand, the public opinion is fast rising which will sweep them all away. The numerous petitions to that effect received far more respect from the last than from any previous legislature.

We have to recur to another decision of a different character. It is that of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in regard to the right of the colored people to exercise the elective franchise.

Founded by William Penn and adopted by Benjamin Franklin, Pennsylvania has been the garden spot of American liberty. Slavery never took deep root there, and was early thrown out of the soil. The principles which in 1776 took from Britain the power to tax those to whom she allowed no *representation* [in her Parliament, were made in 1780 to break the chains of the slaves in Pennsylvania. From that moment, it was the design of the liberal and enlightened statesmen of Pennsylvania to extend to these emancipated men the full franchise of citizens, as a right

* Thus asserting substantially, though indirectly, that every colored person in Ohio might be the property of some one—a *slave*—and this too when the Constitution of that State had declared that slavery, the thing itself, *never* should exist within its bounds. Under the sanction of this odious legislative act, and of others equally inhuman and inconsistent with the Constitution, the colored citizens of Ohio have suffered for years, from the persecutions of the mean and cowardly among the whites.

due to the properly qualified. It was one of the objects of the "Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery," headed by Doctor FRANKLIN, "to qualify those who have been restored to freedom, for the exercise and enjoyment of CIVIL LIBERTY." Accordingly, when the Constitution of the State was revised in 1790, all distinction of color was abolished, and colored men were admitted to vote on the same terms as white men.* From that time to this, numbers of them have exercised the right, and, so far as appears, in an irreproachable manner. It is with great mortification, therefore, that we are obliged to listen to the slaveholders of the South rejoicing over the constitutional degradation of the colored man in Pennsylvania. He has been the subject of a twofold outrage. First, the Convention for revising the Constitution, by a vote of 77 to 45, inserted the word "WHITE," among the qualifications of voters. Second, in the case of Fogg, vs. Hobbs and others, a colored man had brought an action against the Inspector and Judges of an election for refusing his vote, and had recovered judgment against them in the Court of Common Pleas of Luzerne County, the Supreme Court reversed the decision, on the ground that the *present* Constitution of Pennsylvania gives the right to vote only to *white* men!

Strange as it may seem, it is the opinion of intelligent and disinterested men in Pennsylvania, that there is so far a connection between these two facts that the latter would not have existed without the former! We think a little attention to the rise and progress of this question, and to the decision of the Supreme Court itself, will corroborate the opinion.

While the Convention sat at Harrisburgh, on the 17th of June, this point had been disposed of as follows:—

"In elections by the citizens, every freeman of the age of twenty-one years, living in the State one year, and if he had previously been a qualified elector of the State six months, and within two years paid a State or County tax, which shall have been assessed at least ten days before the election, shall enjoy the rights of an elector—provided that the sons of citizens of the United States, between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-two years, having resided in the State one year before the election, shall be entitled to vote, although they shall not have paid taxes."

But at the elections in October, in the County of Bucks, it happened that the administration party was defeated, and, as is affirmed, by precisely the number of votes given by colored men. The defeated party rallied with great indignation, perhaps thinking it a good opportunity to wash off from their party the odium attached to it at the South by the vote of its distinguished leader

* "In the original draft, reported by a Committee of nine, the word "WHITE" stood before "FREEMAN." On motion of ALBERT GALLATIN it was stricken out, for the express purpose of including colored citizens within the pale of the elective franchise."—*Appeal of the Colored Citizens of Pennsylvania.*

in favor of "Negro Suffrage" in the Convention of New-York. Meetings were held in different parts of the County and a memorial to the Reform Convention was adopted, setting forth that "the negroes, in the County of Bucks, have claimed, and for some years, have been permitted to exercise the *right to vote*; that frequently the majority of the whites has been *controlled by the votes of the blacks*, and that at the last election, one member of Assembly, the County Commissioner and Auditor, are returned as elected by the force of the votes of blacks, when their opponents would have been elected, *except for the negro suffrage.*"

On the strength of these facts the memorialists, "believing that their rights as white citizens and freemen have thus been violated and trampled upon by negroes," proceed to pray, "that a clause be inserted in the Constitution, expressly providing that no one of the negro-race be permitted to vote for any public office whatsoever." The memorialists did not forget another solemn subject of complaint, to wit, "the manifest design of a considerable class of abolitionists and amalgamationists, to interfere with and prostrate the compact in the Constitution of the United States, between the Northern States and our brethren of the South;" and this was an additional reason why colored Pennsylvanians should be deprived of their right to vote!

The strange mixture of the ludicrous and the diabolical in these proceedings is well illustrated in an account of one of them given with high approbation in the *Harrisburgh Keystone*. It is as follows:

"THE GERMANS AROUSED.—The meeting held at Buck's Tavern, in Nockamixon, on Saturday last, in opposition to *Negro Suffrage*, was one of the largest ever assembled in the upper section of the County. Long before the hour of meeting, it was found that the tavern house would not contain those in attendance, while the roads in all directions were filled with German farmers and mechanics, coming to the meeting in defence of their violated rights. It is estimated that more than six hundred freemen were present. A number of gray headed Germans were in attendance, who had not attended any public meeting for many years, who declared that they were as ready now to *maintain and defend their sacred rights*, as they were during the perilous times of the revolution, or when marching with Washington, under the Star Spangled Banner, to put down oppressive *British taxation*, and defeat the *British troops and tories*. At 2 o'clock, P. M., the meeting was organized in a large open field in the rear of the public house. Every German Township was fully represented, and throughout, good order and the most enthusiastic feeling prevailed. The spirited resolutions *opposing negro voters,—British influence,—abolition,—*and to contest the election, were UNANIMOUSLY adopted by the large assemblage."

It surely speaks ill for the superiority of the white race, Saxon or Anglo-Saxon, that it did not occur to one of these "six hundred freemen" that he had come to this meeting with all his valor against "*British influence*," to do precisely what "*the British troops and tories*" endeavored to do, viz.: enforce "*taxation without representation.*" Well might it be asked, what right has such infuriate stupidity to claim superiority over any thing that thinks?

Let us add to this state of things in the region of Buck's County the fact, that Pennsylvania has for some years been made the head quarters of a sect of philanthropists who may be properly denominated the Philosophers of Expulsive Benevolence, whose fundamental tenet is, that *colored men cannot exercise the rights of men in the same community with white men*, and we have the influence which was brought to bear on the Reform Convention to reverse its decision. It was thought by some not only that the rights of the colored men were a proper sacrifice to prejudice, but that the sacrifice would make the amended Constitution more popular. They judged of the whole State by the County of Bucks. The vote of next October is to decide whether they judged correctly.

But here comes the connection of the decision of the Supreme Court with the vote of the Convention. The amended Constitution abridges the term of office of the Judges. Hence it has become the interest of the present Judges to defeat the new Constitution; and in order to deprive it of the advantage with the people which the rejection of colored suffrage was supposed to give it, the Supreme Court decided that colored men do not possess the right under the *old*! The opinion of the Court as delivered by Judge Gibson, is, in itself, well worthy of the purpose which it was intended to serve. As an argument it is beneath refutation, and cannot claim even the merit of originality, being in substance and almost in language, a copy of the patriotic resolutions passed at "Harris's White Bear Tavern" in Buck's County. The only point which is peculiar to Judge Gibson's argument is his implicit reliance on a previous decision against the right of "negro suffrage" *said to have been given* soon after the adoption of the Constitution of 1790, but of which *no record can be found!!* On the mere recollection of an individual, who, as he himself says, was not concerned in the cause, Judge Gibson claims that the suffrage of colored men has been illegal for these forty years past, and that the question is not now open to argument!

The colored people of Pennsylvania, very properly regarding their rights under the old constitution to be, in spite of this decision, as good as it is in the power of charters to make them, have appealed to their fellow-citizens to reject the new constitution.—The question is intimately connected with the abolition of slavery. If respectable, law-supporting, tax-paying colored men are to be *degraded* from the platform of manhood in the *free* states, an argument is put into the hands of slaveholders, better than they can derive from any other source.

The spirit of mobocracy has, during the past year, received an illustration which has opened the eyes of the friends of law and order. It is not that an estimable citizen, a pious minister of the

Gospel, and an honored philanthropist has laid down his life a victim to brutal violence, that clothes with their chief interest the scenes of which the young city of Alton has been the theatre.— But it is, that there the finger of God has portrayed the frightful inroads of Slavery upon the framework of our social system, and His voice has proclaimed, in tones that can never be forgotten, that *law and slavery*, as prevailing and established principles *cannot co-exist*. In the death of Lovejoy, republican America has been taught a lesson which she must profit by, or perish!

It is not true, as has been slanderously asserted, that under a *republican* government the liberty of the individual is in the power of the *people*, and he can then say only what *they* will allow and protect; that the prevailing will and voice of the brotherhood, that is to say, of the particular community of which he is a member, will determine his liberty, and that, in point of fact, a republican government confers no other.* Such a description is true only of *anarchy*, headless and lawless. Just so far as it is true of our republic, it is also true that our republic is corrupted and destroyed. He who thus describes republican government, conceives of it only as it would be, if the idea of a God, and eternal truth, and human conscience, and fixed law had no existence.— That government, if it be possible to conceive of such a thing, which affords to liberty of speech no guarantee but the mere “prevailing will and voice of the brotherhood,” even though that brotherhood comprise the whole human race, and their will be engrossed on parchment, or engraved upon brass, is not worthy to be called a republic nor even a government. The foundation of law is of stabler material. The constitution of whatever may properly be termed a government, and especially of a republican government, written or unwritten, is of the nature of a solemn oath. It is assented to by the people, not because they simply *will* it, but because reason and conscience recognize it as the will of the Creator and Supreme Governor that they should do so. Does not this afford a guarantee stronger than the mere popular will? Let us simplify the matter and look at it in its elements. Is not a deed, solemnly acknowledged with an oath, a better title to an estate than the sufferance, the mere will and voice of one who has the power to seize it? When my neighbor calls God to witness that he will protect me in the exercise of certain powers and faculties, cost him what it will, have I no right to expect he

* Rev. Hubbard Winslow's re-statement of the doctrine of his "Thanksgiving Sermon." Were the doctrine confined to Mr. Winslow, it would not here be referred to; but he has put into a definite proposition a doctrine which is unhappily not only advocated theoretically, but acted on practically, by multitudes who pass under the denomination of "men of property and standing."

will protect me after my conduct ceases to please him? He who answers *no*, takes a low, slanderous, atheistic view of human nature. And in like manner, he who affirms that the man who publishes, under a republican government, sentiments which are contrary to the prevailing will and voice of the community, cannot, as a practical matter; reasonably expect protection, slanders that republic.

When our fathers established this republic, they bound it to the throne of God. They recognized the soul of man as responsible directly and only, in its proper individuality, to the Great Being from whom it emanated. They called heaven and earth to witness that they would never chain the conscience—that in the operation of those governmental powers necessary for the maintenance of order, they would never fetter opinion, nor infringe upon the true liberty of tongue or press. And, now, is the liberty we have enjoyed under this constitution to be thrown down at the feet of despots, as the gilded bauble of a mock triumph? Are we to be told that for the last sixty years, both as a matter of necessity and of fact, the liberty of speech under our republic has been just what the individual could beg of the multitude ever ready to seize the bludgeon and the torch?—that mind has been free among us, only because it had the prudence to be led with a loose chain? No. The very existence and liberty of the man who uttered this statement are proof of its falsehood—for surely nothing can be more contrary to the will of what he pleases to call the brotherhood, than to be represented as not only despotic but perjured. The truth is, and it is alike honorable to human nature and to republican institutions, that under our government men *have* said what they pleased, or what they thought to be true, without the slightest consideration whether the *people* would allow it or protect them in it. Theorists of all schools, heretics of all faiths, projectors of all manner of reform—the very Ishmaelites of opinion, have taken this point for granted. Nor have they had cause to repent their presumption. Were we a nation of infidels when we suffered Paine and Cobbett to walk our streets? Were we the converts of Robert Dale Owen, and Frances Wright, when our magistrates protected their assemblies? Are the people of Ohio *Mormonites* that they do not forbid the sale of the Mormon Bible?

The very enterprise in which we are engaged, in all its course, has vindicated Human Nature and Republicanism from the libel on which we are commenting; for while it has shown the invasions of slavery upon the foundations of our social system, it has shown that system to be sound in its essential nature—the rottenness has prevailed fearfully in spots, but it does not pervade the mass. And even in places where our rights have been vio-

lated, we now enjoy substantial liberty and constitutional protection, and that, not by the mere prevailing will and voice of the brotherhood—for the mass of the people may still be opposed to our opinions and to our expressing them—but by the awakened sense of constitutional obligation, by the conscientious recognition of our inherent rights. Thousands there are who now stand ready to defend us at the hazard of their lives, who profess no faith in our doctrines, but earnestly express the wish that we would cease to promulgate them. Such men stood by the side of Lovejoy when he fell. The day is nigh when such men—if the truth does not too soon make them abolitionists—will wield the power of law even in Alton.

We have never for a moment despaired of republicanism or of our country. Though Altons should be multiplied and the land be baptized in the blood of martyrdom, our hope would not be abated. Law will yet triumph, and its antagonist, *arbitrary will*, whose fruit is slavery, will yet be put down. At the door of slavery, and not of popular government, we lay the blood of Lovejoy. The great end of government being the protection of rights, and of republican government, the protection of *the rights of all alike*, what wonder that slavery should defeat it? What wonder if that should happen to an advocate of the slaves which has happened to the slaves themselves? The persecution and death of our noble hearted brother have but disclosed the horrible tyranny under which two and a half millions of our brethren live and groan. They show how the same tyranny, like a gangrene, is stealing upon what we have been proud to call the free north.

It was in the autumn of 1833 that Elijah P. Lovejoy became the editor of the *St. Louis Observer*, a new religious newspaper. Though the capital had been principally furnished by others, the entire control of the paper was left with the editor. He had been well known in St. Louis as the editor of one of its political journals, and was regarded as an ornament to his adopted State and a treasure to the church with which he had recently connected himself. He had, in the affections of the whole Protestant portion of that community, as strong an anchorage as an editor could well desire. And his course was such as to multiply and strengthen his friends, and to disarm, if it did not vanquish, his enemies. Though by no means an abolitionist, he took at the outset that ground of honest inquiry and free discussion which inevitably leads to abolitionism. "Peace," said he of the *Observer*, "will be its aim, as far as that is consistent with the defence of *Truth*. Yet it will never shrink from the path of duty: nor fear to speak out lest some over-sensitive ears should be pained." He did not hesitate to enumerate among the principles of the christian religion, that "wherever she comes it is to set the bondman free, to break the chains of the

oppressor, and to open the prison doors of the captive." Such were the expressions of a man, who, if he was not yet thoroughly acquainted with slavery, was at least well aware of the danger of discussing the subject in a slaveholding city. The ground which he here assumed, was one on which conscience might rest, if it could rest any where short of abolitionism; and every motive in the universe, except the naked power of *truth*, urged him not to step beyond it. He was in favor of abolition in the abstract, and not unfavorable to colonization, and this the community around him would bear. But as the dark traits of slavery, one after another, forced themselves upon his notice, verifying the statements for which the abolitionists were now enduring reproach and the spoiling of their goods, his honest soul was moved and he spoke out fearlessly.* In October, 1835, he had become obnoxious to the slaveholders, and it is not to be wondered at, that when two men had been violently brought from Illinois on suspicion of having enticed slaves to escape, taken back of St. Louis and flogged two hundred and fifty lashes each, by sixty of the most influential citizens, twenty of them, among whom were some *church members*, having first voted for *hanging*, the St. Louis Observer was marked out as a victim. As editor, he was threatened with Lynch law: a public meeting of citizens denounced his course, and soon his friends, the proprietors of the paper, though having vested him with full control, urged him to desist. His stand was firmly and nobly taken. He addressed his fellow citizens with an overwhelming argument in favor of free discussion. "We have slaves, it is true," said he, "but *I* am not one. I am a citizen of these United States, a citizen of Missouri, free born; and having never forfeited the inestimable privileges attached to such a condition, I cannot consent to surrender them." Though many old friends had forsaken him, unexpected ones rallied to his aid, and the Observer continued to bear up against the storm. In July, 1836, it had been concluded, for the sake of better support, to remove the Observer to Alton, on the opposite bank of the Mississippi, in the State of Illinois. The same paper which announced the intention of removal, contained deserved comments on the abominable charge of Judge Lawless, justifying the burning of McIntosh as *the act of the people*. For this a mob of the Judge's true disciples entered his office and destroyed a considerable portion of his printing materials. The remainder were utterly destroyed on their arrival at Alton, whither they were probably pursued from St. Louis.

* One of the horrid atrocities he faithfully rebuked was the burning alive of McIntosh, in May, 1835. On this occasion he clearly exposed the tendency of mobs, and gave an impressive and prophetic warning to his countrymen.

The citizens of Alton voluntarily pledged themselves to make good the loss. Though at their meeting resolutions were passed, for the sake of effect, disapproving of abolitionism, Mr. Lovejoy was far from giving, and they from requiring any *pledge* in regard to the course of the paper. The pretence of such a pledge, which was at a later period got up, is fully refuted by the statement of ten of the most respectable citizens of Alton, of all parties, who were present at the meeting. They testify that after stating his object to be the publication of a *religious paper*, that he was not in full fellowship with the abolitionists, and that he felt less called upon to discuss the subject in a State where slavery did not exist, than he had done in Missouri, Mr. Lovejoy used the following emphatic words, "But, gentlemen, as long as I am an American citizen, and as long as American blood runs in these veins, I shall hold myself at liberty to speak, to write, and to publish whatever I please on any subject, being amenable to the laws of my country for the same." In accordance with this *inalienable* right, Mr. Lovejoy continued, from his *first paper* onward, to devote some portion of his columns to the subject of slavery, till, in the spring of 1837, he entered into "full fellowship with the abolitionists." At no time however did the subject of abolition occupy a larger share of his paper than it long has done of a number of the most extensively circulated religious journals. And at all times it was treated in a *manner* which afforded the fewest possible advantages for carpers. His crime lay in the *matter*. His enemies demanded that he should not utter his sentiments in *any manner*. He advocated a State Anti-Slavery Society in Illinois, and such an organization the friends and flatterers of the slaveholders were resolved should not exist. The common resort was had to a "Market House" meeting. This was on the 11th of July, 1837. Resolutions were passed accusing Mr. Lovejoy of having advocated, in the Alton Observer, principles contrary to the wishes of a majority of the citizens of Alton, &c., and appointing a committee to wait on him and ascertain *whether he intended to pursue such a course in future!* One of the committee who drafted these resolutions,* on the fatal night while Lovejoy was weltering in his blood, was heard by the Mayor of Alton to exclaim, "*Now, boys, we must stick together; and if any one is arrested we must come to his rescue.*" It is the sin and shame of Alton, that her respectable citizens did not then see that these resolutions were in their nature murderous, and could be moved by nothing but murder in the heart. If there were men in Alton who disapproved the sentiments of Mr. Lovejoy, they had unquestionably a right to disavow them and reprobate them; but when they set themselves up

* DR. HORACE BEAL. See *Alton Trials*, page 100.

as an inquisition to ascertain his designs for the future, they assumed an authority and showed a disposition which every good man ought indignantly to rebuke. That was the time for the friends of law and order to rally and throw a shield over the liberty of the press. Why did they not? There is probably but one subject on which the press could have been so insulted without calling around it hosts of defenders from all creeds and parties. On no other subject would the anarchists have ventured such insolence. Presses are occasionally mobbed on other subjects, but not by open proclamation, the sending of heralds, and the flourish of trumpets. The truth is, that our commercial cities are bribed by their connection with slavery; from the princely merchant to the beggar on the dunghill, the mass of their population have been taught to think that *the trade of the South* is hardly less necessary to them than the air they breathe. What shall they do to secure it? "Put down the abolitionists," reply the slaveholders. Argument, our northerners well know, will not do this, and hence, according to their zeal for the South, they urge or silently permit the imbruted tenantry of the grog-shops to undertake the work by pillage and murder. Their eyes are not opened to the folly of such outrages upon law, till they see them to be wholly ineffectual.

Mr. Lovejoy refused to recognize the inquisitorial authority which his fellow-citizens had assumed. Three presses of St. Louis cheered on the mob to their work, and upon the 21st of August, between the hours of ten and eleven in the evening, the destruction of press and types was effected. Mr. Lovejoy himself was surrounded by the mob in the street, and the rabble were urged by the more "respectable" leaders to do him violence, but on approaching him they recoiled at his calm appeal, "I have never injured you."

A concourse of citizens were the quiet spectators of this work of destruction, and the Mayor of the city was present but did nothing to support the authority of law.

