

# ANNUAL REPORT,

OBERLIN COLLEGE  
HISTORICAL COLLECTION.

FROM

*Mrs. D. M. Allen*

PRESENTED TO THE

OBERLIN  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

## American Anti-Slavery Society,

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

AT THE ANNUAL MEETING,

HELD IN NEW YORK, MAY 9, 1855.

WITH AN APPENDIX.

---

NEW YORK:

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

No. 138 Nassau Street.

1855. M. E.

100  
1841

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

100  
1841

## R E P O R T .

---

At the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held in New York, May, 1853, it was determined to revive the custom of an Annual Report, which had been interrupted for a series of years. An arrangement was accordingly made with the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, whose Reports had, in the meantime, covered the ground formerly occupied by those of this Society, by which the National Society was to be made responsible for the usual Annual Statement of the History, Anti-Slavery and Pro-Slavery, of each successive year. Circumstances beyond the control of the Executive Committee led to the omission of the last Report, a circumstance which we hope will not occur again. But this failure of necessity enlarges materially the field of our present survey, and must be our excuse for the cursory and imperfect manner in which many matters worthy of circumstantial treatment, must be rather hinted at than described in full.

We regard it as a wise and necessary custom which has made the Annual Reports of the Anti-Slavery Societies brief records, not merely of the proper action of the Societies themselves, but also of the current history of the year. For the current history of every year, in this country, is but the relation of what Slavery and Anti-Slavery have done. The only American History of permanent interest, or of immediate importance, is that which describes the growing conflict between Slavery and Liberty on this continent. And of this conflict the American Abolitionists are not merely the spectators but, the enemy themselves being witnesses, the chiefest movers and authors. That this struggle would have occurred had this Society never been gathered and had its members never been born, we know, — for we

believe that they are but the instruments of a higher Power, which would have raised up witnesses even from the stones to testify against this giant iniquity, had they never been. But having been called to this work, and having accepted the mission, it is just and proper that they should remark and record the things that they have helped to bring to pass.

It is not merely, then, of the sums of money that the members and friends of this Society have placed in the hands of your Committee, and of the distribution thereof that it is our duty to report to you; it is not only of the doings of Auxiliary Societies and of friendly Conventions, of the labors of devoted agents and faithful presses, and of efforts and operations strictly Anti-Slavery that we have to tell you. From these beginnings, indeed, arose the changes we behold around us, these were the weak and despised causes which have produced, and are still producing, the marvellous effects we see wherever we turn our eyes. And to the faithful maintenance of these testimonies in their highest purity, do we look for the final accomplishment of our great purpose—the highest prosperity, security and happiness of the whole nation by the removal of the curse of Slavery from both Bond and Free. But it is our privilege and our duty to note as it goes on the progress of the work we have begun, and to observe the gradual leavening of the general mind with the ideas and principles it is the business of this Society to spread abroad. We can only regret the necessary imperfections which must mark our work, and ask for the allowance and consideration we need.

#### CONGRESS.

The history of the last two years and a quarter, like that of all former years, has been but a succession of slave-holding insolences and aggressions, each more insolent and aggressive than the last. But this is the natural and necessary course of things and is a subject rather of congratulation than of regret, as it would seem that the Exodus of the Free States from their present bondage must lie through that Valley of Humiliation. The slave-whip of our overseers is all that is likely to arouse whatever of spirit and manhood our long submission has left in us, and the more mercilessly it is plied the more hope is there of our self-redemption. And it does not seem probable that our deliverance will be postponed by any relaxation of this

wholesome discipline of our masters. All we can hope is that we may have the grace to apply it to its proper uses, and that the desire of resistance may not be delayed until our spirit has been too effectually broken to make it possible.

For a session or two after the memorable campaign of 1850, it seemed as if the Peace which had been promised as the reward of those Compromises in which all the concessions were in favor of the South, had been conquered. The questions which would bring Slavery again before Congress were carefully avoided, and it was with difficulty that the earnest opponents of Slavery could have a blow at it. But this did not last long. It was a hollow truce only continuing during the Olympian race for the Presidency. While there was hope left, the eager competitors and their friends abstained from their usual strifes, in the hope that the Judges in whose hands the disposition of the crown has ever rested, might bestow it according to their hopes. But when this contest had been decided in a way which disappointed them all, it was no longer possible to keep the only thought of the nation's mind from struggling to an utterance.

In the month of January, 1853, an affront of a new description was offered to the Free States in the persons of Senators from three of them. In the arrangement of the Senate Committees, Messrs. HALE of New Hampshire, SUMNER of Massachusetts, and CHASE of Ohio, were excluded from a of them, on the avowed ground that they belonged to neither of the two great Pro-Slavery parties. Mr. BRIGHT of Indiana, in stating the fact, gave as its reason that these gentlemen "were outside of any healthy organization in this country!" The test of the political soundness of any party being thus openly admitted to be its subserviency to the Slave Power. For these Senators could be objected to on no other ground than their opposition to the aggressions of that Power. It was the first time, too, that members of either House have been disfranchised, so to speak, expressly on account of their opinions and political associations, however frequently it may be done by indirection and management. Inasmuch as the presence of one of these gentlemen on a Committee composed of four or five *wholesome* Senators could not have affected its action, this exclusion can only be regarded as an intentional affront to themselves and those they stood for.

The Senators thus evilly entreated met their proscription with dignity and good temper, and certainly neither their influence without the Senate nor their activity within it, were at all diminished by it:

A general voice of condemnation was raised against the conduct of the majority, throughout the country, by whatever presses were not hopelessly servile and Pro-Slavery. In this just censure, we regret to say, that the Legislature of Massachusetts, in which the Whigs, at that time, had a large majority, emphatically refused to join. The subject was brought up by Mr. PRINCE of Essex, who offered an order that the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report Resolutions, condemning the action of the Senate of the United States, in excluding from its Standing Committees a Senator of Massachusetts, because of his political opinions. When the order came up for discussion, it found no defender but its mover, and after a few brief and contemptuous speeches from the majority, it was rejected by a vote of 190 nays to 50 yeas. It was observable that the delegations of Boston and the large towns in which Whig influences were predominant, went unanimously against any expression of resentment at this insult offered to the State in the person of one of her Senators. This was undoubtedly one of the many causes of disgust which has since led to the utter demolition of that party, so strong in influence and wealth, in its very strongest hold, of which we shall have occasion presently to speak.

#### KANSAS AND NEBRASKA.

But real dangers of new and threatening shapes soon drove from observant and reflecting minds the thoughts of this action of the Senate, which ended in the insulting distinction thus set up. During that same session, a Bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Nebraska passed the House of Representatives by a large majority. The necessity and propriety of this action seemed to be conceded, and there was no apprehension that the regular course would not be allowed in this case as in all others, since the Missouri Compromise. The whole of this Territory lying North of the line then agreed upon as the boundary of Slavery, no suspicion existed that it would not be erected in due time into a Free State, according to the line of precedents dating from that time. But during the very last hour of the session, the motion to take up the Bill was laid on the table, on the motion of Senator BORLAND of Arkansas. This procedure was favored by the Senators from Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and the other Slave States; and even Northern Whig Senators were found so blind or so false as to follow the Southern leading. Thus

the delay which the conspirators needed to mature and complete their designs was granted to them by treacherous or short-sighted men from the North.

In this discussion, Senator ATCHISON of Missouri, openly avowed the ground of his opposition to be, that the law excluding Slavery from the Territory of Louisiana, North of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , would be enforced in the new Territory, "*unless specially rescinded.*" He did not, however, appear to entertain any hope that this desirable end could be brought about. Still, the organization of the Territory, at that time, was defeated for the reason that it would not be open to the Slaveholding as well as to the Free States. It was done as the next best thing to rejection, being a putting off of the evil day that should secure those rich lands from the blight of Slavery. Time was gained, the idea of the possibility of a Repeal of the Missouri Compromise was thrown out, and it was left to take root in the mind of the nation, with the chance of growing up to perfection. But it is likely that even the most fanatical of the propagandists of Slavery regarded this as a thing rather to be hoped for than expected. They could hardly think that even Northern subserviency could be brought to the point of abandoning the landmark at which the Nation had agreed, after a fierce conflict, that the waves of Slavery should be stayed. The intimations thus thrown out produced no general alarm among the inhabitants of the Free States. It seemed an audacity, before which even the indomitable spirit of Slavery would shrink. But it was caught up and cherished by the Slaveholding fanatics at the South, and seized upon by unscrupulous political adventurers at the North as a new chance of conciliating the favor of the supreme power in the land.