The true friends of order in Alton immediately resolved to re-establish the Observer. A new press was procured, and being threatened with destruction on its arrival, the Mayor undertook to protect it. He posted a *constable* on the night of the 21st of September, at the door of the warehouse where the press was lodged, with orders to remain till a certain hour. As soon as he left, the store was forcibly entered by "ten or twelve" men, the press taken out, broken to pieces, and thrown into the Mississippi. The Mayor arrived while they were at this work, ordered them to disperse, and received for answer that they would do so "as soon as they got through."

What was the conduct of the citizens of Alton after this second outrage? Did they rally to save the laws and their Chief Magis-

trate from utter contempt? Not at all:—they congratulated themselves that this last act of a more than Turkish despotism would be an effectual lesson, and that the attempt to establish a *free press* among them would not be repeated!

It was but a few days after this that the intrepid Lovejoy was again violently assaulted by a mob, in St. Charles, Missouri, and rescued from their hands only by the heroic intervention of his devoted wife. On every side his ears were assailed by the most fiendish threats, and his steps were dogged by villains who had bound themselves under curses to take his life. But amidst all, he was not discouraged. He calmly resolved to seek only the path of duty and persevere in it, cost what it might. On his own account he sent for another press, and referred to the State Anti-Slavery Convention, which met in Upper Alton, on the 26th of October, the question whether it should be set up in Alton or elsewhere. It was the decision of the Convention that it should remain in Alton.

Here it is proper to remark, that the week previous to the Anti-Slavery Convention, there was a resurrection of the *Colonization Society* in Upper Alton, which had been dead for several years. The meeting is represented to have been overflowing, and the abolitionists were denounced as amalgamationists and revilers of the South. The men who addressed it were, as is usual, of high standing in society.

The Anti-Slavery Convention which assembled at Upper Alton, on the 26th of October, consisted of more than sixty delegates from different parts of the State, comprising many of its most pious, discreet and talented men. They were called together as the friends of *immediate abolition*, yet their enemies in Alton had the hardihood to answer to the same call, and outvoting the Convention on its own floor, gloried over its defeat as if it were not their own shame. The members of the Convention again met after the retirement of the Alton intruders, on the 28th, and organized the Illinois State Anti-Slavery Society. The subject of the re-establishment of the *Observer* at Alton was thoroughly discussed, and decided as we have already said, by a nearly unanimous vote.

On the last day of October, a colonization meeting was held in Lower Alton, at which the Rev. Joel Parker, recently from New Orleans, declared it an "unchristian thing, to go into a community and promulgate doctrines that were calculated to excite that community."*

It was at this stage of proceedings that the abolitionists, after much deliberation, came to the conclusion that, as they had called

* Memoir of Lovejoy, p. 257.

on the civil authority for protection, it was their duty to join their fellow-citizens who were friendly to order, and determined it should be maintained, in offering to the authorities such military assistance as it might be in their power to give, to repel the mob and protect the press. The Mayor expressed his approbation of their design, and promised in case of need to require the military service of such as should volunteer.

On the 2d and 3d of November, a final effort was made by the "respectable" patrons of the mob—the self-appointed censors of opinion—to drive the friends of a free press from their position. It was a meeting of those who ought to have been foremost to sustain the martyr in his noble stand—of christians and christian ministers, and men of that profession whose business it is to expound and enforce the law. The object of the meeting was stated to be "to take into consideration the present excited state of public sentiment in this city, growing out of the discussion of the abolition question: and to endeavor to find some common ground, on which both parties might meet for the restoration of harmony and good fellowship by *mutual concession*. The "concession" which the anti-abolitionists required, was simply the liberty of their opponents to print the truth according to the dictates of their consciences; what they proposed to concede it is difficult to say.

The importance of this meeting appears at once, when we consider that it embraced a body of men who might have preserved the law inviolate. The question was now finally put, whether or not the law should be sustained. The following resolutions were proposed at the commencement of the meeting by Rev. Edward Beecher and Winthrop S. Gilman, on the part of the abolitionists:

Resolved, 1. That the free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the invaluable rights of man; and that every citizen may freely speak, write, and print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty.

2. That the abuse of this right is the only legal ground for restraining its use.

3. That the question of abuse must be decided solely by a regular civil court, and in accordance with the law, and not by an irresponsible and unorganized portion of the community, be it great or small.

4. For restraining what the law will not reach, we are to depend solely on argument and moral means, aided by the controlling influences of the spirit of God; and that these means, appropriately used, furnish an ample defence against all ultimate prevalence of false principles and unhealthy excitement.

5. That where discussion is free and unrestrained, and proper means are used, the triumph of the truth is certain—and that with the triumph of truth, the return of peace is sure; but that all attempts to check or prohibit discussion, will cause a daily increase of excitement, until such checks or prohibitions are removed.

6. That our maintenance of these principles should be independent of all regard to persons or sentiments.

7. That we are more especially called on to maintain them in case of unpopular sentiments or persons, as in no other cases will any effort to maintain them be needed.

8. That these principles demand the protection of the editor and of the press of the Alton Observer, on grounds of principle solely, and altogether disconnected with approbation of his sentiments, personal character, or course as editor of the paper.

9. That on these grounds alone, and irrespective of all political, moral, or religious differences, but solely as American citizens, from a sacred regard to the great principles of civil society, to the welfare of our country, to the reputation and honor of our city, to our own dearest rights and privileges, and those of our children, we will protect the press, the property, and the editor of the Alton Observer, and maintain him in the free exercise of his rights, to print and publish whatever he pleases, in obedience to the supreme laws of the land, and under the guidance and direction of the constituted civil authorities, he being responsible for the abuse of this liberty only to the laws of the land.

These resolutions, which it would seem that men having any regard to law or any disposition adverse to mobs should have passed instantly, were referred to a committee to report upon them the next day. Before the adjournment, the following resolution, showing the faith of the meeting in their power over the mob, was moved by one of the most violent of the enemies of abolition, and passed :

Resolved, unanimously by this meeting, That in the interim between the adjournment and re-assembling hereof, if any infraction of the peace be attempted by any party or set of men in this community, we will aid to the utmost of our power in the maintenance of the laws.

This kind resolution showed the abolitionists how sure they might be of protection if they would concede all that needed protection. And it showed them too, what they had to expect if they did not make concession.

At the adjourned meeting, the committee aforesaid, of whom the Hon. Cyrus Edwards was chairman, reported, that however they might approve the "general spirit" of the resolutions that had been submitted to them, "*they did not consider them, as a whole, suited to the exigency which had called together the citizens of Alton.*" But neither in whole nor in part did they adopt them, much as they were obliged to approve their "general spirit."—They thought that for the present occasion, these resolutions required "too much concession" from the mob party! For this reason they prepared another set of resolutions, in which they took advantage of all that the mob had done and were about to do, to impose silence on Mr. Lovejoy. We give here, those of them that passed, because they are not less murderous than the bricks and bullets of the mob itself.

"Whereas, it is of the utmost importance that peace, harmony, order, and a due regard to law, should be restored to our distracted community; and whereas, in all cases of conflicting opinions about rights and privileges, each party should yield some things in the spirit and form of compromise: Therefore

Resolved, That a strong confidence is entertained that our citizens will abstain from all undue excitements, discountenance every act of violence to person or property, and cherish a sacred regard for the great principles contained in our Bill of Rights.

"That it is apparent to all good citizens, that the exigencies of the place require a course of moderation in relation to the discussion of principles in themselves deemed right, and of the highest importance; and that it is no less a dictate of duty than expediency, to adopt such a course in the present crisis.

"That while there appears to be no disposition to prevent the liberty of free

discussion, through the medium of the press or otherwise, as a general thing, it is deemed a matter indispensable to the peace and harmony of this community, that the labors and influence of the late editor of the Observer be no longer identified with any newspaper establishment in this city."

Thus did the the Hon. Cyrus Edwards say to the lawless men who had twice destroyed the press of Mr. Lovejoy because he dared to express his own thoughts, 'It is "indispensable to the peace and harmony of this community" that this man should be removed!'

To this shameful diplomacy between the mob and their victim, Mr. Lovejoy nobly replied that he was impelled to the course he had taken not by contempt for the feelings of the community, but by the fear of God, that he dared not abandon his sentiments or cease in all proper ways to propagate them, that he had neither desired nor asked any compromise, but simply the protection of his rights. "There are not two parties," said he, "between whom there can be a compromise. I plant myself on my unquestionable rights, and the question to be decided is, whether I shall be protected in the exercise and enjoyment of those rights—that is the question, Sir; whether my property shall be protected, whether I shall be suffered to go home to my family at night without being assailed, and threatened with tar and feathers and assassination; whether my afflicted wife, whose life has been in jeopardy, from continued alarm and excitement, shall night after night be driven from a sick bed into the garret to save her life from the brickbats and violence of the mobs; that, Sir, is the question.*"

To this solemn and affecting appeal what was the answer?—Here was the Mayor of the city—here were its wealthiest and most enlightened citizens—here were its physicians, lawyers, judges, and divines—what did they reply? Substantially this—and a minister was their mouth-piece!—"It is your duty as a Christian and a patriot to bow down and obey this mob which has taken your conscience in its keeping!" Not a syllable about protection!

The resolutions reported by the Committee had passed no censure in express terms against abolitionism;—the deficiency was supplied by the following resolution, offered by the Attorney General of the State:—

"Resolved, That the discussion of the doctrines of immediate abolitionism, as they have been discussed in the columns of the Alton Observer, would be destructive of the peace and harmony of the citizens of Alton, and that, therefore, we cannot recommend the re-establishment of that paper, or any other of a similar character, and conducted with a like spirit."

Another resolution, offered by JUDGE HAWLEY, shows that the

* Memoir of Lovejoy, page 280.

meeting did not wish to be held responsible for deeds about to be done, little as they were disposed to do to prevent them. It seems to disapprove of "unlawful violence," but by the striking out of the preamble, which referred expressly to the previous destruction of the press, we are left in doubt whether or not the meeting considered *such* violence unlawful. Such abstract disapprobation of the mob, coupled with the practical disapprobation of their victim, was as good as letters patent for murder and arson.

"Resolved, That whilst we decidedly disapprove of the doctrines, as put forth by the said Lovejoy, as subversive of the great principles of our Union, and of the prosperity of our young and growing city, we at the same time, as decidedly disapprove of all unlawful violence."

The closing resolution of this meeting, which can never be forgotten till American—nay, human Liberty is in her grave, was offered by the Mayor of Alton, as follows:—

"Resolved, That as citizens of Alton, and the friends of order, peace, and constitutional law, we regret that persons and editors from abroad have seen proper to interest themselves so conspicuously in the discussion and agitation of a question, in which our city is made the principal theatre."

No doubt these *professed* "friends of order, peace, and constitutional law," after supinely suffering, if they did not actually encourage, the repeated destruction of the press for the sake of opinion, and after having unsuccessfully attempted to put the padlock upon the lips of the advocate of liberty, *regretted* that persons from abroad should interest themselves in the *discussion* of the matter. They had reason. But why did they not think to regret that slaveholders should have first interested themselves to put down *discussion* in their city by brutal and lawless violence?

We must not omit one resolution reported by the Committee, which was rejected by the meeting. It was in the following words:—

"That we would not be understood as reflecting in the slightest degree upon the private character or motives of the late editor of the Alton Observer, by any thing contained in the foregoing resolutions."

What means the rejection of this resolution but that there were men in that meeting too wary to leave it on record that the man whom they left to the discipline of the mob, was not only in the exercise of his rights, but was of estimable character and unimpeachable motives? We are far from saying that a majority of this meeting desired the death of Lovejoy or the further destruction of his property. Had it been a mere matter of opinion on which he differed from them, they would have been ready to defend him at the hazard of their lives. But they had identified their interests with a system which is incapable of defence by

argument, and for which law provides no defence against argument. Hence if silence could not be had by persuasion or authority, it must be had by force. They acquiesced.

One of the members of the Committee was a true friend of freedom, and to his immortal honor he entered the following protest on its minutes :—

“W. S. Gilman, from the Committee, protested against so much of the report as is contained in the resolutions—alleging it as his opinion, that the rigid enforcement of the law would prove the only sure protection of the rights of citizens, and the only safe remedy for similar excitements in future.”

That the odds against the supporters of a free press were now fearfully great needs not be said. But they were not appalled. They strove to encourage the civil authorities to do their duty by volunteering themselves to stand in the deadly breach. For the protection which they demanded, they offered their full equivalent of peril. Whether their course was justifiable, or their preparations and acts judicious, are questions into which it is not important for us here to enter.

The fourth press to be destroyed in Alton arrived. It was safely stored under the superintendence of the Mayor in an extensive warehouse, on the morning of the 7th November. In the evening a crowd of persons assembled according to threats publicly proclaimed during the day. They were warned from the warehouse that the press would be defended under the authority of law, at the hazard of life. The warehouse was stormed with stones, pistols and muskets. When this mode of attack had proved fatal to one of their number, the assailants retreated for a while, but returned to their work with fire and ladder, threatening to burn the warehouse and its inmates. Among those of the defenders who sallied out to extinguish the flames kindling upon the roof, was the lamented Lovejoy, who was shot at by one of the ruffians from a place of concealment and deliberately murdered! To escape the devouring fire the rest of the defenders were obliged to abandon the building and were fired upon as they fled. The press was thrown into the Mississippi.

Among this ferocious band of felons, the Mayor, and other distinguished citizens, moved about, recognizing by the clear light of a full moon the features of men with missiles and guns in their hands, and distinguishing the voices of others, as they cheered on the crowd to the work of crime.

It may be supposed that the moral sense of Alton was now at last aroused; that riot, arson and murder in her streets had brought home to the consciences of all her citizens their obligation to reassert and maintain the dominion of law. But the system whose work they were doing, is the parent of deeper horrors than these, and its willing servants were destined to still

deeper disgrace. It was not enough that the dark outrage of the 7th of November should be permitted to take place and the perpetrators go unpunished, but justice must be mocked by the indictment and trial of the defenders of the press! Though standing on a right acknowledged by the common law, and acting with the express consent of the Mayor of the city, they were brought to the bar as felons under a charge of riot! "The Grand Jurors for the body of the city of Alton," &c., said the indictment, "upon their oaths present, that Enoch Long, Amos B. Roff, George H. Walworth, George H. Whitney, William H. Harned, John S. Noble, James Morse, junior, Henry Tanner, Royal Weller, Reuben Gerry, and Thaddeus B. Hurlburt, and Winthrop S. Gilman, all late of the city of Alton, &c., on the seventh day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven, with force and arms, &c., unlawfully, riotously, and wantonly, and in a violent and tumultuous manner resisted and opposed an attempt then and there being made TO BREAK UP AND DESTROY A PRINTING PRESS, then and there being found the goods and chattels of ——— contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the people of the State of Illinois!" Another count charged them with having unlawfully and riotously resisted an attempt "to force open and enter the storehouse." It is not to be wondered, that when a Grand Jury could be found to indict the *defenders*, a petit jury could not be found to convict the *assailants* of the press. The highest praise that can be awarded to Alton is, that she did not convict the innocent—and for this she is perhaps indebted to the tide of indignant rebuke which has set in upon her since the fatal 7th of November.

The blood of Lovejoy was not shed in vain. When we consider how deliberately and under what opposing force he took his position for the slave; how calmly, faithfully and unexceptionably he published the truth at the constant hazard of his life; how nobly amidst the cruel persecutions of a mob, and the still more trying provocations of the patrons of the mob, he bore the temper of the Christian, we feel that it was the wisdom of God that selected him for the first martyr to the cause of immediate emancipation, and the grace of God that prepared him to meet the trying hour. The voice of such a man, so dying, could not but be more eloquent from his grave. It has been heard, and it will not cease to be heard—pleading that the cause of the slave and the cause of law are and must for ever be inseparable.

Fearful as is the prostration of law as exemplified in the scenes of Alton, it should never be forgotten that the same thing has not only taken place in regard to two and a half millions of our countrymen, but has become a system. If they enjoy protection from

the law in any respect, it is rather as brutes than as men. Whatever protection the law theoretically affords to their human rights is nullified by the rejection of colored witnesses in all cases where whites are parties.

Those who have followed us through the foregoing pages, unless they have strong faith in God and in man, will be ready to exclaim with mingled indignation and despondency, it is all in vain, give over argument and let the wrath of God do its work.* What hope is there of convincing men who rave at all approach of reason? How can your Society ever succeed, while it relies only on arguments addressed to the reason and conscience?

Such objectors have been numerous from the outset. But they misapprehend the scope and power of our plan. It is true that the conviction of the mass of slaveholders by reason and argument, directly and exclusively applied to them, is a task utterly hopeless. So intelligent abolitionists have always regarded it. To apply arguments to the mass of slaveholders with any prospect of success, certain obstacles and shields must be removed out of the way—there must be a *regeneration of opinion in the rest of the world*. All this was embraced in the plan of our Society. The main application of truth first to be made, was to the minds of those least interested against it. Action upon the South was rather intended to draw forth facts, in relation to slavery, which should produce results elsewhere—the seed sown there was not expected to vegetate till the surrounding atmosphere should be made sufficiently warm. The great work lay, and yet lies, at the North. What has been thus far achieved is a demonstration that the free States can be, and probably will be, soon abolitionized—that a majority of the people of all sects and parties will hold and avow the sentiments professed by the Anti-Slavery Societies. The practical question which now arises is, *what effect will such a state of things have upon the slavery of the South?*

In reply to this question, it is not logical to affirm that the prevalence of abolitionism at the North, will only confirm the South in its present attitude. Men often cordially and sincerely embrace an opinion in its prevalence, which, in the infancy of its power, they utterly opposed and defied. It is not more paradoxical than true, that the increase of the cause in some cases lessens the effect, till, at a certain stage, the effects are reversed. We might, name opinions in politics and morals, which, when first broached, encountered or rather roused almost universal opposi-

* Reference is here made specially to a chapter of *cruelities, Lynching, and acts of kidnapping* which have occurred during the year, but which it was deemed best, on account of the length of the Report, to omit. The whole may be found in the Human Rights for July, headed "Chapter of Abominations."

tion. The supposed interests of society were against them. As they rose into notice, for a while the opposition increased, till it had risen to its height by the whole community being brought into the controversy. From that period, as the victorious sentiment worked its way, the opposition diminished till the two sides of the question played in even balance, and then, truth and argument having at length free access to the minds of men, it took lodgment in the convictions of those who had most opposed it from prejudice. The nature of slaveholders is human nature. Bring up sufficient counter-interests to those which now drive them to oppose abolitionism and they will listen to it as quietly and candidly as the men of the North. Our question, then, resolves itself into this, whether the prevalence of abolitionism at the North will present a sufficient counter-interest to that of slavery to give argument room to do its work.

It is proper before proceeding to answer this question to dispose of that common objection, which every day renders lighter, that the progress of abolitionism at the North will cause a dissolution of the Union. The interests of slavery even are against the objection. The threat of dissolution and dissolution itself are very different things. The one may serve to sustain slavery by repressing discussion at the North—at least in the opinion of slaveholders; the other can only bring it to a sudden and violent death. The slaveholders could not bear the contact of free Mexico; will they place on their northern border a people incalculably more free and powerful, disengaged even from the semblance of obligation to favor their peculiar institutions? Will they make the north bank of the Ohio as safe to their fugitives as the northern shore of Erie? Will they jump out of the frying pan of their present grievances into the very fire which heats it? If they become independent they must stand alone. England is finishing her work. France, Spain, Denmark, Holland, and even Brazil, are likely to follow. The slaveholding States must stand alone in their infamy. Is this the time for taking such a position? Where is their navy? Where their commerce? Where are the materials for either? The live oak they have, and the cotton bales, but the *men* necessary to convert them to the purposes of national wealth and power, have been turned into motiveless machines—nay, unmanageable and mischievous ones. Let the South dissolve the union, and, if she would be independent an hour, the first thing she must do will be to transmute them back to their *manhood*.

1. The first great interest which the abolitionized North will bring to bear upon the South is that which belongs to the power and patronage of the Federal Government. The North has a ma-

majority of the people, a majority of seats in the House of Representatives, and she can have a casting vote in the Senate, for she is abundantly able to appoint both President and Vice President. This power she ought to and will wield, in all constitutional ways, against the common foe of our country. Here a motive of immense power will be presented to the politicians of the South—and she is singularly prolific of politicians. Whatever may be said of the insufficiency of this power when exerted alone it cannot but be efficient in connexion with others. Let it not be said that the controversy will thus become a merely sectional one,—the whole North against the whole South. It should not be forgotten that a great part of the people of the South, in some States a majority, were born abolitionists when they were born slaves. These people never go to the polls, and perhaps they never will, but the moment government begins to sympathise with them they will have their representatives in Congress. They will then form too important an object in the political horoscope to be altogether neglected.

A dissolution of the Union being put out of the question, it is rather Quixotic for the South to expect to present an undivided and indivisible front to a Northern abolition majority. A portion of her statesmen must inevitably be brought at least to a state of candor and inquiry.