At the very beginning of January, 1854, Mr. DOUGLASS of Illinois, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories, made a Report which contained the first open, and as it were official, declaration of the impending *coup d'état*. This Report assumed, as its basis, that the Compromise Acts of 1850 were the supreme, authentic Law of the Land. As the question of Slavery in New Mexico and Utah was left an open one, to be decided by the will of the inhabitants when they came to form themselves into a State, so it was proper to leave to chance or political trickery the fate of an immense territory in this point the most vital to its prosperity and virtue. The Missouri Compromise was recited and coolly put aside as immaterial, when coming in collision with this latest exposition of the sovereign pleasure of Slavery. The Missouri Bill solemnly declared as follows:--

*“And be it further enacted, That in all that Territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies North of 36° 30' N. L., not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this Act, Slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and hereby is, prohibited forever.”*

This perpetual prohibition, Mr. DOUGLASS proposed incidentally to repeal, by the following provision in the Bill for the Territorial Organization of Nebraska:—

*“And when admitted as a State or States, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without Slavery, as their Constitutions may prescribe at the time of their admission.”*

And this, because “a proper sense of patriotic duty enjoined on the Committee the propriety and necessity of a strict adherence to the principles, and even a literal adoption of the enactments, of that adjustment (the Compromise of 1850) in all their Territorial Bills, so far as the same are not locally inapplicable!” Later in the same month, the same Committee submitted an amended Bill, by which two Territories, Kansas and Nebraska, were to be created out of the domain in question, the Missouri Compromise being put aside in the same cavalier manner, as in the first draught, and the opportunity given to erect two Slave States, instead of one, out of lands solemnly and forever consecrated to Liberty. And thus the great issue was again joined before the tribunal of the world between Freedom and Slavery.

The leaders in this conspiracy, the President of the United States being an avowed partaker in it, seem to have hoped that there would have been no serious opposition to its success in Congress. The quarrels between the different sections of the Northern Democratic party, and the desire of those suspected of the taint of an indisposition towards the absolute supremacy of Slavery to vindicate their characters from this aspersion, gave the Administration an open market for politicians, with more than seventy millions of dollars in pocket for the driving of bargains on the most favorable terms. Although the result showed that these expectations were not without foundation, yet the villany could not be accomplished with the secrecy and silence in which they had hoped to hurry through their deed of darkness. Sunk, as the North had seemed to be, in the humiliation of her submission to the



Compromises of 1850, and to the insults which directly flowed from them, there was yet left spirit enough to protest, to vapor, and even to hint at threats, when this new ignominy was offered to it. On the 22d of January, Messrs. CHASE and SUMNER, of the Senate, and Messrs. GIDDINGS, WADE, DEWITT, and GERRITT SMITH, of the House, issued a stirring and weighty Appeal to the People of the United States, urging and imploring instant action to avert the impending calamity. This Appeal was circulated over the whole country, and helped greatly to excite and to inform the public mind as to the urgency of the crisis. That it was timely and dangerous to the success of the plot, was acknowledged in the fierce and vindictive assault made upon it and its signers by Mr. DOUGLASS, on the 31st of January. The calm and dignified reply of Mr. CHASE, which put the whole scheme in a yet clearer light, while it only irritated still farther the rage of the detected traitor, drew the eyes of the country more earnestly to the question, and made its importance more than ever understood and appreciated.

The discussion of the Bill was continued in the Senate, from time to time, through January and February. It was the absorbing topic which swallowed up all other interests, at Washington and throughout the country. The vote was finally reached at five o'clock of the morning of the Fourth of March, when the Bill passed the Senate by a vote of *twenty-three to fourteen*. *Fourteen* of the votes in its favor were given by Senators from the Free States; and *two* of those in the negative by Senators from Slave States—Messrs. HOUSTON, of Texas, and BELL, of Tennessee. Nine were absent, of whom six were from Free States, among whom was Mr. EVERETT, of Massachusetts. This gentleman had given but small satisfaction even to the class of politicians who had sent him to the Senate, by his trimming and vacillating course on this most important matter. In his speech on the subject, while he argued against the general doctrine and purpose of the Bill, he tried to allay the general excitement and just indignation this outrage was exciting everywhere in the Free States, by urging that the nature of the soil and climate must forever exclude Slave labor from the Territories in question. It was the old argument of Mr. WEBSTER, in the case of New Mexico, as to the Anti-Slavery virtues of "Oriental scenery and physical geography," with differences to suit the new case. As if Slavery could not exist in a country, nearly the whole of which is within the same parallels of latitude as Virginia and Missouri! A general voice of rebuke and dissatisfaction went up from the Northern press, even including many of the fiercest defenders of the Compromises

of 1850. There was scarcely one to justify or extenuate his words. And this failure to record his vote against the crowning iniquity, brought down a fresh storm of indignation on his head, which the excuse of ill health and surprise had but little effect in allaying. This general dissatisfaction was, probably, a main cause of Mr. EVERETT'S resignation of his seat in the Senate, which took place not long after.

The debates in the Senate on this Bill were of the most interesting description. The Slaveholders, and their Northern tools, brought all their usual artillery of misrepresentation, cajolement, and intimidation to bear on their adversaries. We are happy to say that a brave resistance was offered to the consummation of the villany by many Northern, and by at least two Southern Senators. Besides Mr. CHASE, MESSRS. FESSENDEN, of Maine, WADE, of Ohio, BELL, of Tennessee, HOUSTON, of Texas, and others, resisted the completion of the great Dishonesty, on various grounds and with differing lights, but with energy of purpose, and with much ability. But it will not be invidious to mention MESSRS. SUMNER, of Massachusetts, and SEWARD, of New York, as foremost in the conflict as the champions of the Right. The laborious research with which they exhausted the subject in its every detail and bearing, and the skillful rhetoric and indignant eloquence they invoked to set the truth in order before the Senate and the world, deserved, as they commanded, the admiration and gratitude of all lovers of liberty everywhere. But while sharing the general sense of obligation to these gentlemen for the gallant stand they made against this fierce onset of the common enemy, we cannot fail to perceive the weaknesses inherently incident to the position of men attacking a deadly foe, who is, at the same time, their acknowledged ancient ally. Admirable as their speeches were, they were not free from the blemishes which must inhere in the best words uttered with the gag of the Constitution in the speakers' mouths. The most graceful and athletic of men cannot dance altogether well in fetters.

For instance, we utterly protest against Mr. SUMNER'S doctrine that "the Slavery Question will be settled," and that "it will no longer enter with distracting force into the National politics, making and unmaking laws and Presidents," after it has been removed from the sphere of National legislation. As Mr. SUMNER claims for the Movement against Slavery with which he is connected, that "it is not contrary to the Constitution, for it recognizes the paramount law, and in the administration of the Government, invokes the spirit of the founders," we conceive that he does not propose to abolish the three-

fifth basis, or the rendition of Fugitive Slaves in the way, whatever it was, that "the founders" had in their mind; nor, yet, the right of the South to call on the General Government to put down their servile wars. How futile is it, then, to talk of tranquility being established, and of Slavery being removed from the field of National politics, by its prohibition in the Territories, and its abolition in the District! Why should not the Slaveholders continue to make our laws and our Presidents? They have the same power as ever, and the same temptations to exercise it. And Mr. SUMNER trusts the North and the South, amidst all differences of opinion, "will ever have a heart and a hand for each other." Unquestionably, they will. The same heart and hand they have ever had. The hand of service and the heart of submission on the part of the one, and the hand of chastisement and the heart of despotic contempt on the part of the other. This glorious Union looks fair for a long duration.

We wish we could ask the Slaveholders, with the confidence expressed by Mr. SEWARD, whether "they see any signs that we (of the North) are becoming indifferent to freedom?" adding, "on the contrary, that old, traditional, hereditary sentiment of the North, is more profound and more universal than it ever was before!" If this be true, alas for the good old times! Verily, let no man say that they were better than these. But we think the Slaveholders read the Signs of the Times better than Mr. SEWARD. When they see the chiefest lawyers, merchants, and capitalists, of New York, organizing themselves into a Negro-catching Committee, and Fugitive Slaves marched down Broadway as living witnesses of their fidelity; when they see the City of Boston turned into a Den of Thieves, and impudent kidnappers bearding the very Senate of the Bay State; when they see their Slaves caught by the score in the Quaker State of Pennsylvania; when the Sabbath air came to their ears loaded with apostolic exhortations from nearly all the pulpits of the North, to be faithful unto the end in catching Negroes—for this was the Whole Duty of Man; and when they saw both parties, by their representative bodies at Baltimore, vying with each other in the fervor of their protestations of loyalty to Slavery; in the presence of all these things, we really think the Slaveholders will not be much dismayed at Mr. SEWARD's appeals. As in JOHN RANDOLPH's time, they reckon upon Northern politicians with as much certainty as they do upon their Negroes. They have done them Yeoman's service, and will again, when the dispensation of the public plunder comes round again.

But we did not intend to dwell as long as we have on the inventions of men as to this matter ; but rather to the part assigned to God and his Providence by devout orators. Mr. SUMNER, at the conclusion of his Speech, says :—

“ Believing in the sure prevalence of Almighty Truth, I confidently look forward to the good time when both will unite, according to the sentiments of the fathers and the true spirit of the Constitution, in declaring Freedom, and not Slavery, *national*, while Slavery, and not Freedom, shall be *sectional*. Then will be achieved that Union, contemplated at the beginning, against which the storms of faction, and the assaults of foreign power shall beat in vain, as upon the Rock of Ages ; and LIBERTY, *seeking a firm foothold, will have at last WHEREON TO STAND AND MOVE THE WORLD.*”

That is to say, that a Union which recognizes Slavery so far as to make a treaty stipulation for the return of Fugitive Slaves, to be executed, in some way or other, an essential part of itself ; which protects Slavery against the Slave’s Right of Revolution, by pledging the whole force of the Government to put it down ; and which clothes the Slave-master with peculiar privilege and extraordinary power in virtue of his man-ownership ; that such a Union is the foothold to be furnished by the prevalence of Almighty Truth, whereon Liberty is to stand and move the world ! Under Mr. SUMNER’s favor, we cannot think so humbly of Almighty Truth that it can have anything to do with such an instrument, except to dash it in pieces, even if it should ever receive the repairs and restorations he desires, and its mischiefs be confined within the bounds he thinks the inventors meant should contain them. Mr. SEWARD, too, is devoutly disposed, as his Speech grows to an end. He says :—

“ ‘ Man proposes, and God disposes.’ You may legislate, and abrogate, and abnegate, as you will ; but there is a superior Power that overrules all your actions, and all your refusals to act ; and, I fondly hope and trust, overrules them to the advancement of the happiness, greatness, and glory of our Country — that overrules, I know, not only all your actions, and all your refusals to act, but all human events, to the distant, but inevitable result of the equal and universal liberty of all men.”

Now there is certainly a sense in which all believers in Divine Providence, which in the end educes good out of evil, will accept these sort of aspirations. They will agree that the great and good revolutions in human affairs will go on, let who will lay their ineffectual fingers on

the great wheel that carries them forward. They believe, as Erskine said, in 1797, of Parliamentary Reform, that "there is an arm fighting against the oppressors of Freedom, stronger than any arm of flesh, and that the great progressions of the world, in spite of the confederacies of power and the conspiracies of corruption, move on with a steady pace, and arrive, in the end, at a happy and glorious consummation." But they know, too, that these advancements are always very slow, and that they often crush dynasties and polities into dust before their chariot-wheels. It is beyond question true, as will be admitted by all who admit the existence of a Superintending Power, higher than Man, or who believe that the natural tendency of Man is towards the highest condition of which he is capable, it is certain that Slavery will come to an end at some time and in some way. But it is by no means certain that it can or will be done except through great tribulation, and much upturning, and many overturnings. What is there in the character of this American Nation that they should be the especial charge of the Most High? Is it that we have extirpated the races He had planted here at first, with fire-water and the sword? Is it that we consented to let England (as we say) force Negro Slavery upon us? Is it that we organized into our Institutions this one which denies all knowledge of God, and of what we profess to believe to be truths essential to Salvation, to one-sixth of His children? Is it that we have promoted this System by blood and this fraud to the utmost of our power, and spread it where it did not exist, and still sigh for new worlds for its fatal victories? Are these things such as should recommend us to the especial favor of a God of Justice and Love? And yet, to judge from the words of priests and politicians, we are His chosen people, on whom depend all the hopes of mankind!

While the question was pending in the Senate, the public mind was in a state of strong agitation, which sought expression in public meetings in various parts of the country. Some of these were particularly observable from the character and former course of the persons who took part in them. Among the most prominent of the protestants against the Bill of 1854, were the most zealous partizans of the Bill of 1850. The ignominious treatment which Mr. WEBSTER had received at the hands of the Southern Whigs, after all the submissions and humiliations he and his friends had submitted to as the price of his nomination, had been rankling for years in their breasts, and they were not slow in embracing so favorable an occasion as this for a word of impotent rebuke to their Southern task-masters. Such a Meeting was

held in the Tabernacle, in this City, on the 30th of January. Mr. SHEPHERD KNAPP, the Treasurer of the Castle Garden Union-Saving Meeting, presided. He was supported on either side by Union Savers, of various types of political faith, but of the most unquestionable loyalty to Slavery, on the adjustment of 1850. Mr. ROBERT EMMETT moved the Resolutions, and they were seconded by Mr. JAMES W. GERARD, who had been the mover of the Castle Garden Resolutions, in the year of Compromise. Another Meeting, of the same character, was held in Faneuil Hall, towards the end of February. The Chair was taken by the Hon. SAMUEL A. ELIOT, the Boston Representative in Congress, who voted for the Compromise Bills, including the Fugitive Slave Act, and the platform was covered with men who hailed those measures as the Salvation of the Country. The set speeches of the occasion were made by men of the same class. These meetings were not without significance, as indicating the changes which had been silently working their way in men's opinions, notwithstanding the insolent attempts to crush them into one Pro-Slavery mould. They showed, at least, that the men who had been the most ready to sacrifice the unhappy Slave for the accomplishment of their own political purposes, had been compelled to feel how vain are any hopes founded on the promises of Slaveholders.

Multitudes of other Meetings were held in various parts of the Country, to protest against this stupendous fraud. Great numbers of Petitions and Remonstrances were forwarded to Washington, in the desperate hope of affecting the action of the House of Representatives. Perhaps the most remarkable of these efforts, regarding both its nature and its treatment, was the Memorial of the Clergy of New England, signed by more than three thousand ministers, of all denominations. Among these many names, besides those of clergymen long known and tried as faithful Anti-Slavery men, were to be seen the signatures of not a few who had deserved and received the thanks of the Slaveholding and Pro-Slavery politicians that bestowed the Compromises on the Country. The most eminent of the preachers of the Gospel of Slave-catching, in 1850, were now found ready to protest against this farther extension of its kingdom. The venerable Dr. WOODS, of Andover, Dr. G. W. BLAGDEN, Dr. SAMUEL BARRETT, Dr. J. B. WATERBURY, Dr. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, of Boston, and various others, equally eminent for piety and loyalty to Slavery, signed this Remonstrance against the natural and logical consequences of what they had exalted as political and Christian duty two or three years before. We trust