2. The ascendancy of abolitionism at the North will, for numerous reasons, decrease the value of slaves.

The slave labor system is notoriously unfavorable to the accumulation of capital. In the management of resources, every thing is sacrificed to present profit. The habit of despotic control generates one of free expenditure. The exceptions are generally of adventurers cradled in a free country, who resort to slaveholding as a means of accumulating fortunes to be expended in the land of their birth. Among those who have inherited large numbers of slaves, and expect to spend their days among them, it is apprehended there are very few who do not expend their profits as fast as they are made if not faster. But to keep up the value of slaves, it is necessary that employment should be found for them, increasing in the same geometrical ratio as the slaves themselves; and to give this employment, far more capital is required than to employ free labor. Whence is this capital to come? From the free states. But will it go from the free states, after slavery comes to be placed on a moral footing with *piracy*? Who will then accumulate a fortune by slavery, with a view to spend it at the North? Who will then vest his capital in southern lands, or slaves, or banks? The great stream of enterprise and capital which has heretofore flowed to the southern states from the

northern, and given value to men as beasts, will then be cut off. Should this not result from the aroused conscientiousness of the capitalists, it will from their apprehensions. Who will buy an estate, the *title* of which is generally considered to be worthless?

Again, though the general agitation of the question may fail to arouse the consciences of slaveholders, as to the validity of their title to the slaves as property, it cannot fail to do so in regard to brutal treatment. The same motive which calls forth from them the plea that their slaves are well fed and clothed, lightly worked and seldom flogged, will also induce them, when millions of eyes are upon them, and the very birds are ready to reveal the secrets of their plantations, to do something to make their statements true. Experience on this point, both general and particular, is confirmatory of our position. It is no doubt true, that the Anti-Slavery agitation may cause the slaves to be subjected to more rigid surveillance and some extra blows to be inflicted in paroxysms of spite; but it cannot but meliorate the general driving system, and consequently lessen its effectiveness and profit. Says the Hon. Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, in his "Essay on the management of slaves," "the only principle upon which any authority over them can be maintained is FEAR; and he who denies this has little knowledge of them." Now *fear* must be somewhat proportioned to the suffering inflicted, so that when the master lessens his blows it must be at the expense of his authority and profit. Kind masters must be thriftless ones till their kindness amounts substantially to a change of the system—the substitution of some other motive than the whip, and addressed to some other passion than *fear*. We have appealed to experience for the correctness of our reasoning. The following testimony is given in relation to the effect of discussion in England upon slaveholders in the West Indies, by gentlemen of the highest respectability, in Antigua and Barbadoes:

"The treatment of the slaves during the discussions in England, was manifestly milder than before."—*Dr. Daniell, Member of Council, &c., Antigua.*

"The effect of the proceedings in Parliament was to make the planters treat their slaves better. Milder laws were passed by the Assembly, and the general condition of the slave was greatly ameliorated."—*H. Armstrong, Esq. of Fitch's Creek Estate, Antigua.*

"The planters did not increase the rigor of their discipline because of the anti-slavery discussions; but as a general thing were more lenient than formerly."—*S. Bourne, Esq., of Miller's Estate, Antigua.*

"We pursued a much milder policy toward our slaves after the agitation began in England. Some estates began gradually to disuse the whip. For a year before emancipation, the whip was not used more than twice on the two estates under my management."—*Jas. Howeli, Esq., of T. Jarvis's, Antigua.*

"The planters did not treat their slaves worse on account of the discussions; but were more lenient and *circumspect*."

Letter of Hon. N. Nugent, Antigua.

"There was far less cruelty exercised by the planters during the Anti-Slavery excitement in England. They were always on their guard to escape the notice

of the abolitionists. *They did not wish to have their names published abroad, and to be exposed as monsters of cruelty!*"—David Cranston, *Etc. Civil Magistrate and Manager, Antigua.*

On one other point the Archdeacon (of Barbadoes) expressed himself substantially thus: The planters undoubtedly treated their slaves better during the Anti-Slavery discussions in England. They knew they were closely watched, and that every act of cruelty would be reported, and would hasten the day which they wished to put far away. The condition of the slaves was very much mitigated by the efforts which were made for their entire freedom. The planters softened down the system of slavery as much as possible. *They were exceedingly anxious to put a stop to discussion and investigation.**

Some of this testimony is the stronger from being of the nature of confession—the whole of it was given at a time when no object was to be gained by a departure from historical truth.

Now it is conceded, as a general fact, that the better slaves are treated, the less contented they are with the lot of perpetual slavery, and of course the less profitable, unless encouraged with the hope of freedom. If abolitionism should continue to increase at the North, we hold it certain that the slavholders of our country will be driven to follow the example of those of the West Indies in regard to treatment, and in doing so, will produce a strong interest in favor of Emancipation.

The value of the slaves will be diminished, again, by the interest they themselves will take in the discussion.† The knowledge that a portion of the whites are laboring to procure their freedom has already reached many of the slaves in the most distant States. But when the mass of the northern people become abolitionists, this knowledge will proceed further and faster. In spite of all precautions the slaves will become acquainted with what so deeply interests them, and so far as they do, self respect will be regenerated,—an excellent and profitable sentiment for a *free laborer*, but ruinous to the *slave*. Not that a knowledge of what is doing for them would excite to insurrection, for the very reverse is the fact, but it would stimulate them to claim justice. Insurrection is so hopeless that it is never resorted to but in the

* See "*Emancipation in the West Indies*," pp. 206, 207, 218.

† A curious instance of the effect of mental illumination upon the *peace* of slavery and the *value* of slaves is furnished in the following *literal* extract of a letter from a man at the South to whose sister a gentleman of this city had sent the *Narrative of Charles Ball and Archy Moore*.

"do you Remember the 2 Books you sent out to my sister by me. My 2 Black boys Wm and Jim who lived better & Easier than I did *Read them* & in consequence *Run off* and after 11 Days *Reiding* and 267\$ cost got them & now their places is made wretched by their own conduct as I sold them (Loosing near 900\$ in price) to a *Trader*. Thus it is, my friend, in almost every instance *they* are not half the slaves you and I are. *they* are 19 times cut 20 better off than their masters and if left alone could be christianized & live happy—I hope the sad consequences every where growing out of this subject may be allayed & this momentous subject left to the Lords time and direction to be remedied therefore yr kind present of Books has done a woefull injury to me and my before good boys & to my own purse."

absence of all other prospects of freedom. If a ray of hope penetrates their gloom, though the chink through which it passes be never so small, it will banish all thought of insurrection while it shines. It was the testimony of the planters of Jamaica before the British Parliament that their slaves became acquainted with all that passed in respect to them in the mother country, and were thereby too much excited to fill the places of slaves with slavish patience. Though while hope of relief from some quarter holds out, the slaves will abstain from rebellion, it is not to be expected they would continue to do so if this hope should fade away. Once let them come to an understanding of their rights, and sooner or later the masters will be brought to the alternative of giving them, or suffering them to be taken. To communicate to the slave the information that he is considered a brother and an equal—that he is unjustly held in bondage—and that thousands are laboring for his release, does not excite him to rise against the life of his master, but the refusal of the master to yield justice, it is true, may do so. Who is responsible in such a case? He who has restored the self-respect of a man where it was wanting, or he who has attempted to crush it after it had been restored? Though our business is with the master—though it is for him and his political equals we print and lecture—yet we have never pledged ourselves to prevent, what it is impossible should be prevented, the slaves from getting knowledge of the fact that we are printing and lecturing. So far as our doctrines reach the slaves they do so coupled with an entreaty that they would reject all other than peaceful means for the recovery of their rights. After our operations have, for a fair probationary space, displaced all thoughts of insurrection by a better hope of deliverance, if the masters disappoint that hope the consequences must be upon their own heads—as indeed they must be in any case, for there never was a moment at which emancipation would not have rendered insurrection a moral impossibility.

The sympathy of the North will not only increase the desire of the slaves to escape to the free States, but it will render it more difficult to recover them. The bearing of this upon the value of "*slave property*" is too obvious to need elucidation. We shall only occupy a moment in attempting to show why the facts *ought* to be, and hence *will* be as we have anticipated.

By all humane and civilized nations it has been recognized as a right and a duty to protect fugitives from oppression. We are not aware that any nation not licensing slavery to its own citizens, has so far extended its comity as to allow the citizens of other nations to exercise slaveholding power within its territory. When a slave touches the shores of England or France, or even of *any* European State, he becomes free. The highest court of

one of our own slave States, Louisiana, has ever decided that a person cannot be held a slave in that State who has once been made free by being carried to France.*

The Divinely sanctioned code of the Hebrews, the great fountain of those wise and beneficent principles which are the glory of our own free government, contains the following explicit provision: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him."—DEUT. xxiii., 15, 16. Yet the following provision of the Constitution of the United States, though slaves are not mentioned in it, and if strictly construed it could not apply to them, was unquestionably intended to bind each State to permit the citizens of other States to exercise within its limits slaveholding power for the recovery of fugitive slaves. "*No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.*" It is obvious to remark, in the first place, that the intentions of the framers, whatever by historical evidence we may ascertain them to have been, cannot bind us to an interpretation of the Constitution which its own language does not render necessary, and which is inconsistent with objects for which it was professedly framed, to wit, "to establish justice" and "to secure the blessings of liberty." But we go further. We contend that when the Constitution was framed it was the understanding of all parties that slavery was soon to be abolished by the States, and the clause intended to facilitate the recovery of fugitive slaves was a mere *temporary* concession, to expire with the unhallowed anomaly which called for it. If such be the case, it needs hardly be said that the slave States, after having violated on their part "that good faith which was implied" in the compact, have no right to urge its fulfilment, beyond the letter, on the other part.

That the concession was made on the part of the States opposed to slavery, on the supposition that it would be of but temporary continuance is indicated,

1. *By the language of the clause in question.* Not only is there a careful avoidance of the word slave, but *laws* and *regulations* are anticipated in the States, which would forbid the restoration of fugitives. No person shall "in consequence of any law or regulation" in any State be "discharged," &c. This is very singular language, and unaccountable except on the expectation that

* *Marie Louise v. Mariol et. al.*—8 Louisiana Rep. 475.

States would pass laws utterly excluding slavery and slaveholding power from their limits. Is such an expectation reconcilable with the other expectation or belief that slavery would be perpetual in some of the States, and would for its perpetuity require the perpetual concession of one of the most precious attributes of a Sovereign State?

2. *By the recent concessions of the advocates of perpetual slavery.* Mr. Calhoun deploras it as an almost fatal mistake of the slaveholders, that till the recent agitation they have almost to a man conceded that slavery was an evil and have lamented its continuance. He almost forgives the abolitionists for having awaked a discussion which has satisfied the South that slavery is a blessing. Well, then, according to the showing of Mr. Calhoun, till recently, slavery has universally been admitted to be an evil. But how could the framers of the Constitution, fresh from the triumph over other enormous evils, and kindled with the desire of establishing a faultless republic, have taken it for granted that this evil would be perpetual?

3. *By historical evidence.*

Sayc Jefferson in his notes on Virginia, written before the close of the Revolutionary war,

"I think a change already perceptible since the origin of the present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave is rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, *the way I hope preparing under the auspices of heaven, FOR A TOTAL EMANCIPATION*, and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation."

Two of the most distinguished framers of the Constitution, *Benjamin Franklin* and *Alexander Hamilton*, were at the time, or had been, presidents of societies for the abolition of slavery. Many of the most prominent statesmen of the time were then, or soon after, officers or members of such societies.

A great measure was commenced by the old Congress and completed at the first session of the new, which clearly illustrates the policy and expectations, in regard to slavery, which prevailed at the adoption of the Constitution, we give it in the words of an able writer in the *National Intelligencer* for the present year.

In March 1784, Virginia ceded to the United States the territory northwest of the river Ohio, and stipulated that the citizens thereof should "have their possessions and titles confirmed to them, and be protected in the enjoyment of their rights and liberties." Soon after the cession was made, Congress referred the subject to a committee, consisting of Jefferson, of Virginia, Chase, of Maryland, and Howell, of Rhode Island. This committee reported an ordinance or fundamental law for the government of the Territory, and of the States to be formed out of it; one provision of which was, "That after the year 1800 of the christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been convicted to have been personally guilty." A motion was made to strike out this

clause: "And on the question, shall the words moved to be struck out stand? the yeas and nays being required by Mr. Howell,

New Hampshire:	Mr. Foster, ay.	} ay.	Pennsylvania	Mr. Mifflin, ay.	} ay.
	Blaichard, ay.			Montgomery, ay.	
Massachusetts:	Mr. Gerry, ay.	} ay.	Maryland:	Mr. McHenry, no.	} no.
	Patridge, ay.			Stone, no.	
Rhode Island:	Mr. Ellery, ay.	} ay.	Virginia:	Mr. Jefferson, ay.	} no.
	Howell, ay.			Hardy, no.	
Connecticut:	Mr. Sherman, ay.	} ay.	North Carolina:	Mr. Spaight, no.	} div.
	Wadsworth, ay.			Mercer, no.	
New-York:	Mr. De Witt, ay.	} ay.	South Carolina:	Mr. Reade, no. no.	} no.
	Paine, ay.			Beresford, no.	
New Jersey:	Mr. Dick ay. (1.)				

So the question was lost, and the words were struck out." (2.)

"March 16, 1785, a motion was made by Mr. King, and seconded by Mr. Ellery, that the following proposition be committed:

"That there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States described in the resolve of Congress of the 23d of April, 1784, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been personally guilty; and that this regulation shall be an article of compact, and remain a fundamental principle of the Constitutions between the thirteen original States, and each of the States described in the said resolve of the 23d April, 1784."

On the question of commitment, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, voted in the affirmative; Virginia, (3.) North Carolina, and South Carolina, in the negative. So it was resolved in the affirmative.

On the 7th of July, 1786, Congress resolved that the stipulation, contained in the cession of Virginia, respecting the division into separate States of the territory northwest of the Ohio river, would be attended with great inconvenience, and recommended Virginia to revise and alter the terms of cession, which was afterwards done.

Sept. 29, 1786, Congress took into consideration an ordinance for the government of the Western Territory, reported by a committee consisting of Johnson, of Connecticut, Pinkney, of South Carolina, Smith, of New York, Dane, of Massachusetts, and McHenry, of Maryland; and after considering it from time to time, it was recommitted to a committee consisting of Carrington and R. H. Lee, of Virginia, Dane, of Massachusetts, Kean, of South Carolina, and Smith, of New York, whose report was read the first time, July 11, 1787. This ordinance is similar, in its leading and fundamental provisions, to that reported in 1784 by the committee of which Mr. Jefferson (4.) was chairman, and like that contained a prohibition of slavery in the following words: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." On the 13th of July, 1787, this ordinance was adopted by Congress, with the concurrence not only of every State, but every individual member of every State present, except one, Mr. Yates, of New York.

The following testimony collected from the State Conventions which adopted the constitution, is quoted from the admirable pamphlet "On the power of Congress over the District of Columbia," to which we have already referred:

(1) To entitle a State to a vote, she must have at least two members present.
 (2) Seven or a majority of the whole number of States, (13) were wanted to carry the question.

(3) Grayson voted in the affirmative; Hardy and Lee in the negative.

(4) To Mr. Jefferson is therefore justly due the credit of the ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory, and not Mr. Dane, as claimed for him by his New England friends.

In the debates in the North Carolina Convention, Mr. Iredell, afterward a Judge of the United States' Supreme Court, said, "*When the entire abolition of slavery takes place, it will be an event which must be pleasing to every generous mind and every friend of human nature.*" Mr. Galloway said, "I wish to see this abominable trade put an end to. I apprehend the clause (touching the slave trade) means to bring forward unanimity." Luther Martin, of Maryland, a member of the convention that formed the United States' Constitution, said, "We ought to authorize the General Government to make such regulations as shall be thought most advantageous for *gradual abolition of slavery, and the emancipation of the slaves which are already in the States.*" Judge Wilson, of Pennsylvania, one of the framers of the Constitution, said, in the Pennsylvania convention of '87, Deb. Pa. Con. p. 303, 156: "I consider this (the clause relative to the slave trade) as laying the foundation for *banishing slavery out of this country.* It will produce the same kind of gradual change which was produced in Pennsylvania; the new States which are to be formed will be under the control of Congress in this particular, and *slaves will never be introduced* among them. It presents us with the pleasing prospect that the rights of mankind will be acknowledged and established *throughout the Union.* Yet the lapse of a few years, and Congress will have power to *exterminate slavery* within our borders." In the Virginia convention of '87, Mr. Mason author of the Virginia constitution, said, "The augmentation of slaves weakens the States, and such a trade is *diabolical* in itself, and disgraceful to mankind. As much as I value a union of all the States, I would not admit the southern States, (i. e. South Carolina and Georgia,) into the Union, *unless they agree to a discontinuance of this disgraceful trade.*" Mr. Tyler opposed with great power the clause prohibiting the abolition of the slave trade till 1808, and said, "My earnest desire is, that it shall be handed down to posterity that I oppose this wicked clause." Mr. Johnson said, "The principle of emancipation *has begun since the revolution. Let us do what we will, it will come round.*" [Deb. V. Con. p. 463.] Patrick Henry, arguing the power of Congress under the United States' Constitution to abolish slavery in the States, said, in the same convention, "Another thing will contribute to bring this event (the abolition of slavery) about. Slavery is *detested.* We feel its fatal effects: we deplore it with all the pity of humanity."—[*Deb. Va. Con. p. 431.*] In the Mass. Con. of '88, Judge Dawes said, "Although slavery is not smitten by an apoplexy, yet it *has received a mortal wound, and will die of consumption.*"—(*Deb. Mass. Con. p. 60.*) General Heath said that "Slavery was confined to the States *now existing, it could not be extended.* By their ordinance, Congress had declared that the new States should be republican States, *and have no slavery.*"—p. 147.

From this overwhelming array of both positive and negative evidence, we have a right to infer that the clause of the constitution in question, so far as it was intended to bind the States to restore fugitive slaves, was based on the understanding, or implied faith, *that slavery was not to be permanent, and otherwise would not have been adopted.* Hence the true intention of the framers in the present attitude of the subject, must be that the clause should be construed strictly according to the grammatical use of its terms and in consonance with the object and spirit of the Constitution—that it should be construed as it would be if slavery were abolished in all the States.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the slave states have violated the conditions on which they obtained the aid of the free states in the recapture of their fugitives. Instead of bringing slavery to an end, and relieving the republic of the disgrace and curse of it, they have proceeded to fortify it even by the enactment of laws, excluding from their territories the free citizens of

of other states in direct violation of the first clause of the very section under which they claim the aid of the free states in the recovery of their fugitives.* The free states will not probably in

*The Southern commercial ports have hit upon a very ingenious expedient for excluding foreign colored seamen. They do it under the *United States' law against the slave trade!* As some of the European nations are sincerely hostile to that traffic, they submit with a good grace to have their vessels seized on account of a colored steward, and after escaping with difficulty, with great admiration of the faithfulness with which we execute our humane laws, they will take care to ship for American ports only people of the right complexion. We have a case in point. The French ship *Le Vaillant*, a regular trader from Bordeaux to New Orleans, consigned to P. O. Sorbè & Co. of the latter place, had on board, in the spring of 1837, a mulatto stewardess, who it was feared by the vigilant authorities might cause discontent among the enslaved population. The ship was seized as a slave trader! The consignees were able to prove satisfactorily that the girl was brought without the intention of selling or holding her as a slave, and from a country whose soil had been acknowledged, even by Louisiana judges, to give everlasting liberty to all who touch it; the case ended in a remission from the *Secretary of the Treasury*. Thus far the proceeding would seem to have been less apropos to its purpose than the confinement of the dangerous kitchen-maid in the "calaboose," under the municipal law. But mark the result. The advocate of the consignees puts in the hands of the French captain a copy of the law under which his vessel had been seized. He transports it to France and hands it over to the functionaries of his government. Presently we find in the French journals the following caution for the benefit of French commerce—in which the nationally illegal and paltry enactments of our Southern States are confounded with the humane Act of Congress against the slave trade! We quote from the *Journal du Havre* of Dec. 17, 1837.

"The Minister of the Marine to the Maritime Prefect at Cherbourg.

"PARIS, 7th December, 1837.

"Monsieur the Prefect—

"By a circular dated 29th April, 1830, one of my predecessors informed you, for the benefit of commerce, that a law of the State of Georgia prohibited, under rigorous penalties, any captain, whether of a national or foreign vessel, to enter the ports of that State, having on board people of color (mulattoes or negroes) either as sailors, domestics or passengers.

"The department of the Marine has recently had occasion to learn (*s'assurer*) that this prohibition was only the application of a general one of the same nature, pronounced in regard to all the ports of the Union, by an Act of Congress of the 20th April, 1818, of which I send you the subjoined copy.

"Some captains of French vessels, bound to New Orleans, having recently contravened this prohibition, have with great difficulty escaped the application of the penalty and confiscation which they had incurred.

"It has therefore seemed important to remind owners and captains of the rigorous legislation in force, upon this subject, in the United States, and I pray you to give orders to this effect to the commanding officers and commissioners of naval enrolment in the arrondissement of Cherbourg, charging these officers to give the necessary cautions to the Chambers of Commerce, and to renew these cautions, from time to time, to the captains of vessels which shall be destined to the United States.

Receive, &c.

Signed, ROSAMEL.

A Copy.

The Rear-Admiral Maritime Prefect.

Signed, J. MARTINENG.

A true Copy.

The Commissary General of the Marine.

DEMOIS."

return, enact laws by which every person held to service by the laws of another state escaping into their territory shall be discharged from such service, but they ought to and will claim the right to take it for granted that the laws of other states are *just laws* and not the rules of a piratical horde; and as *just laws* hold no person to service or labor except by fair contract, or by the judgment of a court, in the case, they will require the claimant to bring forward the evidence of contract or the judgment of the court, and in default of such evidence, they will discharge the prisoner. Moreover in some of the states the laws sustaining or permitting slavery are plainly unconstitutional.

The constitution of Maryland declares "that the inhabitants of Maryland are entitled to the *common law of England*." Now it is fully established that the common law of England frees every slave that sets foot on the shores of that country. More than one hundred years ago, in the case of *Gallway vs. Caddee*, before Baron Thompson, at Guildhall, the slave was judged to be free "*from his first setting foot on English ground*."* Again in the celebrated case of *James Somerset*, decided by Lord Mansfield, on the 22d June, 1772, the same doctrine was so authoritatively settled that it has not since been called in question. This was

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"*Extract from the Act of Congress of 20th April, 1818.*

'FIRST SECTION.

'From and after the passing of this act, it shall not be lawful to import or bring, in any manner whatsoever, into the United States or territories thereof, from any foreign kingdom, place, or country, any negro, mulatto, or person of color, with intent to hold, sell, or dispose of any such negro, mulatto, or person of color, as a slave, or to be held to service or labor; and any ship, vessel, or other water craft, employed in any importation as aforesaid, shall be liable to seizure, prosecution, and forfeiture, in any district in which it may be found; one half thereof to the use of the United States, and the other half to the use of him or them who shall prosecute the same to effect.

'EIGHTH SECTION.

'In all prosecutions under this act, the defendant or defendants shall be bound to prove that the negro, mulatto, or person of color, which he or they shall be charged with having brought into the United States, or with purchasing, holding, selling, or otherwise disposing of, and which, according to the evidence in such case, the said defendant or defendants shall have brought in aforesaid, or otherwise disposed of, was brought into the United States at least five years previous to the commencement of such prosecution, or was not brought in, held, purchased, or otherwise disposed of, contrary to the provisions of this act; and in failure thereof, the said defendant or defendants shall be adjudged guilty of the offence of which he or they may stand accused.'

"A faithful translation of the two Sections of the Act of Congress by virtue of which the ship *Vaillant* was seized.

Transmitted to Captain Ferris, &c.

Signed, AL. SERVANT GRANGEAC."

* See Stuart's Life of Granville Sharp, p. 25.

four years previous to the adoption of the constitution of Maryland.

In the constitution of Virginia, there exists a declaration of rights of equal force with that contained in the constitution of Massachusetts. We give them side by side.

VIRGINIA.

"All men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

MASSACHUSETTS.

"All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned, the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

Now the constitution of Massachusetts, by virtue of the above cited article, was held by its courts to have abolished slavery, and since 1780, it has not existed in that commonwealth. Hence if the doctrine of the Massachusetts courts was sound, slavery is at this moment unconstitutional in Virginia. But unconstitutional law is no law. When a person is claimed, before an upright magistrate who believes in the Massachusetts doctrine, as the slave of a citizen of Virginia, he must necessarily be released.—The claimant can bring no law of Virginia which will not be set aside by its own supreme law. The citizens of Virginia and Maryland have no right by their own constitutions, to hold slaves in their own territory, much less to recover them from other states.* So much for the two principal border states, whatever may be said of the clause in the Constitution of the United States in regard to fugitives.

But to return to the clause; not only does it allow the states to require such proof of *contract* binding to service or labor, as is never pretended in the case of slaves, but it leaves to, or rather does not take from the states the right to protect their own citizens by subjecting the claim of the slave-captor to the adjudication of their regular courts of law, giving the alleged fugitive the full benefit of the trial by jury. The opinion is not without the countenance of high authority, that Congress has not the power to legislate on the subject of the recapture of fugitives.† And we

* What right then have they to impose slavery upon the national domain in the District of Columbia?

† See opinion of Chancellor Walworth, of New-York, in the case of *Jack vs. Martin*, 14 Wendell, 525. It is said that Chief Justice Hornblower, of New Jersey, intimated the same opinion in the case of *Nathan Himesley vs. Haywood*, but we have seen no report of the case. The same doctrine has been sanctioned by the legislature of Massachusetts in adopting the report of a committee and passing an act in favor of a *jury trial*. The doctrine has also been ably advocated by Hon. Francis James, in the Senate of Pennsylvania, and by Salmon P. Chase, Esq. of Ohio.

have the pleasure to refer to the able argument of Salmon P. Chase, Esq., in the recent case of *James G. Birney vs. the state of Ohio*, already referred to, to show that the free states themselves have no power to pass laws for the protection of property in human flesh. The Constitution of the United States binds them to no active interference in behalf of the slave-captor—it simply prohibits them from passing any law or regulation which shall discharge any individual from an obligation to service or labor incurred under the laws of other states, and obliges them to deliver up—that is, to interpose no obstacle to the power of the slave-captor after he shall have established his claim, of which their courts must necessarily judge. More than this the rights of their own citizens and their own constitutions forbid them to do. The right which the slaveholder enjoys under the Constitution, is to arrest the person owing him service or labor according to the laws of his state, and take him back to the place from which he escaped by what means he can. No state can interpose any obstacle to his proceeding any farther than to examine the validity of his claim, and if it appears on due investigation to be sustained by any legislation of his own state which deserves to be called law, the prisoner must be simply left to his will. If slaveholders are not satisfied with this, it is their own fault or that of their fathers. It was all that they could get into the bond. It is more than they ever would have got in, but for their constant, solemn, and universal professions that they regarded slavery as an evil and would get rid of it as soon as it could be done safely. WITH THEIR FEET ON OUR SACRED RIGHT OF PETITION, DO THEY DEMAND OF US TO FULFIL, BEYOND THE LETTER, A PROMISE OF WHICH THEY HAVE VIOLATED THE CONDITIONS ?

By such considerations as these, we believe the free states are yet to become a refuge for the oppressed. There is no doing evil here that good may come—it is simply a return to the fountain of humanity and justice from an overstrained, inhuman, and unjust interpretation of the Constitution. Let moral power achieve this triumph, and what will become of the value of slaves on the border? How long before that border will be removed southward? And where will it stop?

If we are not mistaken in believing that the abolitionized North will thus present counter-interests sufficient to neutralize the supposed advantages of slavery, we may proceed to remark that the arguments which we would present, will flow through channels which cannot be interrupted, and which will with certainty carry them to the mind of every slaveholder. The two great questions which lie within the constitutional control of Congress, the Abolition in the District of Columbia, and of the inter-state slave trade, cannot be smothered. There is but one way to silence discus-

sion. Infinitely wiser would it be for the South, if she wishes to avoid discussion and perpetuate her now cherished system of oppression to concede both of these points instantly. The discussion of these two subjects will make Congress the channel through which the healing truths of immediatism will flow to the deliverance of the masters from prejudice, and the slaves from chains. This is all that our cause requires. Were it left to our option to clothe Congress with peremptory power to abolish slavery in the several states, in time of peace, by a sovereign act, we should have strong motives to abstain from doing it. As a practical matter, the abolition of the inter-state slave trade by act of Congress, is within the bounds of probable feasibility. The power in Congress requisite to pass such an act, could not fail to secure for it a degree of popular support at the points where it would have to be carried into effect. A large portion of the southern population are not so directly interested as in slavery. With multitudes, the character of the slave trader is truly odious. And if the measure were carried at a time when the business was dull, and humanity not overwhelmed by excessive temptation, we may well suppose that there might be sufficient foundation in popular sentiment at the South for its execution to rest upon.* But with slavery itself it must be otherwise. It is a matter belonging to each state by itself, pertaining to her entire population, and requiring for its regulation or extirpation, the comprehensive, minutely divided and every where present local machinery of the state governments. The general government would be as inefficient in such a matter, as a harrow with a single tooth. It would have to be remodelled—it would have to take all the teeth out of the state's harrow. And this it could not do a moment sooner than the implement might be used by the state itself.

It is sometimes said to us, if Congress had the same power over slavery in the States, which the British Parliament had over slavery in its colonies, there would be wisdom in the plan of the Anti-Slavery Societies. We reply that the authority which the British Parliament actually exerted, did not, in reality, proceed to abolition. It scarcely presented a stronger motive to the planters to relinquish their slaves than could be presented by the abolitionized North to our own slaveholders, in the way we have described; yet in two colonies, Antigua and Bermuda, the slaves were set free by their masters. They did it because they disco-

* The very nature of the inter-state slavetrade requires that its abolition should not be left to the states themselves. It is not the concern of any one state, nor of two, but of all. One state could not retire from partnership in it, without inconveniences which would not appertain to a general abolition. But the slave states have no Congress in which they can settle matters of common interest, nor does the constitution allow them to have one.

vered it to be the best policy. Whereas it remains yet to be seen: whether the obstinate planters of Jamaica will not find means to defeat any abolition act which the Mother Country may see fit to pass. They will no doubt attempt to do so if they can make something by it out of their oppressed bondsmen. The moment they see that present interest has turned to the side of freedom they will relent. Were their island, in the present state of their abused apprentices and of British sympathy, to be towed into the British Channel, and moored along side the cliffs of Dover, they would hardly wait for an act of Parliament to proclaim entire freedom. The disadvantage of the distance of Britain from her colonies more than counterbalances her superior power. Let the moral energy of the North be once aroused and put in full motion, and it will bear down upon the wills of slaveholders with more effect than a hundred Acts of Parliament, backed by armed legions.

That the Southern States begin to be affected by the present success of abolitionism at the North, there are numerous indications. Though the complete ascendancy of Lynch law in the slave States makes it dangerous for any man to avow sentiments which seem to have any resemblance to abolitionism, yet a Convention for revising the Constitution of Kentucky is advocated by many in that State, on the ground that it will provide for the gradual abolition of slavery, and opposed by others lest it should *perpetuate slavery*. In discussions on this subject before the public it has been asserted that unless Kentucky abolishes slavery she will soon be forsaken by her best citizens.

In the mountains of Eastern Tennessee the light of free discussion is kindling up, and the full doctrines of immediatism are openly advocated against both slavery and colonization.

A Committee constituted by, and representing the slaveholding delegation in Congress, by one of its members (Hon. F. H. Elmore, of S. Carolina) have thought proper, in the most courteous terms, to seek of this Committee a full exposition of the plans and measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Such an exposition has been frankly accorded and will probably in due time be spread before the public.

That the South is by no means so united and confident as her champions profess her to be, is betrayed in a variety of ways that cannot have escaped the attentive observer or the diligent reader of our periodicals. A striking instance of this is all we have room for. In the course of a debate in the Legislature of Mississippi on a resolution instructing its Senators in Congress in relation to their course on the exciting subject, a member, (Mr. Jenkins) remarked :—

“Let our FEARS be as great as they may; let our abhorrence of their hellish

doctrines be as strong as imagination can conceive, *let us suppress our fears*: let us not afford them (the abolitionists) the triumph of knowing that we consider that they have any probability of success—let our course be one of silence and determination. Sir, let us not notice the visionary projects of these enthusiasts of the North, or at least, *not appear to notice them!*—*Natchez Courier, Feb. 9.*

It would ill become us to bring this report to a close without advertng to the important events in relation to our cause which have occurred in foreign countries. Every year strengthens the probability that ours will soon be the only slaveholding nation in the world. The noble example of England is beginning to take effect upon the other European governments that have slave colonies. France, especially, has been deeply moved and is evidently on the eve of giving liberty to her 260,000 colonial slaves. The colored slaveholders of her principal colonies, Martinique and Guadaloupe, who hold about one eighth of the slaves in those islands, have spontaneously consented to emancipation. The Chamber of Deputies has manifested a determination to enter thoroughly into the discussion of the subject, and the ministry only ask time to procure more accurate information, and to see the results of the British experiment,—and the winding up of this experiment cannot but be such as to favor the speediest action.

In regard to British emancipation, the year has furnished the most striking evidence of the wisdom of immediate and the folly of *gradual* emancipation. The free-labor system of Antigua and Bermuda, has worked, as free labor every where does, to the highest profit of all parties. The apprenticeship is operating as any thing else than a *preparation for freedom*—a preparation now generally conceded to be needless. It has taken the whip from the master and put it in the hands of a magistrate, who too often becomes but the tool of the master. Thus it is tearing away the strongest hold society has upon the nascent freeman, his respect for law. To this effect it has been abused in a great part of Jamaica and in numerous instances in the other colonies. The masters who had the disposition to tyrannize, unhappily a large proportion, have made the apprenticeship but another name for slavery. The worst atrocities of the old system have been re-enacted under it. But the philanthropists of Britain have not been asleep. The apprenticeship was not a plan of theirs. They have rallied to rescue from its curse, those to whom, with the hope of freedom, it brought a more intolerable bondage than slavery itself.* The investigations made by Mr. Sturge and his

* One would think that in a country where the people universally profess to deplore slavery and wish for its abolition as soon as it can take place safely—as is true of the northern States,—every thing pertaining to the West India experiment would be of the highest interest, and could not fail to be widely published. But it is far otherwise. Nothing is published in favor of the negro, and when it is proved that the masters have in many cases made their lot worse than it was, the Eman-

colleagues in the West Indies, brought to light facts which aroused the united kingdom. The government was obliged to inquire whether the abuses were as represented. They turned out to be even worse. Under the eloquence of our devoted friend George Thompson, who has not slackened in his career, the resolution of the *people* has become every day stronger that the apprenticeship shall not exist after Aug. 1st, 1838. Innumerable meetings, and many of them of unprecedented magnitude, have been held in order to bring the subject effectually before Parliament. Lord Brougham with a zeal and ability worthy of his best fame, has advocated the measure before the people and before the House of Lords. The Marquis of Sligo, late Governor of Jamaica, himself a holder of apprentices, has avowed his change of opinion in regard to the apprenticeship, and his determination to set his own free on the 1st of August, 1838. In the first division on the subject in the House of Commons, the motion to abolish on the 1st of August, 1838, was lost by a vote of 250 to 200. We mistake the force of public sentiment in the British isles if the ministry do not find reason to change their position and relinquish the absurd system which they palmed upon the benevolence and generosity of the British people instead of the freedom for which they paid their 20,000,000*l.*

It is with great pleasure that we recur to the prospects of the Haytien Republic. For thirty years that interesting people have struggled for national existence under the most discouraging circumstances. Rising from the ashes of the cities and the carnage of the battle-fields where they had met the fearful power of Napoleon Bonaparte, they were welcomed by no sympathy among the nations. Their arts of peace were checked by the necessity of maintaining a large military force against constantly threatened invasion, and it was a part of their very Constitution that in case of such invasion, the remaining cities on their coasts should disappear in flames and the inhabitants should betake themselves to the mountains. It was not till 1825 that the government succeeded in obtaining from France a partial recognition of independence by promising to pay to the old colonists who had been driven from the island for their tyranny, the exorbitant indemnity of 150,000,000 francs. But to burden the industry of the country with an engagement so onerous in amount and unjust in

ception Act is pronounced a failure! Witness the following from the N. Y. Com. Advertiser.

"Lord Brougham made a tremendous speech on the slave trade, in the House of Lords, on the 29th of January. His Lordship admitted that the Emancipation Act was a failure."

character, was to paralyze it. The government with its best efforts succeeded in paying only one fifth part of the indemnity,* and for its non-fulfilment of the contract has been constantly threatened by the French navy. Under these discouraging circumstances, and without the countenance of a single foreign country, is it to be wondered that the prosperity of Hayti should be slow in rising from the dust? At last the chief cause of depression has been removed by a treaty concluded at Port au Prince, on the 12th of February, 1838, wherein France unqualifiedly acknowledges the freedom, *sovereignty*, and independence of Hayti. By another treaty the indemnity is reduced one half, and made payable in annual instalments for twenty years.

In conclusion the committee would enumerate some of the measures which call for renewed and increased exertions the coming year.

1. *The more general circulation of Anti-Slavery publications.* Permanent and effectual excitement must be based upon a thorough study of the cause. Such documents as "Emancipation in the West Indies," "The Power of Congress over the District of Columbia," "The Bible Argument," &c., should be multiplied by the hundred thousand. And here the committee cannot but commend the system of Anti-Slavery libraries originated and carried into successful operation by the New-York State Society. Every village which is supplied with a well selected library of Anti-Slavery publications may be counted as thoroughly and permanently abolitionized. To facilitate the formation of such libraries, the committee has already made arrangements to issue a series of small volumes which shall embrace, within moderate size and price, the most important facts and arguments which are to be found in our numerous publications.

2. *The extension of our organization by Societies and Conventions.* We might quote the authority of slaveholders themselves to the position that no great evil can be overcome without AGITATION. Let us not be weary of well doing.

3. *The right use of suffrage.* The course of political men in times past gives every abolitionist not only the best right but the strongest reason to inquire the sentiments, on the question of slavery, of every candidate for his suffrage. As honest and determined men abolitionists will not fail seasonably to exercise this right. And he is not worthy the name of an abolitionist who does not put the Anti-Slavery qualification above any and all others

*The statement in the last report, on the authority of a French publication, that the whole had been paid, is a mistake which probably arose from the fact that the first instalment was paid about the time when the last was due.

in selecting the candidate to receive his vote. The principle of using our suffrage in favor of emancipation, while we neither organize a distinct party, nor attach ourselves to any already existing, is vital to our cause. Of what consequence is it whether federalism or democracy, consolidation or state rights, shall prevail, if the republic is to perpetuate a system of tyranny which degrades the laborer—the muscle and tendon of society—to a beast of burden? Every party predilection must be merged or the cause is lost.

4. *Petitioning.* The action of Congress only increases the reasons for pressing upon it its high duties. When the most precious right is denied in the very place where it should find a sanctuary, then is the time to exercise it.

Petitions should also be presented to the State legislatures till they take the ground of the duty of immediately exercising against slavery all our constitutional rights.

A new subject of petition of great importance in every point of view is the recognition of Haytien independence. Every reasonable ground of objection to the measure on the part of our government is now forever removed. Shall we violate our avowed principles of national intercourse for the support of slavery? Shall we injure or throw away a commerce of millions per annum, because it would hurt the market price of slaves, to recognize the freedom and independence of their brethren of the Haytien republic? The discussion of this question in Congress cannot but benefit the cause of humanity. Petitions should be addressed to the Senate of the United States, and to the State legislatures to instruct their senators on the subject.

5. *The utmost assistance should be rendered to the laudable efforts of our colored brethren to rise to the full happiness and usefulness of American citizenship.* They are beginning to manifest a strong disposition to attach themselves to agricultural and mechanical instead of servile employments, and to avail themselves of the means of education. Abolitionists have it in their power greatly to encourage and assist them. The importance of so doing, both in itself and in its bearing on the cause of the slave, need not be here insisted on. Every abolition mechanic who takes a colored apprentice on the same terms as he would a white; every farmer who imparts to a colored man the knowledge of agriculture or encourages him to buy a farm; and every man who gives employment to a colored farmer or mechanic strikes through the shield of prejudice a blow on two and a half millions of chains.

In the prosecution of such an object by such means—of human liberty by truth and brotherly love—we can never tire nor doubt of success. Our victory is no less sure than the laws of seed

time and harvest, and though tears may mingle with the seed which is now scattered amidst the frosts and snows of retiring winter, the sheaves shall yet be brought home with shouts of unmingled joy and the sunshine of unclouded peace.

By order of the Executive Committee.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,
ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jun. } *Cor. Secretaries,*
HENRY B. STANTON. }

LIST OF ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES.

The following list we have reason to believe much further below the true number of Societies than any preceding. This is partly owing to the multiplication of Anti-Slavery newspapers, each of which publishes the formation of Societies in its own vicinity—and which together have become too numerous for the perusal of the person whose business it is to prepare the report. After a diligent overturn of all the files within his reach, doubtless many have escaped him. To save room for Counties and Post Offices, which in some cases are important, we have omitted the figures denoting the original number of members as well as notices of increase.