that this change of hand was a sign of a change of heart, and not a mere expression of spleen at the disappointment of their Presidential favorite in his ambitious hopes. But these reverend gentlemen found their reception from the men in high places very different from that accorded to them in the days when they preached the subordination of the Law of God to the Law of Congress. On the presentation of the Memorial to the Senate by Mr. EVERETT, it was met with the fiercest and bitterest denunciation. Mr. DOUGLASS pronounced it to be "an atrocious falsehood, and an atrocious calumny, coming from political preachers, who did not know what they were talking about;" who had "prostituted the sacred Desk to the miserable and corrupting influence of party politics," and "who ought to be rebuked, and required to confine themselves to their vocation." The Petition was "an attempt to set up a Theocracy!" To "put the legislation of the Country under the control of the Church!" Senators MASON, of Virginia, BUTLER, of South Carolina, ADAMS, of Mississippi, and PETTIT, of Indiana, also all denounced the Remonstrants, without distinction, in the most unmeasured terms. Mr. HOUSTON, of Texas, defended the rights of the memorialists in a manly and honorable spirit, and warned the Senate of the excitement in the popular mind of which this Remonstrance was an unmistakable indication. Mr. EVERETT rose "to explain." He had presented the Petition without having read it! Though he did not approve of the presentation of Memorials on subjects which had passed from before the Senate, he had thought no harm in offering this, as the same thing had been done by others. He regretted that it had excited any feeling. The main defence of the petitioners, however, fell upon Mr. SEWARD, of New York, who in an earnest and argumentative Speech vindicated their rights and their action from the passionate and futile assaults of their enemies. Finally, on motion of Mr. BADGER, of North Carolina, the Memorial was laid on the table without being referred. In the House, the proceedings on this matter were yet more summary. Upon the presentation of the Memorial by Mr. APPLETON, of Boston district, objection was at once made by Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina. Mr. DAVIS, of Rhode Island, asked for the reading of the paper. This was ruled out of order by the Speaker, and the Memorial was unceremoniously hustled out of the Chamber, and there an end.

Besides this Remonstrance of the Clergy of New England, one was forwarded from New York, headed by the late Bishop Wainwright and signed by 151 clergymen of various denominations. Among

these, too, were to be found the names of divines who had signalized themselves by their fidelity in the Union-Saving times, — as the Rev. Drs. TYNG, KREBS, SPENCER, and others. The different organizations of the Religious Society of Friends sent up their official testimony against this extension of the domain of Slavery. Various religious conventions and collected bodies of different creeds united in remonstrances against this iniquity. All these demonstrations were treated with no more respect than that of which we have just spoken, and were looked upon rather as expositions of the general opinion on the matter, which might at some future time find voice in deeds, than as instrumentalities of any avail in that present distress. These indignities, as might have been supposed, had the natural effect of exciting the indignation of the remonstrants, and produced a more general voice against Slavery and its aggressions from the pulpits than has been heard thence for many years. The Legislatures of many of the Free States have expressed the strong sense of their constituents on this subject. In the Legislature of Massachusetts, in which the Whigs had the predominance at that time, after some prudent hesitation, lest an emphatic expression of indignation might enure to the benefit of the Abolitionists and Free Soilers, at last passed a series of strong resolutions, by the unanimous vote of the Senate, and with a very few negative votes (of Adamantine Democrats) in the House. The Legislature of Connecticut, also, passed a series of manly and comprehensive Resolutions, as her Protest against this wickedness, by a vote of 16 to 1 in the Senate and by an overwhelming majority in the House. During all this time, too, the voice of the Press was mainly heard on the side of freedom and justice. The great deeps of Northern feeling seemed to be stirred up and to threaten fearfully, in case the will of the people should not be obeyed. That the great majority of the people were opposed to this new outrage there is no reason to doubt. The result was only a fresh proof how impotent are Northern majorities against the chicaneries and trickeries of Slaveholding politicians and their tools, at Washington.

It was, at first, vainly hoped that the Northern wing of the House of Representatives would be found strong enough to do their clear duty to their constituents. When the Senate Bill was reached in due course, on the 21st of March, Mr. RICHARDSON of Illinois, the fugleman of the Pro-Slavery host, moved its reference to the Committee on Territories, of which he was Chairman. This would have put the control of the Bill into the hands of its friends and enabled them to



put it through the House at a proper time, without debate, under the pressure of the Previous Question. But he met with an unexpected opposition. Mr. CUTTING of New York, moved its reference, instead, to the Committee of the Whole, which would secure a thorough and exhaustive examination and discussion of the principle of the Bill and of all its details. He professed himself to be friendly to the principle of the Bill; but utterly opposed to the smothering of discussion. Mr. RICHARDSON resisted this disposition of the matter to the utmost, well knowing, and as good as admitting, that light and air would be fatal to its life. Still, the motion prevailed, and the reference to the Committee of the Whole made by a vote of 110 to 95,—29 being absent or “*dodging*” the vote. Though this was, undoubtedly, done for the purpose of improving the market of the venal dough-faces, who were not inclined to have their services extorted from them without a due consideration; still, it was caught at by many hopeful minds as indicative of what the sense of the House would be when it came to a final issue.

Little more than six weeks, however, had elapsed when these hopes were disappointed. On the 8th of May, Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, declaring it to be his intention, if his motion prevailed, to move the laying aside of all the matters having precedence of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, so that that measure might be considered and acted upon at once. After a brief debate, this motion prevailed by 109 *yeas* to 88 *nays*. According to his promise, Mr. RICHARDSON then moved, as each subject was called in the order in which it stood on the calendar, that it be laid aside. The despotic majority, a majority having been secured in the interval, on his motion, voted to lay aside seventeen subjects, successively, by large majorities, although many of these were among the most important matters before Congress. The Nebraska Bill having been at length reached, Mr. WASHBURN moved that that too be laid aside;—a proposition which was received with shouts of derisive laughter by the triumphant slaveocrats. The Committee refused to lay it aside by a vote of 105 *nays* to 85 *yeas*, and thus the great issue was at last joined. And having been joined it was not long in the deciding. On Thursday, the 11th, Mr. RICHARDSON, the jackall of Mr. DOUGLASS, moved that the debate on the Bill should terminate at noon on the following day. The object of this plan being to have it reported at once to the House, where it could be passed at the point of the Previous Question, without delay and

without debate. This scheme the opponents of the Bill resolved to defeat, if possible, by consuming the time of the Committee, by calling for the *yays* and *nays* on motions of one sort and another,—which was strictly in order. Excepting in so grave a case, and engaged with opponents so unscrupulous, obvious objections would lie against such a course as this. But the stern necessities of the case justified any expedients, not wrong in themselves, by which time could be gained. During this excited session of thirty-six hours, every effort of intimidation and persuasion having been used to shake the resolute minority, and without success, Mr. RICHARDSON, at last, consented to an adjournment until the next day.

The debate having terminated on Saturday, on Monday the Committee of the Whole began acting on the details of the Bill, under the rule limiting speeches to five minutes time. The opposition had hoped to resume their tactics of the week before and to put off the evil day, if not to hinder it altogether. But the craft of the enemy was, as usual, more than a match for the minority. Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, moved to strike out the Enacting Clause, the effect of which is, under the rules, to cut off all amendments and require the Bill to be reported to the House for its action. A brief struggle ensued, but it was ineffectual. The minority was out-manœuvred as well as out-numbered. They did all they could by refusing to vote, particularly on the motion that the Committee rise and report to the House. But as the SPEAKER ruled that he could not know, officially, the fact that there was no quorum in the Committee, this effort was of no avail. The rest of the work was done speedily and effectually. After a turbulent session, in which the better part of the House was overborne by the numbers of the worsers, the Bill finally passed, late at night, by a vote of 113 *yays* to 100 *nays*. The Senate soon assented to some unimportant modification which it had received in the House, the PRESIDENT hastened to give it the sanction of his name, and the barrier which had been solemnly erected to limit the extension of Slavery, was levelled, and a vast domain, equal in extent to mighty kingdoms, left open to its invasion. And it was done with a coolness of impudence which showed how implicitly they have come to rely on the submission of the patient North. After receiving the consideration of a bargain for thirty-five years, they coolly tell us that it was inherently vicious from the beginning, and no bargain at all! In 1850, there was, at least, the decent pretence of tossing the shells to the North, while the South

devoured what was contained between them ; but, this time, they not only swallowed the oyster, but kept the shells into the bargain.