MAINE.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Augusta,	Dr. E. S. Tappan,		150
Bath,	Henry Masters,	Mar. 1833,	
Bangor,		Aug. 1837,	
Bangor, (Female)	Mrs. J. W. Mason,	Sept. 1837,	
Brewer,	Rev. Wales Lewis,	Jan. 1839.	6
Bloomfield,			
Brunswick,	Rev. G. E. Adams,		
Bridgeton,			
Bowdoin College,	Stephen H. Hayes,	Aug. 1833,	78
Buxton,	Peter Libby,	Mar. 1836,	29
Cumberland County,	Prof. W. Smyth,	Feb. 1836,	
Cumberland,	Reuben Sweetzer,		
Dixfield,			
East Pittston,	Rev. E. Robinson, President,	Jan. 1838.	20
Fairhaven,			
Farmington,	John Titcomb,		
Freeport,	Enoch Pratt,	Jan. 1838.	20
Gardiner,	Joel Cowee,	April 1836,	50
Gorham,	Charles O. Libby,	Dec. 1835,	21
Hallowell,	George Shepherd,	Oct. 1833,	
Hebron,		May 1835,	
Kennebec County,			
Limington,	Joseph Brackett,	Mar. 1836,	83
Lincoln County,	Rev. Asbury Caldwell,	Mar. 1838,	
Machias,	Wm. A. Crocker, Esq.	Jan. 1838,	40
MAINE, (State)	Wm. Smyth, (Brunswick)	Oct. 1834,	
Minot,	Benjamin Johnson,	April 1836,	
Mount Desert,	Rev. C. L. Carey,	May 1834,	149
New Sharon,	Samuel Mason,		
North Leeds,	Rev. Wilson C. Rider,	April 1838,	75
North Yarmouth,	Nathan Ode,	Oct. 1834,	136
Oxford County,			
Portland,		Mar. 1833,	40
Portland, (Young Men's)	James M. Dodge,	Oct. 1834,	59
Portland, (Female)	Mrs. Miriam Huseey,	April 1834,	89
Somerset County,			
Topsham,	J. Barron,	Mar. 1833,	53
Turner,			90
Vassalborough,			
Washington County,	Thomas T. Stone,	Mar. 1838,	
Waterville,			
Walnut Hill,	John W. Goekin,	Mar. 1836,	14
Wayne,			
Weld,	Jacob Abbot, Esq.		
West Mt. Vernon,	Nath. Larrabee,	Dec. 1837,	41
Winthrop,	Stephen Sewall, Esq.	Mar. 1834,	103
Winthrop, (Female)	Mrs. Mary Carr,	1837,	60
Woolwich,	John M. Bailey,	Jan. 1838,	100

Total number of Societies, 43.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Alexandria,	L. B. Sawyer,	June 1836,	67
Alstead, (Cheahire)	James F. Isham,	May 1836,	69
Bedford,	Dr. Peter P. Woodbury,	Dec. 1835,	98
Boscawen, (East Parish)	Capt. Joseph Morrill,	June 1835,	70
Boscawen, (Young Men's)	F. P. Atkinson,	June 1836,	35
Bradford,	David Bayley,	Mar. 1836,	35
Bristol,	Dr. Jacob S. Eaton,	Sept. 1835,	14
Canaan,	George Harris,	April 1835,	130
Canaan, (Female)	Mary Wallace,	1837,	50
Campton,	Davis Baker, Esq.	Feb. 1834,	63
Chester,	Amos Chase,	Sept. 1835,	70
Chichester,	J. W. Fowle,	July 1835,	73
Concord,	Albe Cady,	June 1834,	100
Concord, (Female)	Miss Mary Clark,	Nov. 1834,	129
Concord, (Juvenile)	Alexander H. Kent,	Dec. 1835,	63
Dartmouth College,	Sylvester Dana,	Aug. 1835,	95
Dorchester,	Rev. W. Le Bosquet,	Oct. 1836,	16
Dover,	R. D. Jones,	Aug. 1835,	121
Dover, (Female)	Miss Elizabeth Wheeler,	Feb. 1835,	382
Dover, (Young Men's)	Dr. A. G. Tenney,	Aug. 1835,	66
Dunbarton,	Deacon Daniel H. Parker,	Aug. 1834,	80
Dunbarton, (Female)	Miss Louisa Whipple,	1837,	
Durham, (Female)	Mrs. J. A. Richardson,	1837,	
East Kingston,		June 1837,	
Exeter,	Woodbridge Odlin,	1838,	
Fitzwilliam,	John K. Vandoorn,	Sept. 1837,	75
Franceia,	Jacob L. Hall,	Jan. 1837,	18
Gilmanton,		Sept. 1836,	
Goffstown,	David A. Bunton,	April 1835,	160
Grafton County,	Rev. D. I. Robinson,	Sept. 1836,	100
Grantham,	Edward A. Rice,	Nov. 1835,	25
Grantham, (Female)	Miss Emeline Cone,	Nov. 1835,	30
Great Falls,	Theodore B. Moses,	Dec. 1834,	376
Hampton Falls,	N. Ambrose,		
Haverhill,	T. K. Blaisdell,	July 1835,	95
Haverhill, (Female)		1837,	
Hebron,	George Woodworth;	Oct. 1836,	68
Henniker,	Rev. Amos Kidder,	1835,	
Hillsborough County,	Rev. Samuel Lee,	1838,	
Hopkinton,	Stephen Blanchard,	July 1835,	
Kingston,	Joseph Eastman,	1835,	50
Landaff,	George W. Clement,	1837,	52
Lebanon,	Joseph Martin,	1837,	60
Lisbon,	Amos Woolson,	1838,	
Loudon,	Dr. James B. Abbott,	May 1835,	30
Lyme,	Zenas Hamilton,	Nov. 1836,	244
Mason,	C. E. Eastman,	1837,	
Merrimac County,	Wm. H. Foster,	1838,	
New Grantham,			
New Hampton, (Theo. Sem.)	Edward R. Reynolds,	Aug. 1834,	30
NEW HAMPSHIRE, (State)	John Farmer, Esq. (Concord)	Nov. 1834,	
N. H. Conference, (M. E. Ch.)			
New Ipswich,	William Hewes,	April 1836,	45
New Ipswich, (Academy)	Ira Russell,	Aug. 1836,	
New Market,	Timothy Murray,	Jan. 1836,	50
New Market, (Female)	Hannah B. Gross,	Feb. 1836,	130
New Port, (Sullivan Co.)	John Wilcox,	Dec. 1836,	45
Northfield and Sanborn,	D. Sanborn,	Mar. 1835,	135
Orange,	William Loomis,	Mar. 1837,	30

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
Peeling, [Grafton Co.]	Rev. Francis Ropes,	Oct. 1836,	38
Pembroke,	Thomas Kent,		
Peterborough,	Rufus Hyde,	Feb. 1837,	53
Pittsfield,	Dr. Jeremiah Blake,	May 1835,	20
Pittsfield, (Ladies')		July 1835,	
Plymouth,	N. P. Rogers, Esq.,	Dec. 1833,	140
Plymouth, (Female)	Mrs. N. P. Rogers,	Feb. 1834,	102
Plymouth, (Students')	Walter Baker,	May 1838,	
Portsmouth,	J. P. Cooper,	1833,	
Portsmouth, (Ladies')	Miss Mary Mann,	1836,	
Rochester,	Dr. John M. Berry,	Feb. 1836,	40
Rockingham,	J. E. Hood,	Mar. 1837,	
Sandown,	David French,	May 1836,	29
Sandwich, [Grafton Co.]		Sept. 1835,	63
Sandwich, (Female)		Oct. 1836,	63
Tamworth,	Tristram Mason,	July 1836,	86
Wakefeld, (Female)		1837,	
Weare, (Female)	Ann Page,	May 1837,	
Weare, (Young Men's)	Moses A. Cartland,	May 1837,	
Wilton,	Joseph Hadley,	1838,	

Total number of Societies, 79.

VERMONT.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
<i>Addison County,</i>		July 1835,	
Albany,		1836,	
Andover,			
Barnet and Ryegate,	William McLeran,	Mar. 1834,	130
Bennington,	James Ballard,	July 1835,	140
Benson,		1836,	68
Berkshire,	Deacon Stone,	Jan. 1837,	75
Berlin,	Francis Hilbury,	1837,	63
Braintree and Snowsville,	John White,	Mar. 1838,	
Brandon,	Ephraim Marcham,	Feb. 1836,	78
Brattleborough, (East Village)	Samuel H. Elliot,	July 1837,	
Bristol,		Mar. 1835,	
Brookfield,	F. Blood,		100
Burlington,		Nov. 1836,	
Cabot, [Caledonia Co.]	John R. Putnam,	Feb. 1834,	300
<i>Caledonia County,</i>	Rev. W. Scales, (Lyndon)	Sept. 1836,	
Cambridge,	W. H. Law, Esq.	1837,	200
Chester,	William Armington,	July 1834,	60
<i>Chittenden County,</i>	Henry P. Hickok,	Mar. 1838,	
Colchester,			
Corcord,	David Hibbard,	Jan. 1837,	70
Cornwall,	G. B. Rockwell,	July 1833,	167
Cornwall, (Female)	Sarah Skinner,	1837,	
Craftsbury,	Samuel M. Wilson,		140
Danville,	Samuel Collins,		
East Barnard,	Lyman Belknap,	Feb. 1837,	56
East Bethel,	Rev. Daniel Crane,	Feb. 1837,	61
East Williamstown,	J. S. C. Farnham,	Dec. 1837,	70
East St. Albans,		1837,	
Enosburgh,	Samuel Kendall,	Dec. 1834,	150
Essex,	Rev. Chester Ingraham,	Jan. 1837,	70
Fairfax,	Elijah R. Grant,	1836,	100

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Fairfield, Fayston.	Joel Barber,		
Ferrisburgh and vicinity, <i>Franklin County,</i>	R. T. Robinson, (Ferrisburgh) A. O. Aldis, (St. Albans,)	Mar. 1834, Oct. 1836,	205
Franklin, Georgia,	P. Chase, (Berkshire Mills)	Jan. 1836,	300
Glover, Granville,	Horatio Goodrich,	Jan. 1836, 1836, 1835,	300
Grafton, Greensbury,	John Bassett, ----- Scott,	Mar. 1837, 1836, Jan. 1835,	95
Hancock, Hardwick, (Caledonia Co.)	Rev. Chester Wright,	Nov. 1836,	94
Hinesburgh, Jamaica,	John Ide, Joel Holton,	1836, April 1833,	
Jericho, Johnson,	Truman Galasha, Rev. Albert Stone,	Nov. 1834, 1835,	200 100
Kirby, (Caledonia Co.) Lunenburg, (Essex Co.)		July 1837,	
Ludlow, Lyndon, (Essex Co.)	Abishai Stoddard,† Ezra E. Adams,	July 1837, Jan. 1837,	200
Marshfield, Middlebury,	John Boyles,	Jan. 1837, Jan. 1835,	175
Milton, Montgomery,	Mr. N. Blake, (West P. O.) Rev. Luther Cole,	Jan. 1837, April 1836,	50
Monkton, Montpelier,	C. L. Knapp,	Oct. 1835,	100
Newbury Center, Newbury Town,	John Stephenson, Dr. Carter,	April 1835, 1836,	91 64
New Haven, Newark,	E. S. Hinman, Amos Parker,	Aug. 1836, Sept. 1837,	103
North Fairfax, North Fairfield,	John H. Richardson, Elias H. Sherman,	Mar. 1837, Mar. 1836,	60 64
Northfield, North Lyndon,	Elijah Smith, Jr., Rodolphus Walker,	Dec. 1836, Jan. 1837,	54
North Springfield, <i>Orange County,</i>	Jewett Boynton, Jr. Rev. J. Buckham, (Chelsea)	April 1838, June 1837,	22
<i>Orleans County,</i> Orwell,	Col. Abraham Stinson,	Jan. 1837,	
Peachain, Randolph,	Dr. Zebina K. Pangborn, Philander Perrin,	Aug. 1833, Mar. 1838,	80
Randolph, (Female) Richford,	Theresa M. Bissel, Eli Goff,		132
Rochester, Rockingham Centre,	A. Eaton, Dr. Hiram Daw,	Jan. 1835,	65 50
Rutland, Rupert,	A. Johnson, John H. Campbell,	Jan. 1834,	54
Saxton's River, Sheffield,	Joseph Ide,	Feb. 1837,	40
Shoreham, Springfield,	Nomias Cobb,	Mar. 1838,	101
St. Albans, St. Johnsbury,	C. L. Jones, Rev. J. Morn, (St. J. Centre)	Jan. 1837,	80
Sudbury, Starksborough and Lincoln,	A. Hawkins, (Starksborough) Geo. Roundes, (East P. O.)	April 1834, Jan. 1837,	485 150
Swanton, Topsham,	Moses A. Dutton, Dr. J. Holton,	1836, Mar. 1836,	124 40
Townsend, Underhill,	Ralph Woodruff,	Jan. 1867,	150
Union Village, VERMONT, (State)	I. N. Hobart, E.D. Barber, Esq. (Middlebury)	July 1837, May 1834,	

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Waitsfield,	Thomas Smith,	Feb. 1834,	60
Waitsfield, (Female)	Elvira S. Knight.	Sept. 1836,	
Walden,	John Woster,	Feb. 1834,	155
Washington County,	Rev. G. Putnam, (of Barnet)	May 1836,	
Wallingford,	— Stone,	1836,	
West Fairlee,	Reuben Farnsworth,	Nov. 1834,	330
Westford, (Juvenile)	Henry H. Brown,	Feb. 1837,	138
West Randolph,		Mar. 1834,	
Weybridge,		April 1834,	
Whiting,		Mar. 1836,	
Windham County,	W. Stearns,		
Wilmington,			

Whole number of Societies, 104.

MASSACHUSETTS.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Abington,	Nath. H. Whiting, (East Ab.)	Mar. 1836,	363
Abington, (Female)	Mrs. H. Ward,	Aug. 1837,	120
Abington, East,			
Acton,			
Agawam,	Newbury Norton,	Dec. 1837,	42
Amesbury & Salisbury,	James Watson,	Dec. 1833,	70
Amesbury & Salisbury, (Fem.)	Eliza H. Whittier,		144
Amesbury Mills,	W. Carruthers,	Dec. 1833,	50
Amesbury, (Female)	Miss Betsy Linscott,	Dec. 1833,	70
Amherst,	Joseph Colton,	Mar. 1836,	288
Amherst, (South Parish)	Thomas Reed,	July 1837,	35
Amherst, (College)	Jesse K. Bragg,	Dec. 1837,	80
Andover,	S. H. Emery,	Jan. 1835,	400
Andover, (Female)			
Andover, (Female Juvenile)	Louisa L. Foster,	April 1837,	37
Andover, (West Parish)	Moses Parker,	Nov. 1837,	36
Ashburnham,	Gilman Jones,	Nov. 1834,	111
Ashburnham, (Female)	Silva W. Jones,	June 183,	106
Ashfield,	Jasper Bement,	Dec. 18,	57
Assonet, (Freetown)	C. C. Nichols, (Hyannis P. O.)	April 1838,	
Attleborough,	Nathaniel Wright,		
Barnstable,	Rev. Dr. Cheesman,	Feb. 1835,	109
Barnstable, (Female)	Rosella Ford,	Sept. 1837,	67
Berkshire County,	John G. Stanley, (Lenox)	Sept. 1837,	67
Becket,			
Boston, (Young Men's)	S. O. Torry,	Sept. 1833,	189
Boeton, (Ladies')	Mrs. Maria W. Chapman,	Oct. 1833,	300
Boston, (Juvenile)		April 1837,	
Boxborough,	Samuel Hayward,	June 1835,	60
Boxborough, (Female)	L. Wetherby,	June 1835,	100
Boylston,	James Davenport,		140
Boylston, (Female)			
Boylston, West,			
Braintree,			
Bradford,	N. Ladd,		
Bradford, West,	William F. Johnson,	Aug. 1837,	28
Bradford, West, (Female)	Sarah C. Reynolds,	Aug. 1836,	40
Bradford, East, (Female)	Miss Ellen B. Ladd,	Oct. 1836,	75
Brimfield,	Phillip G. Hubbard,	April 1837,	160
Bridgewater, North,	Jesse Perkins,		
Bridgewater, East, (Female)	Mrs. S. P. Ryder,	April 1838,	
Bristol County,	Hodges Reed, Esq.	Nov. 1836,	

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	NAMES.	MEMB.
Brewster, (Barnstable Co.)	Robert C. Crosby,	June 1837,	43
Buckland,			
Cambridge,			
Cambridgeport,	John Dailinger, Jr.		70
Charlestown,	Dr. Moses Barret,	Dec. 1836,	179
Charlestown,		April 1837,	50
Chatham,			
Chelmsford,	Charles B. Thompson,	Mar. 1837,	118
Coleraine,	Hollis Thompson,	Jan. 1838,	100
Concord, (Female)	Caroline D. Brooks,	Sept. 1837,	61
Conway,	Gen. Asa Howland,	May 1836,	
Cowper, (Boston)	Stephen Vialle, Jr.	Sept. 1835,	30
Cummington,			
Danvers,	Samuel W. King,	April 1837,	96
Danvers, (Female)	Mrs. Isaac Winslow,	April 1838,	
Danvers, South, (Female)	Emily Winslow,	June 1837,	20
Deerfield,	Deacon Z. Graves,		
Dorchester,	O. P. Bacon,	April 1835,	255
Dorchester, (Female)	Sarah Baker,	Dec. 1835,	130
Dracut,	C. G. Parsons,	Dec. 1837,	45
Dukes County,	Deacon Charles G. Athearn,	1837,	
Duxbury,	William H. Sampson,	Nov. 1837,	150
Duxbury, (Female)	Mrs. Abigail D. Cook,	April 1838,	50
East Cambridge,	Gilbert Robbins,	1837,	
East Brookfield,	Oliver C. Felton,		
East Randolph,	William W. Linfield,	Mar. 1836,	61
Edgartown,	Daniel Tilton,	1837,	75
El River, (Plymouth Co.)	Nathaniel Lenard,		50
Essex County,	Thomas Spencer, (Salem)	June 1834,	130
Essex,	Samuel Burnham, 2d.		
Essex Street, (Boston)	John A. Allen,	May 1835,	50
Fairhaven,	Clother Gifford,		
Fairhaven, (Female)	Miss Delia Weeden,	Dec. 1837,	
Fall River,	Gilbert H. Durfee,	July 1834,	279
Fall River, (Female)	Mrs. Sarah G. Buffum,	July 1835,	175
Falmouth,	Zeph. Bennet,	Sept. 1837,	60
Foxborough,	Otis Hodges,		
Franklin County,	Rev. T. Packard,	Dec. 1836,	46
Franklin,	Milton M. Fisher,		
Framingham,	C. F. W. Parkhurst,	Dec. 1837,	
Freetown,		July 1833,	
Fitchburg,	B. Snow, Jr.	Jan. 1837,	66
Fitchburg, (Female)	Harriet A. Kimball,	Feb. 1837,	96
Gardner,			
Grafton,			
Groton,	Luther Boutelle,	Oct. 1834,	100
Groton, (Female)	Elizabeth Farnsworth,	Mar. 1836,	110
Groton, (Juvenile Female)			
Greenfield,	G. C. Munsell,	Nov. 1836,	92
Hampden County,	Rev. J. Porter, (N. Wilbraham)	1837,	
Hampshire County,			
Hanover,	Rev. Robert B. Dickie,	June 1835,	65
Hardwick,	Lyman Snow,	June 1837,	62
Harvard,	Dr. E. A. Holman,		
Hawley,	Hezekiah Warriner, Jr.	Dec. 1836,	130
Haverhill,	George O. Harmon,	April 1834,	86
Haverhill, (Female)	Miss Harriet Minot,	July 1834,	87
Haverhill, East, (Female)	Miss Abby Sawyer,	1835,	50
Hebronville,	Rev. C. Simmons,		
Holden,	Ethan Davis,	April 1834,	314

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Holliston,	Bucklin Fitts,	July 1834,	100
Holliston, (Female)	Joanna W. Kinsbury,	Oct. 1837,	17
Hatfield,		Nov. 1834,	
Heath,	Edmund J. Farnsworth,	July 1836,	60
Hingham,	Jairus Lincoln,	1838,	
Ireland Parish,	Mr. Rogers,	June 1837,	
Kingston,	Justus Harlow,	Nov. 1834,	102
Leverett,	Dr. B. Wilmarth,	Jan. 1837,	119
Littleton,	Col. Harwood,	Mar. 1837,	75
Lowell,	William S. Merrill,	Mar. 1834,	168
Lowell, (Female)	Mrs. Nathaniel Thurston,	Dec. 1834,	180
Lowell, (Young Men's)	Samuel A. Brown,	Jan. 1836,	110
Lynn,	T. H. Atwill,	April 1832,	236
Lynn, (Female)	Abby Kelly,	May 1835,	90
Lynn, (Young Men's)	S. B. Simonds,	Oct. 1836,	160
Lynn, (Juvenile)			
Lynn, (Juvenile Female)	Emeline Breed,	Mar. 1837,	84
Mansfield,	I. Sterns,	Dec. 1837,	305
Marshfield, (Juvenile)		1837,	
MASSACHUSETTS, (State)	William Lloyd Garrison,	Jan. 1832,	
Medford,			
Mendon, North,	J. G. Metcalf,	July 1837,	100
Middleborough,	Nathaniel A. Eddy,	Dec. 1834,	39
Middlefield,			
Middlesex County,	Rev. U. C. Burnap, (Lowell)	Oct. 1834,	
Millbury,	Elias Lovell,	Dec. 1834,	130
Millville,	Charles Gladding,		
Millville, (Female)	Miss Abby Pitts,	July 1836,	29
Monson,	Franklin Newell,	Mar. 1837,	60
Nantucket, (colored)	Edward J. Pompey,		
Nantucket,	Rev. Cyrus Pierce,	July 1837,	300
Nantucket, (Female)	Anna Gardner,	Feb. 1838,	33
Nantucket, (Juvenile)	Eunice F. Ross,	Nov. 1837,	24
Natick,	Nathan Rice,	Dec. 1836,	163
Newburyport and vicinity,	J. H. Young,	April 1834,	100
Newburyport, (Female)	Miss Susan C. Wood,	May 1834,	112
Newbury, (Byfield Parish)			
Newbury, West, (Female)	Harriet K. Emery,	1837,	30
Newbury, West, (Juv. Female)	B. O. H. Marshall,		
New Bedford,	John Burrage,	July 1834,	120
New Bedford, (Young Men's)	Joseph D. Nichols,	Feb. 1836,	120
New Bedford, (Female)	Elizabeth G. Taber,	Nov. 1836,	26
New Rowley,	Daniel Palmer,	May 1834,	107
New Rowley, (Young Men's)	T. A. Merrill,	Dec. 1837,	20
New Salem,	Rev. Erastus Curtis,		
Norfolk County,	Rev. D. Sandford, (Dorchester)	Jan. 1838,	
North Attleborough,	Charles Anthony,	Oct. 1837,	
North Carver,	E. Harlon,	Mar. 1836,	47
North Danvers, (Female)	Mrs. Mary P. Putnam,	June 1837,	74
North District, Edgarton,	Samuel Butler,	1837,	33
North Leverett,			114
North Leicester, (Female)	Eliza Earle,	Oct. 1836,	90
North Sunderland,	F. Robinson,	Jan. 1836,	40
North Springfield,	A. G. Parker, (Willimansett, P.O.)		
North Wilbraham,	Henry B. Brewer,	Feb. 1838,	84
Northfield,	Charles Matoon,	April 1836,	40
Northfield, (South East)	Calvin T. Swan,	Jan. 1837,	49
Northampton,	Sylvester Judd,	May 1836,	
Northborough,			
Norwich,	David Sanford,	Jan. 1836,	30
Old Colony,	George Russell,	1834,	301

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Old Hampshire,	Issac Clarke,	Jan. 1836,	200
Pawtucket,			
Paxton,	David G. Davis,		70
Peru,	Samuel Cone,	Mar. 1837,	137
Pine Street, (Boston)	Charles C. Barry,	June 1834,	30
<i>Plymouth County,</i>		July 1834,	91
Plymouth,	Edwin Morton,		50
Plymouth, (Female)	Mrs. Phebe Cotton,	1837,	90
Plymouth, (Juvenile)	Miss M. A. Paty,	July 1837,	25
Princeton,	Rev. E. Demond,		
Reading,	William Wakefield,	Mar. 1833,	
Reading, (Female)	Louisa Wakefield,	Mar. 1833,	
Roxbury, (Female)	Mrs. John Jones,	April 1837,	30
Rutland,	Cyrus Rogers,		
Salem and vicinity,	Rev. G. B. Choever,	Jan. 1834,	469
Salem, (Female)	Miss L. L. Dodge,	Jan. 1834,	153
Salem, (1st Juvenile Female)	Mary Brooks,		
Salem, (2nd Juvenile Female)	Anna B. Frye,	June 1837,	35
Salem Street, (Boston)			
Sandisfield,			
Sandwich,	Josiah Gifford,		
Saugus, (River)	Abel Newhall,	April 1837,	56
Saxtonville,	Lewis Jones, Esq.	April 1838,	
Scituate,	E. L. Sewall & W. P. Tilden,	1835,	180
Seekonk,	Joseph Gates,	Sept. 1837,	
Shelburne,	Deacon Ebenezer Fiske,	Dec. 1837,	153
Shelburne Falls,	Ralph B. Bardwell,	Oct. 1836,	94
Sherburne,			
Shrewsbury,		1838,	
Shirley,			
South Brookfield,	O. B. Felton,	Jan. 1837,	52
South Deerfield,	Deacon Z. Graves,	Dec. 1836,	35
South Hadley Canal,	Joseph Clough,	June 1837,	35
South Reading,	A. G. Sweetzer,	April 1834,	73
South Reading, (Female)	Sarah G. Waitt,	Dec. 1835,	50
South Weymouth,	Jacob Loud,	May 1836,	62
South Weymouth, (Female)	Mrs. E. T. Loud,	Nov. 1835,	132
South Weymouth, (Juv. Fem.)	Betsy J. Pratt,	Oct. 1837,	66
South Wilbraham,	S. C. Spelman,	Dec. 1837,	50
Stockbridge,	William Rossiter,	June 1836,	155
Sturbridge,	Simeon Drake,	Dec. 1837,	200
Stoneham,	Levi D. Smith,	Jan. 1838,	60
Sudbury, (Female)	Miss Mary Rice,		
Taunton,	Hodges Reed,	May 1835,	100
Taunton, (Juvenile)		1837,	
Townsend,			
Truro,	Jedediah Shedd,	Feb. 1838,	30
Tisbury,	Capt. Charles Smith,	April 1838,	
Upton, (Female)			
Upper Beverly,	E. H. Moulton,	Mar. 1838,	58
Uxbridge,	Richard Battey,	Mar. 1834,	310
Uxbridge, (Female)	Sylvia Willard,	Mar. 1836,	57
Walpole,	Eliphalet Rhodes,	Dec. 1836,	70
Waltham,	G. A. Williams,		
Ware,			150
Ware Village,	Amos Merriam,	Mar. 1837,	
Westfield,	Simeon Collins,	July 1837,	30
West Amesbury,	Edward C. Jenkins,	April 1837,	65
West Amesbury, (Y. Men's)	Noah Jackman,		
West Attleborough,	S. M. Stanley,	Jan. 1838,	50
West Brookfield,	Amos Gilbert,	July 1837,	34

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
West Boxford,	Thomas S. Hovey,	Apr. 1838,	64
West Hampton,	Francis Loud,		38
West Hampton, (Female)	Louisa Clark,	Jan. 1837,	55
West Hawley,	Ebenezer Crosby,	Dec. 1836,	
West Harwich,			20
West Milbury,	A. A. Marcy,	Oct. 1837,	34
West Tisbury,		1837,	
Westford,	George Brown,	Mar. 1837,	115
Weston,	Lewis Gourgas,		
Westminster,	E. Kendall, Jr.		
Weymouth and Braintree,	Elias Richards, (President)	Mar. 1836,	143
Weymouth,	Atherton N. Hunt,	April 1836,	133
Weymouth, (Female)	Mrs. H. C. Field,	Sept. 1835,	46
Williams College,			
Williamset,			
Woburn,	Henry A. Woodman,	Nov. 1834,	
Worcester,	John R. Morse,	Mar. 1835,	
Worcester County, (North)	Edward Kendall,	Jan. 1836,	
Worcester County, (South)	George Allen, (Shrewsbury)	Feb. 1836,	
Wrentham,	Joseph B. Gerould,		
Wrentham, (Female)	Susan Mann,	April 1837,	90
Wrentham, (Juvenile)			

Whole number of Societies, 246.

RHODE ISLAND.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Assonet,			
Barrington,			
Centreville,		Jan. 1836,	40
Coventry,	William Henry Anthony,	Jan. 1834,	53
Cumberland,			
Kent County, (Young Men's)	Asa Sisson, (Coventry)	Aug. 1835,	102
Little Compton,	Charles Milburn,	Dec. 1836,	47
Natick,			125
Natick, (Female)			150
Natick, (Young Men's)			
Newport, (Juvenile)			
North Scituate,			220
Pawtucket,	Joseph Sisson, Jr.	Jan. 1834,	136
Pawtucket, (Female)	Mrs. William Adams,	Feb. 1835,	100
Pawtucket, (Female Juvenile)	Eliza Kelly,	1835,	40
Pawtucket, (Juvenile)			
Phoenix and Arkwright,			
Providence,		Jan. 1833,	110
Providence, (Female)	Mrs. Harriet L. Truesdell,	April 1835,	130
Providence, (Juvenile Female)	Miss Almira Bolles,	Dec. 1834,	35
RHODE ISLAND, (State)	Oliver Johnson,	Feb. 1836,	313
Smithfield and vicinity,	Aaron White, Jr.	Nov. 1835,	200
Smithfield, (Female)	Miss Mary Rathbone,	Aug. 1836,	58
Tiverton and Little Compton,	Dr. G. Sexton,	April 1837,	34
Union, (Fiskeville)	George J. Adams,	Jan. 1836,	112
Valley Falls,		1835,	70

Whole number of Societies, 26.

CONNECTICUT.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Barkhamstead,	Nelson Gilbert,	April 1837,	50
Brooklyn,	Herbert Williams,	Mar. 1835,	
Brooklyn, (Female)	F. M. B. Burleigh,	July 1834,	53
Canton,	Lancel Foot,		25
Chaplin,	Deacon Jared Clark,	June 1836,	
Colebrook,	John H. Rodgers,	June 1836,	90
CONNECTICUT, (State)	H. Cowles, Esq. (Farmington)	April 1835,	
Deep River,	Joseph H. Mather,	July 1835,	60
East Hampton,	Timothy R. Markham,		28
East Windsor Hill, (Theo. Sem.)	L. Leonard,	1837,	8
Farmington,	Thomas Cowles,	Feb. 1833,	70
Glastenbury,	Rev. Warren G. Jones,	Jan. 1838,	40
Greenville,	William H. Coit,	1836,	
Greenville, (Female)	Miss Louisa Humphrey,	Jan. 1836,	80
Hadlyme,	Elijah Day,	1837,	20
<i>Hartford County,</i>			
Hartford,	S. B. Mosley,	Mar. 1837,	120
Lebanon, (Goshen)	Orrin Gilbert,	Mar. 1837,	30
Liebon,	Levi P. Rowland,	July 1835,	30
Mansfield,	Dr. H. Skinner,	Dec. 1837,	300
Meriden,			
Middle Haddam,			30
<i>Middlesex County,</i>			
Middletown,	S. W. Griswold,	Nov. 1836,	
Middletown, (Female colored)	S. W. Griswold,	Feb. 1834,	83
	Mrs. Clarissa M. Beman,		
New Haven,	J. E. P. Dean, Esq.	June 1833,	
New Haven, (Female)	Mrs. Leicester A. Sawyer,	Jan. 1837,	50
New Haven, (Theo. Seminary)	J. Mattocks, Jr.	Mar. 1838,	25
New London,	L. Bolles,	1837,	
Norwich and vicinity,	Alpheus Kingsley,		
Norwich, (Female)	Miss F. M. Caulkins,		
Plainfield,	C. C. Burleigh,	Aug. 1833,	94
Pomfret,			
South Cornwall,	Ezekiel Birdseye,	Jan. 1837,	40
South Killingly,	Almond Ames,	Mar. 1837,	
Stratford,	Asa S. Curtis,	Dec. 1837,	18
Torrington,	Dr. Erasmus D. Hudson,		67
Waterbury,	S. S. Deforest,	July 1836,	57
Warren,	George P. Tallmadge,	May 1836,	27
West Woodstock and vicinity	James R. Guild,		
Winchester Center,	Noble J. Everett,		12
Willimantic, (Female)			
<i>Windham County,</i>			
Windham and Willimantic,	Thomas Huntington,	May 1834,	
Winstead, (Winchester)	Thomas Gray, Esq.	Mar. 1836,	
Wolcottville,		Jan. 1837,	50
			40

Whole number of Societies, 46.

NEW-YORK.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Aaronville, (Erie Co.)	Rev. Solomon Gale,	Dec. 1835,	125
Adams, (Jefferson Co.)	Rev. C. Jones,	June 1837,	70
Alabama, (Genesee Co.)	Mr. Church, Postmaster,	Feb. 1838,	
Albany,	Otis Allen,	May 1835,	200
Albany, (Young Men's)		Feb. 1838,	
Albany, (Colored)	J. G. Stewart,	April 1836,	
Alden, (Erie Co.)	Isaac Hawes,	Dec. 1836,	35

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Alford, (Allegany Co.)	Orra Stillman,		110
<i>Allegany County,</i>	H. J. Webb,		76
Almon, (Allegany Co.)			
Amity, (Allegany Co.)	John May,	Jan. 1837,	12
Amsterdam,		Nov. 1835,	
Annsville, (Oneida Co.)		Feb. 1838,	
Angelica, (Allegany Co.)		July 1835,	70
Antwerp, (Jefferson Co.)	J. A. Northrop,	Dec. 1835,	110
Arcade, (Genesee Co.)	C. O. Shepard,	June 1835,	122
Ashville, (Chatauque Co.)	Enoch Morgan,	Jan. 1837,	162
Attica, (Genesee)	Chester Keney,	Feb. 1837,	118
Auburn,	S. C. Dunning,	Aug. 1837,	75
Auburn, (Wesleyan)	H. H. Heath,	1837,	
Auburn, (Theo. Seminary)	John J. Keep,		
Augusta, (Oneida Co.)		Feb. 1837,	60
Augusta, (Young Men's)	S. L. Rose,	Sept. 1837,	
Batavia, (Genesee Co.)	Samuel Heston,	Feb. 1838,	76
Beekmantown,	Dr. Barak Beckwith,	April 1837,	40
Bellville, (Jefferson Co.)	Edward B. Hawes,	1837,	40
Bergen,	Richard Crampton,	Feb. 1837,	80
Bethany, (Genesee Co.)	Roswell Frary,	Mar. 1838,	13
Black River Conf. (Preachers')	Rev. George G. Hapgood,	Aug. 1837,	
Boston, (Erie Co.)	Dr. Terrey,	Dec. 1836,	250
Broadalbin, (Montgomery Co.)		1837,	
Brockport, (Monroe Co.)	C. J. B. Mount,	Dec. 1836,	50
Bridgewater, (Oneida Co.)			
Brighton, (Monroe Co.)	Gardener Mudge,	Sept. 1835,	40
Bristol, (Ontario Co.)	William T. Coddling,	1837,	51
Buckbridge, (St. Lawrence Co.)	Rev. P. D. Gorrie,	1837,	83
Buffalo City,	William Verrinder,		100
Buffalo, (Female)	Miss Harriet Rossiter,	Sept. 1835,	40
Busti, (Chautauque Co.)			
Buxton, (Cattaraugus)	J. Lathrop,	Jan. 1837,	31
Byron,	R. A. Fairbanks,	May 1837,	130
Cambria, (Niagara Co.)	Daniel Alvord,	Jan. 1837,	38
Canterbury and New Windsor,	William Hill,	Aug. 1837,	50
Canandaigua, (Young Men's)			
Carroll, (Chautauque Co.)			
Castile, (Genesee Co.)	J. G. True,	Sept. 1835,	90
Catskill,	Charles Sturtevant,	May 1835,	30
<i>Cayuga County,</i>	E. W. Goodwin,	Sept. 1837,	
Cazenovia,	Welford Wilson,	Mar. 1835,	
Ceres and Genesee,	Daniel Edwards,	June 1837,	39
Champlain,	H. D. Savage,		200
Champlain, (Female)	Mrs. P. Savage,	April 1837,	40
Chatham st. Chapel, (Female)	Dorcas W. Bell,		
Chateaugay,	G. W. P. Beeman,	Mar. 1836,	68
<i>Chautauque County,</i>	James Van Buren,	Jan. 1837,	
Charleston, (Montgomery Co.)		1837,	
Charlestown, (Saratoga Co.)	John Anderson,	1838,	
Cherry Valley, (Otsego Co.)			
Chesterfield, (Clinton Co.)		Feb. 1837,	
Chili, (Monroe Co.)			20
Churchill, (Monroe Co.)	E. C. Debble,	Feb. 1837,	50
Cincinnatus, (Cortland Co.)	Lewis T. Halley,	Mar. 1835,	60
<i>Clinton County,</i>	J. H. Barker, (Peru, P. O.)	April 1837,	
Clinton, (Oneida Co.)			
Clymer, (Chautauque Co.)	Daniel P. Phiney,	Jan. 1837,	25
Colden, (Erie Co.)	A. Dutton, (Buffum's Mills)	Jan. 1837,	157
Columbia, (Delaware Co.)		1837,	59

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Copenhagen,	Charles Load,		64
Cortland County,	Simeon S. Bradford,	April 1837,	135
Cortlandville,	E. P. Healy,	Feb. 1838,	50
Covington, (Genesee Co.)	M. C. Watkins,	Mar. 1836,	73
Cuba,	Kendall Wilder,		
Darien, (Genesee Co.)	Daniel Bailey,	1838,	
Debitville, (Chatauque Co.)	Thomas Cook, (President)		50
Delaware County,	Rev. Fayette Sheppard,	Jan. 1837,	
Deerfield, (Oneida Co.)	Henry Fowler,	Feb. 1837,	30
Deposit, (Delaware Co.)	Benjamin R. Nickerson,	Aug. 1836,	70
Dunkirk, (Chatauque Co.)			
East Aurora, (Erie Co.)			
East Bloomfield, (Ontario Co.)	Myron Adams,	1837,	23
East Java, (Genesee Co.)	Nelson Wolcott, P. M.		
East Galway, (Montgomery)	Andrew Carnduff,	Jan. 1838,	
Eden, (Erie Co.)	William H. Pratt,	Nov. 1835,	150
Elba, (Genesee Co.)	Asa Aldrich,	1837,	154
Ellery,	Rev. Caleb Van Ness,	1835,	
Ellicotville, (Cataaugus Co.)	J. M. Burlingame,	Jan. 1837,	140
Erie County,	L. Album Skinner,	Oct. 1835,	
Erie Conference, (Wesleyan)		1837,	32
Essex County,	William J. Curtng,	July 1837,	
Evans, (Erie Co.)		Dec. 1836,	
Evans, East, (Erie Co.)		Dec. 1836,	
Farmington, (Ontario Co.)	J. Hathaway,	Mar. 1837,	100
Farmington, (Female)	Phebe Hathaway,	April 1837,	32
Farmersville, (Cataaugus Co.)			
Fayetteville, (Onondaga Co.)			
Fenner, (Madison Co.)		April 1836,	
Fifth Free Church, (N. Y. City)			
Floyd, (Oneida Co.)	Clark Bradish,	June 1837,	40
Fly Creek, (Otsego Co.)			
Florida, (Montgomery Co.)		1837,	
Florence,	James S. Hascall,	Feb. 1837,	40
Fort Ann, (Washington Co.)	William Barnes,	Aug. 1835,	
Fourth Free Church, (N. Y. City)			
Franklin, (Delaware Co.)	Joseph H. Merrick,		
Franklin Free Church,	William P. Johnson,		
Franklin Institute, (Fowlerville)	Clark L. Capron,	June 1837,	
Franklinville,	Merlin Mead,	Feb. 1834,	50
Friendship, (Allegany Co.)	C. P. Townsend,	Jan. 1837,	55
Fulton, (Schoharie Co.)	A. P. Knox, Esq.		40
Fulton, (Oswego Co.)			
Galway, (Saratoga Co.)	H. C. Foster,	1838,	55
Gainsville, (Genesee)	D. D. Marvin,	1837,	33
Genesee County,	C. O. Shepard,	May 1835,	
Genesee Conf. (Wesleyan)	Wilber Hoag,		100
Geneva, (Ontario Co.)	W. Hogarth,	1838,	39
Geneva, (Colored)	James W. Duffin,	Jan. 1837,	32
Genoa, (Cayuga Co.)	Archelaus, Chadwick,	June 1837,	60
Gilbertsville, (Otsego Co.)			
Gorham, (Ontario Co.)	R. C. Palmer,		
Glen, (Montgomery Co.)		1837,	
Greece, (Monroe Co.)	Elisha M. Brockway,	May 1836,	
Greenbush,		April 1835,	70
Greenwich,	Edwin Andrews,	July 1835,	
Griffin's Mills,		Sept. 1835,	
Guilford, (Chenango Co.)			
Hamburg, (Erie Co.)	H. C. Hickok,	Dec. 1836,	
Hamilton,	Thomas Potheary,		