The cry of the Nebraska orators in Congress, caught up and carried over the country by the venal presses of the then dominant party, was, that it was a question of Popular Sovereignty that was at stake. That they who opposed the passage of the Bill, including the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, were infidels to the great American doctrine of the capacity of the people to govern themselves. All that was desired was that the territories should be left open to all the citizens of the country, leaving it for them to decide, after they got there, what their institutions should be. The hollowness of this pretence was shown early in the history of the Bill, by the decided rejection of a proposition that the Territorial Legislature should have power to pass laws forbidding Slavery, if they so pleased. These main champions of Popular Sovereignty would not permit the People of the Territories to exercise their supreme power until they were numerous enough to be erected into a State. Until that time no obstacle was to be interposed, even by the unanimous wish of all the inhabitants, in the way of the free ingress of the Slavemasters and their human cattle. Another transparent hypocrisy of those who supported, and of some who opposed, this measure, was one at which we have already glanced, that it was physically impossible for Slavery to exist in those regions. This was the ground, not only of Mr. EVERETT, who did not favor the Act, but of President PIERCE, who signed it and used the whole of his vast patronage and influence to secure its passage. The absurdity of this proposition is demonstrated by the whole history of Slavery, since the world began, and it is especially contradicted by the nature and philosophy of our own Slavery. We have heard before of "physical geography" and "Asiatic Scenery;" but for all that we have a Slaveholding Governor and a bench of Slaveholding Judges, doing all they can to compel Slavery to enter in and possess New Mexico. That Slavery will not be as well adapted to develop the resources of any new territory, is, of course, a flat truism. But that it will be as well adapted to give political weight to our handful of masters there, as elsewhere, is quite as patent a fact. The Slaveholders do not cherish Slavery in Georgia or in Carolina, on account of the profitableness of the immediate result, so much as because of the political supremacy it gives them in the nation. Where the institutions of a country are arranged with such a devilish ingenuity as to give not more than a hundred thousand voting men, scattered over one-half of the States of

the Union, the control of the legislation, the nomination of the Presidents, and the command of the whole policy of twenty-three millions nine hundred thousand souls, on condition that they hold the qualification of ownership in human beings, it is too much to expect of that oligarchy that it will resign its power, or omit to increase and strengthen it. No aristocracy ever yet laid down its authority or divested itself of the element of its supremacy. Like all other nations that are ridden by lords who have come into the world booted and spurred to ride them, we have lifted our masters into the saddle and persuaded ourselves that, should we throw them over our heads, it will be our destruction that will ensue, instead of theirs. As long as this delusion lasts, it is of no consequence how deep they plunge the rowels in our sides, or how loud may be the crack of the whip they flourish over us; we shall patiently carry them whithersoever they will.

In every nation tyranny and bad government exist because the people choose to have it so. Louis Napoleon, Francis Joseph, Nicholas himself, hold their sceptres only because the many do not choose to take them away. Whenever the masses of the people choose to have a change in the forms of their polity, it is done. The difficulty is to get the people to see that it is for their advantage that a change should take place. In all countries, despotic power is concealed under various disguises and certain mists of antiquity, loyalty or religion. It is not so here. We have nothing but certain Articles of Copartnership by which we agree to be bound for our mutual convenience and advantage. Within a few years, indeed, attempts have been made to apotheosize this legal document and to hedge about with a kind of awe a parchment, of no more inherent sanctity than a bill of lading or a policy of insurance. This is all pretence, of course. No one but a very suckling Whig supposes the Union to be of any authority or validity, excepting as far as it is the shrine and sanctuary of our National Idol, the Almighty Dollar. The Union is respected because it is, falsely, understood to stand for our National prosperity. When meetings in Castle Garden or Faneuil Hall vapor about Loyalty to the Union and Constitution, none but a fool supposes they mean the musty parchment and the institutions existing under it. They mean Clipper Ships, Government Contracts, Warehouses bursting with Merchandise, large profits, great dividends; they mean houses in the Fifth Avenue, or Beacon Street, services of plate, servants in livery, Potiphar balls, dinners of seven courses and twenty-five kinds of wine, fine carriages and horses; they mean tours in Europe, winters in Paris and Rome,

summers in Switzerland, presentations at Court, tuft-hunting and toadying, purchases of pictures, books, statues, whatever, in short, money can buy.

Let the Slaveholders only mismanage so as to change all this, let the Union stand for Commercial Bankruptcy and Manufacturing Ruin; let the bills of the Castle Gardenites come back protested; let the goods in the bursting warehouses be brought to the hammer; let executions be put into the houses in the Fifth Avenue and in Beacon Street, and the world would soon see how much value is really attached to those magic words the Union and the Constitution. The Slaveholders did very nearly bring matters to this pass some five-and-forty years ago, in the successful war they waged against New England, under the pretext of their disgraceful one with Old England. Then ruin and bankruptcy taught the New Englanders to calculate the value of the Union, and the great mass of the people were ready to show how much they thought it worth, had they not been betrayed by their leaders. Could this state of things be brought about again, there would be hope of the Republic. But, unfortunately, the North has got beyond the point at which the South can materially affect her prosperity. And the South knows too much, too, to try the experiment again.

"For Satan now is wiser than of yore,  
And tempts by making rich, not making poor."

She has bought us with the price of our own industry, with the wages of our own labor, with the wealth which we have extorted from untoward circumstances in despite of her. Perhaps the North may come to see, what is demonstrably true, that she is the poorer in purse as well as in character for her connection in business with that beggarly partner of hers, who controls her affairs, supports herself out of the concern, and spits in her face to show her gratitude. The Union was emphatically a mercantile one, and we fear commercial bankruptcy alone will have power to end it.

And circumstances very soon showed that the Slaveholders held very different views from these as to the capabilities of the new Territories for Slave labor. Almost before the Bill was passed, we heard of Slaves having been carried and held there. Immediately afterwards, great numbers of Missourians emigrated, carrying their Slaves with them, and the whole tone of the bordering press was one of triumphant determination to push their success as far as possible. After the Bill had

been passed, it was discovered that, by some political legerdemain, a provision had been foisted into it, by which all foreigners were excluded from voting in this great question of Popular Sovereignty, and by another they were even forbidden to enter the Territories, without a passport from the War Department. The object of these provisions, obviously, being to prevent the Germans and other emigrants from going thither, tainted, as they were suspected of being, with the European distaste for Slavery, and helping to exclude it from the institutions of the State. The wide-spread indignation which was felt at these insolencies of the Slave Power, and the feeling that something must be done to counteract its machinations, suggested the plan of promoting the settlement of the Territories with emigrants from the Free States. Men of large capital, by no means infected with extreme Abolitionism, entered into this scheme and organized Emigrant Aid Societies in New York, Boston, and other places, by which large numbers of persons have been forwarded to the debatable ground. The result, however, has not, thus far, been as favorable as was hoped. In Kansas, last winter, the Pro-Slavery delegate was elected, and the Pro-Slavery parties generally triumphant. And, at the election which has just been held in Kansas, the principle of Popular Sovereignty has had a new and remarkable exposition. On the eve of the election, crowds of Missourians, armed to the teeth, breathing death and destruction to all who opposed their plans, crossed the river, drove the established residents, on whom they could not depend, from the polls, took possession of them themselves, and elected the officers and representatives of the Territory, at their pleasure. In the plenitude of their zeal for popular rights, they threatened the Governor, REEDER, who, though a "National Democrat," has shown some decent regard for the duties of his office, with hanging or drowning, if he presume to interfere between the Territory and its Manifest Destiny. They have appointed a Convention for the nomination of a suitable man as Governor, whom they will require the President to appoint in his place. It is said, however, that Governor REEDER intends to disallow these banditti elections, and that he has gone to Washington to see whether the President will protect him and his people in their guaranteed rights, or not. We have but little hope, however, in the President, nor yet in the description of persons who form the bulk of the emigration from the East, as sufficient for the time. We shall rejoice to be proved false prophets, but we fear that the unconquerable will of Slavery will prove more than a match for the feeble virtue of

men, probably not of stronger Anti-Slavery *stamina* than the average of Northern men, and that Kansas and Nebraska will begin their existence with the deadly disease of Slavery organized into their life.