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
Hamilton, (Young Men's)	James N. Granger,	Aug. 1837,	100
Hamilton College,	W. Richardson,	May 1836,	23
Haight, (Allegany Co.)	S. L. Davidson,	Jan. 1837,	30
Hannibal,	J. W. Brewster,	July 1836,	30
Hartford,	John Carlisle,		
Hartwick,	William Davison,	Dec. 1836,	
do. Seminary and vicinity,	S. Otuman,	Jan. 1837,	31
Hartland, (Niagara Co.)	David H. Cook,	Nov. 1836,	320
Hebron,	Dr. David Martin,		
Herkimer County,	B. B. Gaylord, (Litchfield)	June 1837,	238
Holland Patent, (Oneida Co.)			
Hoover, (Cortland Co.)	Simeon S. Bradford,	Dec. 1835,	550
Hopewell, (Ontario Co.)	S. Bates, Jr.	1838,	25
Hudson, (Female)	Maria Mariott,	Nov. 1833,	19
Huntsville,	Bradly Blakeley,	Feb. 1836,	
Independence, (Allegany Co.)	J. M. Wood,		17
Jamestown, (Chatauque Co.)	Russell Jones,		206
Jasper, (Steuben Co.)	Dr. J. Read,	July 1836,	205
Juva,			
Jay,	Franklin Storer,	Oct. 1835,	100
Jefferson County,			
Johnstown,	Robert Kirkpatrick,	Nov. 1836,	50
Keesville, (Clinton Co.)	Andrew Keese,	Feb. 1837,	
Knowlesville, (Orleans Co.)	Rev. J. Tholmer,	Jan. 1837,	50
Knowlesville, (Female)	Mrs. A. Burt,	Jan. 1837,	50
Lagrange, (Genesee)	Rev. Jesse Elliot,	1837,	
Lansing, (Tompkins)	Mr. Crawford,	June 1837,	100
Lancaster, (Erie)	Henry Johnson,	Feb. 1837,	40
Lebanon, (Madison)	Ezra Campbell,	Dec. 1835,	40
Ledyard,		Mar. 1836,	104
Lenox, (Madison)	John A. Wilson,	Dec. 1836,	100
Le Roy,	A. P. Hascall,	Sept. 1835,	214
Le Roy and Bergen,	Seth M. Gates, Esq.	Feb. 1837,	200
Lewis County,	Hiram Carpenter,	Aug. 1835,	
Leyden,	Ezra Carter,	May 1834,	58
Lincklaen,	John A. Howes,	June 1834,	60
Litchfield, (Herkimer)	B. B. Gaylord,	Nov. 1835,	218
Little Valley,	Lyman Cuiver,	Jan. 1837,	24
Livingston County,	W. H. Stanley, Esq. (Genesee)	July 1837,	
Lodi, (Frie)	Halsey Stearns, (Persia p. o.)	Feb. 1837,	112
Lodi, (Juvenile)	Henry Johnson,	Dec. 1837,	123
Lockport,	L. A. Spalding,	Mar. 1836,	100
Lockport, (Wesleyan)	J. B. Barnes,	Sept. 1836,	
Lockport, (Female)	Margaret F. Snell,	May 1837,	
Lyons, (Wayne)	Miles Hinman,	April 1837,	36
Macedon, (Wayne)	D. Osband Macedon Centre, p. o.	May 1837,	91
Madison County,	F. Rice, (Cazenovia)	May 1836,	280
Madison, (Madison Co.)	Deacon Philip Tompkins,	Dec. 1336,	70
Madison, (Female)		1838,	20
Manheim, (Herkimer)	S. G. Haskins,	May 1838,	
Manlius,	John M ^r Vickar,	June 1836,	112
Marion, (Wayne)	Benjamin B. Durfee,		87
Marshall, (Oneida)	Rufus Pratt,	June 1837,	
Mexico,		1835,	
Middlefield, (Otsego)			
Milford,	Parker Scott,	Dec. 1836,	28
Milton, (Saratoga)	Caleb M. Hoyt,	1838,	100
Milville,	Rev. Richard Dunning,	Dec. 1835,	40
Monroe County,	Dr. W. W. Reid,		
Montgomery County,	W. Kennedy, (Johnstown)	July 1837,	90
Moore's, (Clinton)	James S. Shedden,	1835,	75

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Moriah, (Essex)	Rev. Bishop Isbelle,	Sept. 1836,	68
Morrisville,		April 1835,	
Mount Morris,	Reuben Sleeper,	April 1836,	100
Murray, (Orleans)	Mr. Benedict,	May 1837,	50
Naples, (Ontario)	John Hill,	April 1838,	30
Napoli, (Cataaugus)	Phineas F. Noble,	Jan. 1837,	76
New Fane, (Niagara)	Joseph Brown,	Mar. 1837,	40
New Hartford,	Dr. U. H. Kellogg,		
New Haven, (Oswego)			
New Hudson, (Allegany)	S. L. Davidson,		35
New Lisbon, (Oswego)	H. Pettingell,	1837,	18
New Sweden and Clintonville,	Lewis Woodard Pierce,	April 1837,	50
New Stead, (Erie)	John F. Ball, P. M.	Feb. 1837,	48
New-York, (State)	Rev. B. Green,	Oct. 1835,	625
New-York, (City)		Oct. 1833,	24
New-York City, (Methodist)	Rufus F. Hibbard,	1838,	
New-York City, (Young Men's)	J. F. Robinson, Esq.	May 1834,	
New-York City, (Garrison)	William R. Jackson,	May 1838,	25
New-York City, (Female)	Mrs. A. L. Cox,	April 1835,	
Niagara County,	Lyman A. Spalding,	April 1836,	578
Niagara, (Niagara Co.)			
North Bergen,		Mar. 1836,	200
Norway, (Herkimer)	David Humphreyville,	June 1836,	65
Nunda, (Allegany)		July 1835,	160
Ogden, (Monroe)			80
Oneida County,	Seth B. Roberts, Esq. (Rome.)	May 1835,	
Oneida Institute,	William Hunter,	June 1833,	90
Oneida Castle,			30
Ontario County,	John Mosher,	July 1837,	
Onondaga County,	William M. Clarke, (Manlius)	1837,	
Oppenheim, (Montgomery)		1837,	
Orangeville, (Genessee)		Feb. 1837,	150
Oriskany,	C. C. Chaffer,	July 1835,	40
Oriskany Falls,	Z. Lathrop,		
Orleans County,	Alba Sumpson,	June 1836,	
Oswego County,	Starr Clark,	Oct. 1835,	182
Otsego County,		1835,	
Otsego,	Martin Bridges,	Jan. 1836,	31
Palermo, (Oswego)			
Palmyra, (Wayne)	Otis Clapp,	Dec. 1834,	165
Palmyra, (Female)	Almira Edson,	Dec. 1837,	47
Panama, (Chautauque)	Enoch Morgan,	Jan. 1837,	25
Parma Centre, (Monroe)	George W. Andrews,	Dec. 1836,	140
Paris,	Alonzo Gray,	Aug. 1835,	167
Perry, (Genessee)	Josiah Andrews,	Feb. 1835,	350
Perrysburgh, (Cataaugus)	D. D. Perker,	Feb. 1837,	51
Perrinton,	Justus Beardsley,	Aug. 1835,	70
Peru, (Clinton)	John H. Barker,	Feb. 1837,	200
Peru, (Female)	Ruth Keese,	Dec. 1833,	476
Peruville,	Sumner Whiting,	June 1837,	86
Peterborough, (Madison)			
Phenix, (Juvenile, N.Y. City)	Lewis H. Tappan,		100
Pike, (Allegany)	C. C. Chaffee,	Dec. 1837,	125
Pittsford,	James Linnel,	Jan. 1837,	100
Pitcher, (Chenango)	Dr. David McWharton,	June 1837,	60
Plymouth, do.	William Skinner,	June 1837,	25
Pompey, (Onondaga)	O. J. Wheaton,	April 1837,	15
Pompey, (Female)	Miss Mary Ann Gillett,	April 1837,	100
Portage, (Allegany)			
Porter,	Elder Olney,	April 1837,	75
Poughkeepsie,	John L. Duzenbury,	Mar. 1835,	62

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
Poundridge, (Westchester)	Jos. Scofield,	Mar. 1837,	30
Potsdam, (St. Lawrence Co.)	Gardiner Sweet,		
Prattsburgh,	Erastus Skinner,	Nov. 1837,	60
Preble, (Cortland)	J. J. Johnson,	July 1837,	50
Randolph, (Cataaugus)	Daniel Nichols,	Jan. 1837,	33
Remsen, (Oneida)			
Renselaerville, (Albany)	G. W. Durant,	Mar. 1838,	90
Richland, (Oswego)	W. H. Pettit,	April 1835,	85
Richmond, (Ontario)	George Thayer,	Dec. 1836,	115
Ridgeville,	Joshua W. Fiske,		60
Riga, (Monroe)	Joshua P. Rogers,	Feb. 1837,	65
Ripley,			95
Rochester City,	G. A. Avery,		700
Rochester, (Fem. colored)			
Rochester, (Female)	Mrs. Susan Porter,	Sept. 1835,	400
Roger Williams, (N. Y.)	Rev. J. N. Horner,	Mar. 1837,	51
Rome,	Benjamin P. Johnson,	July 1834,	154
Royalton, (Niagara)	Wm. Adams, (Middleport)		300
Rushford, (Allegany)	Alford Bull,	Jan. 1837,	111
Russia, (Herkimer)	Nathan Johnson,	Jan. 1837,	54
Rutledge, (Cataaugus)	George F. Fort,	Feb. 1837,	39
Salisbury,		Jan. 1837,	20
Sandlake,			
Sauquoit, (Female)	Emily Priest,	May 1835,	44
Saratoga County,	Clark Lockwood,	April 1837,	
Sardina, (Erie)		Dec. 1836,	125
Sangersfield,	Jeremiah Clark,	Mar. 1837,	20
Schenectady County,			
Scheneectady,	Isaac G. Duryee,		
Seipio,	Enoch Honeywell,		
Scott, (Cortland)	Raymond P. Babcock,	Dec. 1836,	123
Seneca County,	D. W. Forman,	Oct. 1837,	
Sennett, (Cayuga)	Samuel Marsh,	Feb. 1838,	45
Seventh Free Church, N. Y.	Bates,		
Shelby,	Rev. R. Dunning,	Mar. 1837,	23
Sheldon, (Genessee)	Daniel Rudd,	Mar. 1836,	92
Sherburne,	G. Copeland,		100
Sherburne, (Female)	Mrs. H. Avery,	April 1835,	
Sheridan, (Chatauque)	Edmond Mead,		75
Shushan, (Washington)	Daniel Valentine, Jr.		
Sinclairville, (Chatauque)			25
Skaneateles,	Jas. C. Fuller,	Feb. 1837,	41
Smithfield and vicinity,	Colquhon Grant,	July 1836,	100
Smithfield, (Jefferson)	Austin Putnam,	May 1837,	
Somerset, (Niagara)	Elijah Richardson,	Nov. 1836,	87
South Evans, (Erie)	Lewis Varney, (Collins, r. o.)	Jan. 1837,	75
South New Berlin, (Chenango)		1837,	
Spencertown, (Columbia)	Henry Johnson,	June 1836,	62
Springfield, (Otsego)	Wm. Lindsey,	Sept. 1836,	
Springville, (Erie)	Wm. F. Church,	Sept. 1835,	100
Stauben County,	Rev. C. Wheeler, (Bath)	Jan. 1836,	
Sterling, (Cayuga)	Wm. M'Knight,	June 1837,	30
St. Lawrence County,	Truman Smith,	Aug. 1837,	
St. Helena, (Genessee)	S. R. Lathrop, (Castile r. o.)	1837,	35
Stockton, (Chatauque)			40
Stone Church, (Genessee)	Daniel Rudd,	Mar. 1837,	92
Strykersville, (Genessee)	A. B. Hall,	Mar. 1836,	60
Suffolk County,	Rev. J. R. Moser,	Aug. 1835,	
Sweden, (Monroe)	Chauncey Staples,	Mar. 1837,	150
Tarrytown,	Dr. James Law,	May 1830,	
Third Free Church, (N. Y.)	James W. Farr,		

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Thorp's Patent, (Clinton)	Daniel Wescot, (Peru P. O.)	1838,	40
Tompkins County,	B. Johnson, Esq. (Ithaca)	April 1837,	150
Trenton, (Oneida)			
Troy,	Ebenezer Clarke,	April 1835,	150
Troy, (Female,)		April 1835,	
Turin, (Lewis)	Henry Page,	May 1834,	161
Union College, (Schenectady)	George L. Lerow,	July 1836,	53
Utica,	Rev. O. Wetmore,	June 1834,	550
Utica, (Female)	Mrs. M. S. Savage,	Nov. 1835,	70
Utica, (Young Men)	J. T. Marshall,	Dec. 1835,	100
Utica, (Juvenile)		April 1833,	
Utica, (Female Juvenile)		April 1833,	
Utica, (Wesleyan)	J. S. Mitchell,		
Vernon, (Oneida)			
Verona, (Oneida)	Ambrose Coan,	Feb. 1837,	30
Victor, (Ontario)	A. Simonds,	Dec. 1836,	80
Vienna, (Oneida)	Sullivan Brigham,	April 1833,	99
Volney,			
Wales, (Erie)	Milton Noyes,	Dec. 1835,	50
Walton,	John S. Nash,	Nov. 1836,	80
Walworth, (Wayne)	Lucius Strong,		14
Warsaw, (Genessee)	Levi Spencer,	July 1834,	200
Warsaw, (Female)	M. A. Woodward,	July 1835,	156
Washington County,	Erastus D. Culver,	Nov. 1835,	
Washington,	Robert F. Biddle,		
Waterloo,	Joseph S. Dervey,	Dec. 1836,	20
Waterville, (Oneida)			
Wayne County,	John J. Thomas,		
Westfield,			142
Westford,	William Paddock,	Dec. 1836,	
West Aurora,	Rev. R. G. Murry, (Griffin's	Sept. 1835,	25
West Bloomfield, (Ontario)	Sereno French, [Mills, P.O.	1837,	120
West Chester County,	C. Roscoe, Esq. (Sing Sing P.O.		
West Chester,	N. V. Pennypacker,		
West Galway,		Nov. 1835,	
West Granville,		July 1835,	78
West Groton, (Tompkins)	Joseph Goodyear,	June 1837,	40
West Hartwick, (Otsego)	Erastus Robinson,		43
West Leyden,	Jonathan A. Pease,		32
West Lincklaen,	W. Arigil,	June 1837,	55
West Mendon,	P. Pank,	Dec. 1836,	46
West Otto, (Cataaugus)	John Ferris,	Feb. 1837,	21
West Peru, (Clinton)	E. F. Hoag, (Keesville, P. O.)	April 1837,	45
West Sandlark, (Renselaer)	James Parkes, Jr.		42
West Sparta, (Livingston)			
Westmoreland, (Oneida)			
Wesleyan A. S. (Cazenovia)			35
Wethersfield, (Genessee)	D. L. Groger, (Gainesville P.O.)	April 1837,	44
Wheatland, (Niagara)			
Whitesborough, (Female)	Emeline Smith,	May 1834,	50
Whitesborough, (Juvenile)		1834,	
Whitcreek,	H. R. Dunham,	Mar. 1836,	
Whitestown,	Rev. L. H. Loss,	April 1834,	291
Wilson, (Niagara)	Daniel Holmes,	Dec. 1835,	124
Winfield, (Herkimer)	Samuel Smith,	Feb. 1837,	35
Windsor,	Spencer Reed,	April 1834,	47
Woodhull,	Calvin Seal, Esq.	1836,	100
Yates County,	Roscius Morse,	Nov. 1837,	116
York, (Livingston)	Rev. John Fisher,	April 1835,	140

Whole number of Societies, 369.

NEW JERSEY.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Boonton,	John Grimes,		
Bloomfield,	John Ward,	Aug. 1837,	
Haddonfield & Fredericville,		1836,	
Newark, (Colored)	John A. King,	1837,	
Newark,	Ellison Conger,	April 1836,	60
Newark, (Colored Juvenile,)	Adam Ray,	Jan. 1837,	
Newark, (Juvenile)	N. Dougherty,	Jan. 1837,	150
Patterson,	Patterson,	1837,	80
Patterson, (Juvenile)	— Insec,		
Princeton,			
Snow Hill and Mt. Zion,	Isaac Clement,	Feb. 1837,	92
Springfield,		1834,	
Whippany,			
Whippany, (Juvenile)	William H. Ritchel,	Jan. 1837,	

Whole number of Societies, 14.

PENNSYLVANIA.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
<i>Adams County,</i>	William M. Reynolds,	Dec. 1836,	31
Adamsburgh,	Robert M'Guffy,		
Allegheny Town,		Jan. 1836,	
Allegheny, (Wesleyan)	James P. Morris,	Aug. 1837,	
Amity, (Erie)		1837,	36
Amwell, (Washington)	Joel Woods, (Amity, P. O.)	Oct. 1837,	25
Beaver Falls,	John Collins,	May 1836,	
<i>Beaver County,</i>	Rev. George Scott,	Feb. 1836,	
Belfontaine, (Centre)			25
Big Sugar Creek,	James Morrison, Esq.	1837,	
Blackleys, (Indiana)	John McAdoo,	Sept. 1837,	24
Bloomfield, (Crawford)		1837,	30
<i>Bucks County,</i>	H. Johnson,	July 1836,	60
Buckingham, (Bucks)		Dec. 1836,	71
Buffalo Township,	Abraham Ritner, (Washington)	Jan. 1837,	100
Burgittstown, (Washington)	John Stevenson,	July 1836,	20
<i>Bradford County,</i>	George F. Horton,	1838,	
Brownsville, (Fayette)	J. Stanley,	Sept. 1837,	50
Cannonsburgh, (Washington)			
Carlisle, (Cumberland)	Thomas Craighead, Jr.	Dec. 1836,	86
Centreville, (Washington)	O. M'Fadden, (E. Bethlehem)	Nov. 1837,	40
Ceres, (M'Kean)	Daniel Edwards, Jr.	Feb. 1837,	
<i>Chester County,</i>			
Clarkson, (Sadsbury)	Eli Hambleton,	Dec. 1832,	60
Clarksville, (Mercer)	Samuel Fruit,		27
Colerain,			
Conneautville, (Chester)	Theodore M. Power,	Feb. 1837,	
Connessville, (Fayette)	Herman Gebhart,	April 1835,	39
Cross Creek, (Washington)	Dr. R. Anderson,	Aug. 1836,	24
<i>Delaware County,</i>	James Rhoads,	Jan. 1837,	58
Donegal, (Washington)	J. Mayes, (West Alexander, P. O.)	Aug. 1837,	100
East Bethlehem, (Washington)	Joseph Mills,	Dec. 1836,	25
East Deer,	James Miller,	April 1838,	
East Fallowfield,	James Fulton, Jr.	Aug. 1835,	41
East Nantmeal,			
Elizabethtown,	James Elliott,	May 1836,	26

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
<i>Erie County,</i>	Rev. Charles Morton,	Feb. 1836,	
Fairview, (Erie)		1837,	53
Falsington,			
Fayetteville, (Franklin)	Rev. George H. C. Hussey,	July 1837,	
Florence, (Washington)	William L. Robb,	Mar. 1837,	40
Frankfort, (Philadelphia Co.)	John Lewis,		
Girard, (Erie)		1837,	12
Green, (Indiana)	William Evans,	1837,	43
Greenfield, (Erie)		1837,	20
Greensburg, (Westmoreland)	Albert Everhart,	May 1836,	
Greenville, (Luzerne)			
Harbour Creek, (Erie)	James Moorhead,	Feb. 1837,	45
Harrisburgh,	M. M'Kinney,	Jan. 1836,	109
Herrick, (Susquehanna)	J. T. Dimmick,	April 1838,	
Hickory, (Mercer)	John Rankin, Esq.	1837,	35
Honesdale, (Wayne)	Stephen Brush,	April 1836,	132
Ickesburgh, (Perry)	John B. Baker,	Sept. 1837,	24
Kennett, (Chester)	Chandler Darlington,	Jan. 1837,	48
Kimberton, (Chester)	Abby Kimber,	Dec. 1836,	24
Lower Delaware Ward,	Caleb Clothier,	Mar. 1837,	
Lower Wakefield,	William Beans,	Dec. 1836,	25
Lower Wakefield, (Female)	Ann Buckman,	Dec. 1836,	12
Lundy, (Indiana)	William Laugaley,	1837,	24
Mahoning, (Indiana)	Allan Work,	1837,	27
M'Kean, (Erie)	Job Stafford,	1837,	60
Madisonville, (Westmoreland)		Sept. 1836,	26
Mead Township,	Seth Ward,	Dec. 1836,	
<i>Mercer County,</i>	Rev. A. W. Black,	July 1835,	
Middletown, (Dauphin)	George Smuller,	Oct. 1837,	57
Middletown, (Washington)	James M'Fadden,	1836,	120
Millersburgh, (Dauphin)			
Millstown,		Aug. 1835,	50
Millerstown, (Perry)		Sept. 1837,	23
Miller's Run, (Washington)	John Reed, Esq.	Mar. 1837,	
<i>Montgomery County,</i>			
Montrose, (Susquehanna)		May 1836,	
Mount Pleasant, (Washington)	James Allison,	July 1836,	80
Mt. Pleasant, (Westmoreland)	Isaac Sidner,	Feb. 1836,	77
Mountville, (Beaver)	Samuel Sterrill, (Portersville)	July 1834,	211
Morris Township, (Washington)	William Day, (Sparta)	Dec. 1836,	50
New Alexandria, (West'land)		Sept. 1836,	75
New Castle, (Mercer)	S. A. Semple,	Jan. 1837,	99
Neshannock, (Mercer)	Samuel Irvin, (Newcastle)	Dec. 1836,	58
Newton, (Bucks)			
Northeast, (Erie)	Dr. Ephraim Smedley,	Aug. 1835,	120
Nottingham, (Washington)	Dr. James Miller,	Jan. 1837,	30
Oxford, (Chester)	Joseph Keller,	Sept. 1836,	
Paoli,			
Penns' Manor,	Charles Magill,	Dec. 1836,	20
PENNSYLVANIA, (State)	S. Garrigues & Rev. T. Sproul,	1836,	
Perryopolis, (Fayette)		April 1836,	
Peters Creek, (Alleghany)	Hiram Hulst,	July 1836,	85
<i>Philadelphia County,</i>	Daniel Neal, Jr.	April 1834,	80
Philadelphia City,	Haworth Wetherall,		
Philadelphia, (Female)	Mary Grew,	Dec. 1833,	143
Philadelphia, (Juvenile)	Daniel L. Miller,	June 1836,	40
Philadelphia, (Junior)	Baldwin Chapman,		70
Pineville, (Bucks)	Joseph Gunner,	Oct. 1836,	
Pittsburgh,	John Dickson,	Oct. 1833,	240
do. and Alleghany, (Female)	Mrs. H. P. Gazzam,	Jan. 1836,	85
Powersown, (Crawford)		1837,	25