#### CASE OF ANTHONY BURNS.

The Nebraska Bill having been carried by the Slaveholders and their allies, in spite of the reclamations of the better part of the Free States, it was important to ascertain whether the practical loyalty of the North had been shaken by the affront. As Massachusetts, and Boston, particularly, had been among the foremost in resistance, and as intimations of a possible disinclination to catch their masters' slaves contingent on the completion of the contemplated villany, had been thrown out, it was important that the question should be tried, and that without delay. The Bill was hardly a law when one CHARLES F. SUTTLE, of Alexandria, Va., having learned through the exercise of his prerogative of opening and reading his slaves' letters, that one of his slaves, ANTHONY BURNS, by name, was commorant in Boston, was despatched by his fellow citizens to show the inhabitants of that city that the Fugitive Slave Law was still the Supreme law of the land. On Thursday night, the 25th of May, BURNS was arrested on a Warrant, issued by EDWARD G. LORING, a United States Commissioner, and also Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk, (which includes the City of Boston,) and hurried to the Court-house. Or rather, he was arrested on the usual lying pretext of a charge of robbery, by the United States Deputy Marshal, who held a warrant against him as a Slave, in order to avoid the danger of a desperate self-defence on the part of his prey. At the Court-house he was suddenly introduced into the presence of the man who claimed him as his property. Ignorant of his rights, cowed by the presence of a Slaveholder, surrounded only by the infamous tools of his natural enemy, with no friend near him, he was betrayed, as they alleged, into admissions which his Judge afterwards seized upon as the pretext of consigning him again to Slavery.

It was probably the expectation of the claimant of BURNS, and of the creatures he hired to help him, SETH J. THOMAS and EDWARD G. PARKER, that the business could be despatched in a truly summary manner, and without any general knowledge of the villany in hand, until it was done, and its object beyond the reach of pity or succor. If such were their wish, they had selected their tool well in Commis-

sioner LORING, who, before hearing the case, on the mere *ex parte* statements of the master and his counsel, advised Mr. PHILLIPS to attempt no defence, as the case was so clear that the man must go back. Fortunately for the cause, if not for the individual, Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. THEODORE PARKER, accidentally hearing of the case, procured admittance, though with no little difficulty, to the Slave-pen, in the Court-house. MESSRS. R. H. DANA, JR. and CHARLES M. ELLIS, volunteered their services as counsel of the alleged slave. Encouraged by friendly voices, poor BURNS expressed his wish to have a hearing, which the Commissioner had regard enough to appearances, at least, not to deny. The hearing was adjourned over, at the request of his counsel, though strongly opposed by those of his master, until Monday, from Friday. Time having thus been gained, no pains were spared to put it to the best use. A Public Meeting was demanded, to be held in Faneuil Hall, to consider what the crisis required. The request was acceded to, by the Mayor and Aldermen, with cheerful readiness. The rules were suspended, and the necessary permission granted unanimously. The Mayor even expressed his regret that another engagement for the evening should prevent him from presiding at the Meeting. But he assured the gentlemen who waited on him, that no police officer, or public servant of the City, should take any part in the reduction of the wretch claimed to slavery again.

The Meeting in Faneuil Hall was truly an immense one. It filled the entire room, the stair-cases, and stretched out into the street. GEORGE R. RUSSELL, Esq., a gentleman of eminent character and high social position, but not "a technical Abolitionist," presided. Speeches were made by the President, MESSRS. WENDELL PHILLIPS, THEODORE PARKER, JOHN L. SWIFT, FRANCIS W. BIRD, and others. The Meeting seemed perfectly unanimous in its sense of the character of the crime impending, and desirous of knowing what was best to be done. The Speeches were of a high and stirring order of eloquence; but any attack upon the Court-house, or the kidnappers, was strongly deprecated as unwise, and likely to be of mischievous consequences. The Court-house was known to be garrisoned by armed men, who had control of the gas, and every opportunity of defending themselves, or of smuggling away their prisoner to safer quarters, in case of a serious alarm. The Meeting seemed to acquiesce in the opinions of the Platform, and it adjourned, to meet the next morning, at the Court-house, to watch, if they could not guide, the event.

But the zeal of a portion of those who had a keen sense of the wrong



and indignity of which the City was at once the scene and the object, could not be restrained. A small body of men, about nine o'clock, made an attack upon the Court-house. By means of a piece of timber they succeeded in bursting in the outer door. The garrison made a stand in the breach. One of the Marshal's assistants, JAMES BATCHELDER, was killed; but whether by the assault of those without, or the awkwardness of those within, has never been clearly ascertained. The time which it took to break in the door, and the noise which necessarily attended the operation, drew the Police of the City to the scene. The attacking party were not strong enough to follow up their first success, or, at least, had good reason to think so. And the accident of a volunteer company marching into the square, on their return from target-practice in the country, helped to discourage the attempt, through the belief that it was a company of Marines, detailed to strengthen the force inside. So the Rescuer had to be abandoned. It was a gallant and generous attempt, but ill-advised and injudicious, under the circumstances. It should not have been made without a larger coöperation, and a more general understanding. Its failure complicated very materially the possibilities of subsequent operations, and gave the slave-catcher's minions the occasion they desired, of calling in the aid of the military.

That very night the Marshal despatched a request for aid to the Navy Yard, at Charlestown, and a force of Marines were marched over before morning. The next morning a demand was made, and answered, for the help of the regular United States Troops, at Fort Independence. The Mayor, also, was eager to signalize his loyalty to the Slave-catcher, and to make amends for the incautious weaknesses of the day before. On pretence of danger to the public property—a danger which the regular Police of the City were amply sufficient to guard against—he called for the aid of the volunteer companies, which was joyfully granted. An opportunity for a holiday, a chance of showing their uniforms, a share of the good cheer and good liquor provided for them, at the public expense—any one of these inducements were enough, but all together, they were irresistible. The Independent Cadets, or Governor's Guard, were proud to add the title of the Slave-catcher's Guard to their other honorary distinctions. For nearly an entire week, the City was, virtually, under Martial Law, and all that SETTLE might make a Slave of a man who had had the address and courage to make himself a freeman. For the distinctions which were attempted to be made between keeping the peace and keeping the man, were too trans-

parently absurd to deceive any one of sense and reflection, had they not soon afterwards stopped their own mouths by greedily taking the blood-money proffered by the President. There was no apprehension or possibility of a breach of the peace, except for the purpose of the Rescue of the Slave. To prevent such a breach of the peace, the United States Soldiers held the Court-house, and for the same purpose the Militia held the streets. Their purpose was one and the same, and they accomplished it in common. The only difference being, that the United States Troops, composed chiefly of Irishmen, and officered, probably, by Slaveholders, were in the discharge of their regular business, and, it is said, had the grace to be ashamed of it; while the service of the Militia was strictly voluntary,—any pretence of military necessity being a transparent show—and most of them glorying in their shame.

The President of the United States was eager in the interest with which he looked on, and prompt in the services he could afford, at this critical moment. The despatches which passed between him and his minions, in Boston, are worthy of preservation, as showing the natural relation of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation to the lesser kidnappers under him.

BOSTON, MAY 27, 1854.

*To the President of the United States :*

In consequence of an attack upon the Court-house, last night, for the purpose of rescuing a Fugitive Slave, under arrest, and in which one of my own guards was killed, I have availed myself of the resources of the United States, placed under my control by letter from the War and Navy Departments, in 1851, and now have two companies of Troops, from Fort Independence, stationed in the Court-house. Everything is now quiet. The attack was repulsed by my own guard.

WATSON FREEMAN,  
United States Marshal, Boston, Mass.

WASHINGTON, MAY 27, 1854.

*To Watson Freeman, United States Marshal, Boston, Mass. :*

Your conduct is approved. The law must be executed.

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

“On Tuesday last, the following despatch was sent to Boston, by direction of the President.”

WASHINGTON, MAY 30, 1854.

*To Hon. B. F. Hallett, Boston, Mass. :*

What is the state of the case of BURNS?

SIDNEY WEBSTER.

BOSTON, MAY 30, 1854.

*To Sidney Webster :*

The case is progressing, and not likely to close till Thursday. Then armed resistance is indicated. But two City companies on duty. The Marshal has all the armed force he can muster. More will be needed to execute the extradition, if ordered. Can the necessary expenses of the City Military be paid, if called out by the Mayor, at the Marshal's request? This, alone, will prevent a case arising under second Section of Act of 1795, when it will be too late to act.

B. F. HALLETT.

WASHINGTON, MAY 31, 1854.

*To B. F. Hallett, United States Attorney, Boston, Mass. :*

Incur any expense deemed necessary by the Marshal and yourself; for City Military, or otherwise, to insure the execution of the law.

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

"On the same day, the President ordered Col. COOPER, Adjutant-General of the Army, to repair to Boston, empowered to order to the assistance of the United States Marshal, as part of the *posse comitatus*, in case the Marshal deemed it necessary, the two companies of United States Troops, stationed at New York, and which had been under arms for the forty-eight preceding hours, ready to proceed at any moment."

BOSTON, MAY 31, 1854.

*To Sidney Webster :*

Despatch received. The Mayor will preserve the peace, with all the Military and Police of the City. The force will be sufficient. Decision will be made day after to-morrow of the case. Court adjourned.

B. F. HALLETT.

"Yesterday morning the following despatch was received :"

BOSTON, JUNE 2, 1854:

*To Sidney Webster :*

The Commissioner has granted the certificate. Fugitive will be removed to-day. Ample Military and Police force to protect it peacefully. All quiet. Law reigns. Col. COOPER's arrival opportune.

B. F. HALLETT.

In the meantime the examination proceeded. The defence was conducted with great zeal and ability by Messrs. DANA and ELLIS. A much stronger case than had been supposed possible was made out on the side of the prisoner. It was incontestably proved that BURNS had been in Boston before the time at which it was sworn by SUTTLE and his witness that he was in Alexandria. The case of the claimant was

broken down, to all intents and purposes, on the facts. For two or three days earnest hopes were entertained that the decision would be favorable to the prisoner. During this time attempts had been made to purchase BURNS of the man that claimed him. More than once he had agreed to do so, and the papers were actually drawn by the very Commissioner who sat on the trial, who thus made but too manifest, the foregone conclusion at which he had arrived! But the Slaveholder was too good a representative of his class, to regard himself bound by any promises to a Slave, or to his friends. It is believed that instructions came on from Washington to the District Attorney, HALLETT, to prevent any such termination of so promising a case. There is no doubt, we believe, that SUTTLE was threatened with chastisement, if not with death, by his fellow Slaveholders of Alexandria, if he dared to let this opportunity of triumph and vengeance escape him. At any rate, he showed that he was a liar, and that the truth was not in him; for he paid no regard to his engagements, and finally refused to part with his claim, even when it was hoped that it was most desperate. But he, doubtless, had a well-founded belief that he would not be sent empty away.

On Wednesday, May 31st, the hearing closed, and the Commissioner adjourned over to Friday, when the decision was to be given. Hope and fear alternated, though those whose instincts had been informed by experience, foreboded the worst. On Friday, June 2d, the whole Boston Brigade, (which has received, for services on another occasion, the honorary addition of the *Sims* Brigade,) were under arms, the Major General of the Division, BENJAMIN F. EDMANDS, a Baptist brother in the faith of poor BURNS, at its head. The Court-house Square was commanded by cannon. The Governor's Guard, under command of Lieut. Col. THOMAS C. AMORY, were out with full ranks, in the defence of Mr. SUTTLE's rights. When the time of adjournment had arrived, the Commissioner came in, and very briefly decided the case in favor of the claimant, mainly on the ground of BURNS's own admissions, alleged to have been made on the night of his arrest, and when he appeared, by the evidence of SUTTLE's own witnesses, to be under intimidation. The arrangements, previously made, were carried out. The streets were lined with the Militia companies, horse and foot, while poor BURNS was marched down, surrounded by a body of Deputy Marshals, chosen by Marshal FREEMAN from the very dregs of the vilest of the population, the leavings of the gallows and the penitentiary, and the scum of the gaming-houses and brothels of the city; and they,

again, escorted by a strong body of United States Soldiers and Marines, with cannon loaded, and matches lighted. In this state he was marched to T wharf, whence he was conveyed on board the Revenue Cutter, in the stream, where his master and his witness had been long waiting his arrival. Thence he was conveyed to Norfolk, and then to Richmond, where he was put in prison, and there lay, for four long months, in chains, to expiate his crime, until he was sold farther South, and very recently ransomed, at a high price, by citizens of Boston. This money was, in a great measure, raised by men in no wise connected with the Anti-Slavery Movement, many of whom were, doubtless, moved to this action by a wish to diminish the odium, and to avert the danger in which Judge LORING stood. Indeed, all attempts to raise BURNS's ransom had failed until the Removal of his Commissioner seemed imminent. He is now, we believe, studying at Amherst, to fit himself for the Gospel ministry — in which, indeed, he was engaged before his escape. He certainly will be able to expound American Christianity with eminent success, if his abilities are at all commensurate with his opportunities of studying it.

During this disgraceful day, Boston, for the first time since the British Troops evacuated it, in 1776, was put under Martial Law, and the lives of its citizens placed at the disposal of a Militia officer. Dr. JEROME V. C. SMITH, the man whom the first struggles of the American, or Know Nothing Party, thrust up into the position of Mayor of that City, proved himself as ignorant of the laws he had undertaken to administer, as he had, in former times, of the branches of Science he had professed to teach. But an ignorance, which only made him a laughing-stock and a by-word, when he proposed to instruct mankind as to the Fishes of Massachusetts, made him a dangerous, as well as a ridiculous animal, when he assumed the charge of the Men of Boston. Totally regardless of the clear directions of the laws as to the duties of a municipal Magistrate, in case of an apprehended riot, which are most minutely specific, this remarkable Magistrate hid himself in the safe recesses of his official chamber, and delegated not only his own powers, but powers which were never given to the Sovereign of a constitutional Monarchy, to an Apothecary, disguised as a Major General. This person, whose ignorance of his legal powers qualified him to be a fitting representative of his employer, cheerfully undertook the duty. Fortunately for him, his men were withheld from shedding blood — for the killing of a man, under these circumstances, would have constituted the legal, as well as the moral crime of murder; — but this was due more

to the self-contained indignation of the witnessing crowd than to any merits of officers or men. The troops had been freely plied with liquor, and it would have taken little to have roused their drunken insolence to the firing point. As it was, one company, headed by a gallant Captain, named EVANS, charged an unlucky Apothecary's apprentice, who had a bottle of ink in his hand (which their muddled vision magnified into vitriol,) and succeeded in disabling him for life. Boston, that day, was like a house on a day of a funeral. The feeling of disgrace was deep and almost universal. Every one seemed to feel a sense of personal dishonor. Some of the Militia men engaged in this kidnapping attempted to make a distinction between keeping the peace, in order that BURNS might be carried back, and carrying him back. But, unfortunately for themselves, they greedily swallowed the bait cunningly prepared by the Cabinet, at Washington, and by accepting the pay of the Government for their services, necessarily admitted their nature. It was not for keeping the peace of Boston, but for helping to secure Mr. SETTLE'S Slave, that the money was paid and received.

One great object of the legal proceedings of the Vigilance Committee was to obtain possession of the person of BURNS. It was to aid in such a design, that Massachusetts, seventeen years before, had reinstated in the Statute Book, the writ *de homine replegiando*. A coroner had agreed to serve this, provided any opportunity could be obtained. The service of it would afford another opportunity of bringing before the Supreme Court the question of the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Act. Rumor said some of the Judges repented of their decision in the SIMS case, which affirmed the constitutionality of that Act. It would also have surrendered BURNS to the custody of his friends, who, by allowing their bonds to be forfeited, could thus, in the event of an unfavorable decision, have secured his Liberty.