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
Shenandoah, (Crawford)	Vanleer Eachus,	1837,	50
Smithfield, (J. Fayette)	John McFann,	Dec. 1836,	86
Spring, (Crawford)	Rev. B. Allen,	April 1836,	51
Spring Garden, (Phil.)	Mr. Welis,	1837,	23
Springfield, (Eric)	Dr. Edwin Griffin,	1837,	30
South Mulberry Ward,	Wm. A. Garrigues,	Feb. 1837,	
Sagar Grove, (Warren)		1837,	80
Susquehanna County,	Albert L. Post, (Montrose)	April 1836,	300
Upper Darby & vicin. (Juv.)	William Sellers,	1837,	19
Upper Delaware Ward,	Rowland Johnson,		
Uwchlan, (Chester)	Morgan J. Thomas,	April 1837,	50
Warren, (Warren)		1837,	66
Washington County,	Samuel McFarland,	July 1836,	
Washington, (Washington)	George W. Brice, Esq.	Sept. 1834,	170
Washington, (Fayette)		April 1836,	
Washington, (Eric)	Mr. Helle,	1837,	45
Washington, (Indiana)	Samuel Thompson,	1837,	
Wayne County,	Rev. Alfred Ketchum,	Jan. 1837,	60
Wyalusing, (Bradford)	Dr. Geo. F. Horton,	Feb. 1837,	86
Wesleyan, (Philadelphia)			
West Chester,		Aug. 1835,	
West Finley, (Washington)	James McCoy,	1837,	25
West Greenville, (Mercer)			
West Middletown, (Wash.)	James McFadden,	Oct. 1835,	160
Westmoreland County,	W. Brown, (Greensburg p. o.)	Feb. 1836,	300
York,			

Total number of Societies, 126.

OHIO.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMB.
Abbeyville,	Mary W. Ladd,	Sept. 1836,	20
Adams and Brown County,	John C. Poage,	Sept. 1833,	
Akron,	Wm. E. Wright,	Feb. 1836,	
Amesville, (Athens)	Wm. R. Walker,	Feb. 1838,	76
Andover,			
Antrim (Guernsey)	John Walker,	Aug. 1836,	
Apple Creek,	Mr. Barrett,	Dec. 1836,	22
Ashland,	Wm. Wasson,		
Ashtabula County,	R. W. Walker,	1835,	
Ashtabula Co. (Female)	Miss Betsey Cowles,	Sept. 1836,	224
Athens, (Athens)		Jan. 1836,	94
Atwater,			
Austinburg,			
Austintown, (Trumbull)		1837,	23
Avon,			
Barlow, (Washington)	Jesse Lawton,	Jan. 1838,	32
Bazetta, (Trumbull)	Moses Messer,	Jan. 1837,	50
Batavia, (Clermont)		Sept. 1836,	
Batavia, (Trumbull)			
Beach Grove, (Adams)		Sept. 1836,	22
Berkshire and Berlin,			
Belmont County,	Joseph Grimes,		
Bethel, (Clermont)	James Denham,	Sept. 1836,	
Bloomfield, (Trumbull)			26
Do. & Sandusky, (Richland)	James Reeves, (Riblets p. o.)	1837,	45
Bloomingsburgh,	James T. Claypoole,	May 1835,	100

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Bloomingsburgh, (Female)	Sarah Stewart,	July 1837,	66
Brimfield, (Portage)	William Hall,	Feb. 1836,	42
Bristol, (Trumbull)	Alpheus Alvord,	Dec. 1836,	30
<i>Brown County,</i>			
Brownhelm, (Loraine)	Eld. C. Betts,	Dec. 1836,	50
Brookfield, (Trumbull)			60
Braceville, (Trumbull)	William Griswold,	1837,	85
Brunswick, (Medina)	A. Myers,	1835,	86
Cadiz, (Harrison)	William Boyer,	1835,	50
Camden, (Preble)	William Hall,		60
Canaan, (Wayne)	Dr. John Paul, P. M.	Dec. 1836,	98
Canfield, (Trumbull)		1836,	25
Canton, (Stark)	Abraham Baer,	1835,	50
Canton, (Female)	Mrs. E. A. G. Griswold,	Mar. 1836,	17
Cardington, (Marion)	Thomas Sharp,	April 1837,	30
Carlisle,	N. S. Bishop,		40
Champion, (Trumbull)	Hiram Baldwin,	1837,	21
Chardon, (Geauga)			
Charleston, (Portage)	R. Loomis,	1835,	25
Chester Township,	James Baker,	Jan. 1837,	14
Chester, (Geauga)	Dr. William N. Hudson,	April 1835,	125
Chillicothe,	John N. Templeton,		
Cincinnati,	A. Wattles,		
Cincinnati, (Women's)	Mrs. S. B. Eustis,	Feb. 1838,	
Circleville,			
Clarksfield,	Thomas F. Husted,	Aug. 1835,	26
Claridon, (Geauga)			
Clear Creek,	Joshua Brinkinhuff,	Dec. 1836,	30
Clermont County,	Andrew Coombs, Jr.		
Cleveland,	S. Severance,		
Clinton County,	Thomas Hibben, (Wilm.)	Oct. 1836,	
Columbiana County,	Abner G. Kirk,	Oct. 1834,	
Columbiana, (Columbiana)			
Concord, (Ross Co. Female)	Mrs. Mary Ann L. Gage,	Jan. 1838,	93
Cuyahoga Falls,	Ogden Wetmore,	Jan. 1836,	50
<i>Cuyahoga County,</i>			
Dear Creek, (Stark)	Samuel Beane,	Mar. 1836,	60
Delhi,			
Deerfield Township,	John Lewis,		25
Delaware County,	Milo D. Pettibone, (Del.)	Nov. 1836,	140
Dick's Creek & Monroe, (War.)	A. McFarlane,	Mar. 1838,	
Dover,	Wells Porter,	Jan. 1836,	
Dover, (Wayne)	James Cunningham,	Oct. 1836,	
Edinburgh, (Portage)	E. Pearson,	Mar. 1835,	24
Elyria, (Lorain)			
Elyria, (Female)			
Elyria, (Juvenile)	Sarah S. Monteith,	Aug. 1836,	
Euclid, (Cuyahoga)			
Farmington, (Trumbull)		1835,	71
Fairfield, (Columb.)			
<i>Fayette County,</i>	D. C. Eastman, (Bloomingsburgh,	May 1835,	78
Felicity,			60
Finley's Bridge,	Benj. Finley,		
Fitchville,			50
Flushing,	Asa Bronson,		
Fowler, (Trumbull)	Dea. John F. Kingsley,	Nov. 1837,	57
Fredericksburgh,		Dec. 1836,	
Freedom, (Portage)	Daniel T. Milliken,		30
Freeport,	W. Wolcott,		25
Geneva, (Ashtabula)	A. Cowles,		40
Geneva, (Female)	Mary Fitch,		

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
<i>Geauga County,</i>	Seth Marshali, Jr.	Sept. 1834,	1500
Georgetown, (Harrison)	Isaac Lewis,	Mar. 1836,	75
Georgetown, (Brown)			
Gilead, (Clermont)	A. Coombs,	Sept. 1836,	40
Goshen, (Belmont)	John Price, (Belmont)	1837,	18
Grafton,			
Granville,	Dr. W. W. Bancroft,	July 1835,	
Granville, (Female)	Mary E. Drury,	June 1835,	40
Grassy Run,	Thos. Shannon,	Sept. 1836,	
Green, (Trumbull)	M. Churchill,	1835,	75
Green Plain,	J. A. Dugdale (Cortsville, Clarke		50
Green, (Green)		1836,	90
Green, (Richland)	Robert Wilson,		
Green Township,	John S. W. Fetridge,	Dec. 1836,	54
Gustavus,	G. A. Griswold,	Sept. 1833,	140
Hanover, (Columbiana)	Dr. Abel Carey,	Mar. 1836,	30
<i>Harrison County,</i>		1834,	
Harrisville,	Samuel Lewis,		
Harrisville, (Madina)	Wilson Burr,	Dec. 1836,	
Hartford, (Licking)	David Bushnell,	Jan. 1837,	72
Hartford, (Trumbull)	Ralph Plumb,	1835,	96
Harveysburgh,	Dr. Jesse Harvey,	Mar. 1836,	17
<i>Highland County,</i>			
Hinkley,	O. Wilcox,		36
Hubbard, (Trumbull)	Alfred Tyler,	1837,	39
Hudson, (Portage)	J. B. Walker,	Sept. 1834,	84
<i>Huron County,</i>	F. D. Parish, (Sandusky)	Jan. 1837,	100
Huntsburgh, (Geauga)			
Indian Creek,	Elias Williams, (Riley p. o.)		37
Israel Township, (Preble)	N. Brown, (Camden p. o.)		25
Jefferson,			
Jefferson, (Richland)	John Lamb,	Feb. 1837,	15
Jersey,	Stephen K. Ward,		
Johnsonville, (Trumbull)	Alpheus Alphone,	Dec. 1836,	30
Johnstonville,	N. Webb,		25
Kingsville,			
Kinsman,	Dr. Dudley Allen,	1836,	60
Kirtland, (Geauga)			122
<i>Knox County,</i>	W. W. Beebe,	April 1836,	45
Lagrange, (Lorain)	N. P. Johnson,	1837,	
Lane Seminary, (Cincinnati)			
Leesburg and vicinity,	C. W. Scoles,	Feb. 1837,	33
Lexington,	Jonas Crosby,		
Liberty, (Trumbull)	James Scott,	1837,	50
Lima,	James Austin,		
Litchfield,	O. Cole,	1836,	72
Liverpool,			54
<i>Lorain County,</i>	Albert A. Bliss,		
Lordstown, (Trumbull)		Jan. 1837,	20
Lloydsville, (Belmont)	Samuel Swayne,	, 1837,	20
Lyme,			
Madison,	Rev. F. W. Adams,	1835,	60
Madison, (Female)	Mrs. Glezen,		112
Mahoning,	J. H. Day,		
Mansfield, (Richland)	Edward Sturges,	Mar. 1837,	56
Marshallville,	George Hanner,	Dec. 1836,	30
Marlborough,	Dr. A. Brook,	Feb. 1836,	90
Marietta, (Washington)		Aug. 1834,	80
Mecca, (Trumbull)	Enoch Starks,	Dec. 1836,	40
Medina,	Timothy Hudson, Esq.		

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Mesopotamia, (Trumbull)	Alonzo Bates,	Nov. 1836,	75
Miami University,	J. W. Stone, (Oxford)		
Miami, (Logan)			
Middlebury,			
Milan,			
Millbrook, (Wayne)	Elisha Wyman,	Dec. 1836,	35
Millersburg, (Holmes)			
Mount Leigh, (Adams)		1836,	
Monroe, (Clermont)	Samuel Jackson,	Sept. 1836,	
Monroe, (Jefferson)	S. S. Bushnell (Kellogsviller. o.	Oct. 1837,	43
Monroe County,	Jephthah Duvall,		
Monson, (Geauga)			
Moulton,	Samuel Hall,	1835,	106
Mount Pleasant,			75
Mount Union,			
Munson,	A. H. Talcott,	Feb. 1836,	12
Muskingum, (Muskingum Co.)	J. M'Cammon, (Irville P. O.)	Dec. 1836,	23
Muskingum County,	A. G. Allen, (Putnam)	July 1835,	502
Muskingum County, (Female)	Mrs. M. A. Sturges, (Putnam)	April 1835,	150
Nelson, (Portage)	S. Baldwin,	May 1835,	50
Neville, (Clermont)	Robert Galbreath,	Dec. 1836,	9
New Athens, (Harrison)	William Lee,	Aug. 1834,	208
New Concord, (Muskingum)	Andrew Magee,	Dec. 1835,	138
New Concord, (Young People's)	Oliver Wylie,	Mar. 1838,	23
New Garden,	Benjamin B. Davis,	Feb. 1834,	216
New Lisbon,	John Frost,	Mar. 1836,	40
New Lyme, (Jefferson)	L. B. Reeve,	Feb. 1838,	12
New Petersburg,	J. W. Eastman,	1838,	
New Richmond,	W. G. Gage,	Jan. 1836,	60
Newkirks,			
Newton, (Muskingum)			
Newton Falls, (Trumbull)	Horace Stephens,	1837,	70
North Bloomfield,	Asa Smith,		24
Norwich,			
Oberlin,	N. T. Chamberlin,	June 1835,	300
Oberlin, (Female)	Mrs. E. P. Ingersol,	Dec. 1835,	48
Oberlin, (Young Ladies')	Miss Angeline L. Terry,	Dec. 1835,	86
Ohio, (State)	M. R. Robinson,	April 1835,	
Painesville,	Raphael Marshall,	Sept. 1835,	153
Paint Valley,	Rev. James H. Dickey,	May 1833,	942
Penfield,			
Peru, (Delaware)	William Grissell,	Feb. 1837,	106
Perry, (Geauga)			
Pickaway County,	J. B. Finley,	Mar. 1835,	
Plain Township,	James Baker,	Jan. 1837,	14
Poland, (Trumbull)		1837,	200
Portage County,	James S. Carpenter,		
Portage County, (Female)	Miss Lucy Wright,		
Putnam, (Muskingum)	L. M. Chandler,	June 1833,	220
Randolph,	Truman Case,	Feb. 1834,	55
Ravenna,		Oct. 1835,	
Richfield,	Wyllys Welton,	Jan. 1836,	
Richhill, (Muskingum)	Wm. Auld, (Chandlersville r. o.	Dec. 1836,	53
Richmond, (Geauga)			
Ripley, (Brown)	Hon. A. Campbell,		
Ross County,	William Gage,	Aug. 1836,	242
Russel, (Geauga)	Wesley Whipple,	Jan. 1836,	33
Salem, (Columbiana)	A. G. Kirk,	1836,	70
Scott Township, (Adams)	James Williams,	July 1835,	50
Sheffield,	J. S. Burrill,	Jan. 1836,	77

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Somerton, (Belmont)	B. Stanton,	1835,	85
St. Alban's,	Mahlon Holden,	July 1835,	70
St. Albans' (Female)	H. Case,		
Southington, (Trumbull)		1837,	27
Springfield, (Hamilton)	N. S. Schooley,	Dec. 1836,	43
Sunbury,	Moses Allen,		69
Stark County,	A. Baer, Jr.	1836,	60
Steubenville, (Jefferson)	James E. Wilson,	April 1837,	60
Streetsborough,	D. Lane,	Nov. 1835,	46
Storrs,			
Tallmadge,	Elizur Wright, Esq.	April 1833,	87
Thompson, (Geauga)			
Trumbull County,	Rev. Benjamin Fenn,	Nov. 1836,	
Union Township, (Brown)	N. Brown, (Camden P. O.)		25
Unity, (Columbiana)			
Unionville, (Geauga)			
Unionville, (Female)			
Utica, (Licking)		Dec. 1836,	50
Vermillion, (Richland)	Wm. Dunlap, (Clear Cr. P. O.)	Feb. 1837,	40
Vernon,	Samuel Plumb,		50
Vernon, (Female)	Mary P. Sutliff,	Aug. 1835,	20
Vienna, (Trumbull)	Halsey P. Hart,	1834,	70
Wakenian,			70
Warren,			
Washington County,	S. Hall,	Feb. 1836,	
Washington & Monroe, (Richl.)	G. M'Farland, (Mansfield r.o.)	Feb. 1837,	25
Waynesburgh, (Wayne)	William Rogers,	Feb. 1836,	
Waynesburgh, (Stark)			30
Wayne, (Female)	Rachel Babcock,		
Weathersfield, (Trumbull)		Jan. 1837,	70
Welch Hill,	Erasmus Phillips,	Oct. 1835,	40
Wellington,			60
Wellsville,			
Western Reserve,	Rev. John Montieth,	Aug. 1833,	
Western Reserve College,		Nov. 1833,	70
West Union,			60
Westville, (Columbiana)	S. Cope,	June 1837,	26
White Oak, (Brown)		1836,	
Wilksville,		'837,	18
Willoughby,		April 1833,	121
Windham,	Denzon Kingsley,	Sept. 1834,	60
Wooster and Milbrook,			
Worthington, (Franklin)	Dr. Skinner,		68
Youngstown, (Trumbull)	William H. Fitch,	July 1836,	170

Whole number of Societies, 251.

INDIANA.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Cass County,	D. Cherry,	Mar. 1838,	36
Decatur County,	James M' Coy,		
Fall Creek,	Dr. E. Fussel,	July 1837,	
Fairfield, (Franklin Co.)	William B. Ogden,	Mar. 1838,	13
Logansport, (Cass Co.)		1836,	35
Middle Fork, (Wayne Co.)	K. Grave,	Feb. 1838,	
South Hanover College,			

ILLINOIS.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Canton, Farmington, Galesburgh, (Knox Co.) Galesburgh, (Juvenile) Hadley, ILLINOIS, (State) Jefferson County, Juliet, (Williams Co.) Lofton Prairie, (Green Co.) Madison County, Princeton, (Buren Co.) Putnam County, Williams County,	George W. Little, N. H. Losey, William S. Gale, Col. James Morrow, Dr. R. E. W. Adams, J. Brown, (Jerseyville P. O.) Owen Lovejoy, E. H. Phelps, William M. Stewart, Dr. R. E. W. Adams,	1837, Oct. 1837, Dec. 1836, 1836, Oct. 1836, Aug. 1837, 1837, Dec. 1837,	64 108 100

Whole number of Societies, 13.

MICHIGAN.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Ann Arbor, Detroit, Dexter, (Washtenaw Co.) East Bloomfield, (Oakland Co.) Farmington, (Oakland Co.) Franklin & Cambridge, (Lena. Greenoak, (Livingston Co.) Gull Prairie, Lenawee County, Logan, MICHIGAN, (State) Monroe, (Monroe Co.) Niles, (Berrien Co.) Oakland County, Raisin, Tecumseh, (Lenawee Co.) Troy, (Oakland Co.) Webster & Scio, (Washtenaw) West Bloomfield,	Charles H. Stewart, George Millard, Nathan Stone, Nathan Power, Isaac Smith, (Benton P. O.) Pitt Giddings, Benjamin Workman, Thomas Chandler, Arthur L. Porter, (Detroit) W. V. Studdingford, W. S. Elliott, George W. Wisner, Jeremiah Westgate, Benjamin Workman, Charles Hastings, John Holden,	Jan. 1837, April 1837, Jan. 1837, July 1837, Oct. 1836, Feb. 1837, Oct. 1836, Feb. 1836, April 1837, Jan. 1837, Mar. 1836,	 28 70 80 70 114 25 25 50 40 30 72 34

Whole number of Societies, 19.

DELAWARE.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
DELAWARE, (State)	Charles W. Denison,	Dec. 1837,	

UPPER CANADA.

NAMES.	SECRETARIES.	DATES.	MEMS.
Upper Canada,	Rev. E. Evans, (Toronto)	Jan. 1837,	106

Total number of Societies in the United States, 1350.