But the Militia of the County of Suffolk stood encircling the United States Marshal. Through them, no civil officer could penetrate to serve his writ. Of them, the Governor was Commander-in-Chief. Had he appeared in Court Square, and ordered them, in his capacity of Commander, to ground arms, while as Chief Executive officer of the State, he ordered his deputy, the Coroner, to serve his Writ, the end would have been accomplished. This, Governor WASHBURN refused to do, referring the applicants to Attorney General CLIFFORD, whom there was no time to consult, and no hope of inducing to do anything that would pledge him to either side — certainly not to that of Freedom.

While the case was on trial, various attempts were made to take BURNS out of the hands of the United States authorities into those of the State. Ample process existed, if it could be but served. Governor WASHBURN was approached, and earnestly entreated to interpose his just and lawful authority to save Massachusetts from the impending disgrace. All that was wanted was a shadow of authority. There were men enough ready to storm the Court-house, and overpower, by numbers, the United States Garrison, provided they had the State behind them. The influence and authority of the Governor, WASHBURN, was invoked and implored. But he refused to execute the laws of his State, even to exercise his authority as Commander-in-Chief, and forbid the interposition of the Militia, because he shrank from a collision with the General Government. The humiliation of Massachusetts was complete. Her laws, her Judges, her Militia, her Governor, himself, were prostrate in abject submission to a shop-keeper of Virginia, in his Sovereign capacity as a Slavemaster! Perhaps it did require more courage than goes, now-a-days, to the composition of governors, to take a manly stand against Slavery, so few years after the Party he represented had been hailing the Fugitive Slave Law as the Salvation of the Country. But the ingratitude of the Slaveholders towards Mr. WEBSTER, had worked a mighty change in the loyalty of the Whig Party to the Supreme Power. We are sure Governor WASHBURN would have been safe in executing the legal processes of his State, or in saving its Militia from the stain of kidnapping, and that even the Whig Party would have stood by him. But though the Hour was come, the Man was wanting, and SUTTLE had his Slave marched in triumph through the Capital, escorted by the Body Guard of the Governor and the volunteers of Boston, over the prostrate Body of Massachusetts. All the comfort that the disgraceful fact allowed, was the admission that he could not have been carried off otherwise — being, as the Slaveholding presses themselves declared, not an execution of the Fugitive Law, but a public declaration that it could not be executed.

The action of the Commissioner in the case, though as discreditable as the Governor's, seemed even more inexplicable. For there was no necessary obligation upon him to issue the Warrant, or to sit in the case, or to confront any responsibilities at all, while his official position, as Judge of Probate, rendered any such interposition eminently improper and offensive. The public, to which he belonged, were taken by surprise. Every community is occasionally startled by a great crime committed by a hand never before stained with guilt. A cloud of

infamy settles down suddenly upon a name which had been spotless, if not honored, for many years, and men stand aghast at finding the mild, friendly, amiable spirit they have loved to know, start up in an instant a felon or a fiend. Such an astonishment fell upon Boston, when it was known that it was EDWARD G. LORING that had issued the Warrant for the arrest. Perhaps there was scarcely a man in the City, not a committed Abolitionist, who would not have been sooner suspected of a readiness to be an accessory in the dirty atrocity of sending back to Slavery a man who had had the courage to escape from it. The very weaknesses of his character seemed to be his safeguard against so revolting a crime. A fortnight before, EDWARD G. LORING stood fairly respected among those that knew him as a man of an average humanity, and a Judge of an ordinary sense of justice. And now, where is he? Gathered to that small company of infamous Judges whom the world never forgets, and whose names are a by-word and a hissing to the latest posterity.

Mr. LORING is a man a little past the middle of life, say about fifty-two or fifty-three years of age. He has always been esteemed among his contemporaries and acquaintances as a well-meaning and good-natured man, of moderate abilities, but excessive self-esteem. His personal connections have been such as to push him to a certain point in his profession, beyond what he could have attained by his own merits; and more recently, his family interest had procured for him the lucrative post of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk, (which includes Boston,) and a Law Lectureship of some kind, at Cambridge. Both these appointments gave no little dissatisfaction to the profession and to the public, both of which looked upon them, if not as *jobs*, at least as acts of favoritism, in behalf of one who had no claim to such promotion by weight of character or standing in his profession. Thus comfortably provided for, and with everything around him to make life respectable and happy, he elected to assume the detestable function of a Slave-Commissioner, and to put himself by the side of INGRAHAM, MORTON, IRVING, and the other wretches who have made themselves perdurably infamous by the swiftness of their Negro-catching. His case is, surely, phenomenal. How the tempter could have approached such a man, with everything to lose and nothing to gain, it is hard to conceive. Doubtless, it was by the weak side of his constitutional vanity, that the attack was made. But the first yielding over, and his mind once within the gripe of the robust villany of HALLETT, and under the magnetic influence of the presence of a rich Virginia Slaveholder,



(one almost omnipotent with a character of the type and quality of his,) and all the rest followed as the night the day.

The fate of poor BURNS was settled from the moment the Warrant was signed. Could a gentleman from the Old Dominion lie? Could he even err? Would he seize a Negro that did not belong to him? Was it possible that he could be mistaken in the identity of the man? Of course, not. All that was to be done was to put him in possession of his property as speedily and as courteously as possible. Had it not been for a most extraordinary combination of circumstances, or rather, as Mr. PHILLIPS expressed it, by the good Providence of God, BURNS, stupefied with terror, would have been passed over to SUTTLE, with a simper of polite congratulation, before twelve o'clock of the day of his arrest. And though the Commissioner had sufficient regard for his own character to grant a delay, after counsel had insisted on letting the man know his rights, or rather (for a man, free or bond, claimed as a Slave, has no legal rights,) had extorted a decent attention to appearances, still the *animus* of the man who was to pass upon this awful issue of Liberty or Slavery was made but too plain by this remark of his, to Mr. PHILLIPS, on that very morning:—

“THIS CASE IS SO CLEAR, MR. PHILLIPS, THAT I DO NOT THINK YOU WOULD BE JUSTIFIED IN PLACING ANY OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE WAY OF THE MAN’S GOING BACK—WHICH HE PROBABLY WILL”!!!

Imagine a Judge, when a criminal was on trial for his life, after hearing an informal and *ex parte* statement of the ease for the prosecution, saying to the prisoner’s counsel, “This case is so clear that I do not think you would be justified in obstructing the course of Justice—for the man will probably be hanged!” And yet, what is the Life of a man compared to his Liberty!

This being the frame of mind in which Commissioner LORING approached the ease, it is not to be wondered at that he should have persevered to the bitter end. It is said, and we think it likely, that he was utterly astonished at the excitement the case produced. So little observant had he been of the Signs of the Times, that he probably thought Boston was unchanged since SIMS was kidnapped, and carried back to be whipped to death. But this very circumstance, adroitly used by the more powerful minds that had his in their clutches, would but confirm that obstinacy of opinion, which is a usual element of weakness of character. So all the ways of escape that were opened for him,

though some of them were wide and high enough for an army with banners to pass through, were all provided in vain. It was to no purpose that it was proved, by incontestable evidence, that the only witness for the claimant swore falsely as to the time that BURNS left Richmond, (if he were ever there,) and thereby vitiated his credibility. It was not to be supposed that a Virginian, though he had come on expressly to swear away a man's Liberty, could commit perjury, or even be in error as to the personal identity of the man claimed. It was in vain that counsel tried to show that the claimant, having elected one of the two clauses in the Fugitive Slave Law on which to rest his case, and failing therein, he should not be permitted to impale his victim on the other horn of the diabolical dilemma. The Commissioner read the Statute but too well, that it was designed to prevent the escape of any person claimed, under any circumstances that legal ingenuity could conceive of, and so he carried it out.

And, finally, he decided the case on the single point of identity, and that on the single evidence of the admissions of BURNS, himself, made at a time when, according to the evidence of the claimant's own witness, he "*appeared to be intimidated!*" And even in then he never acknowledged that he was a Slave. Thus this Commissioner, sitting as Judge and Jury on the most solemn issue that can arise; under the most terrible responsibility that can be imposed, decides the case on evidence, which would not be enough to convict a vagrant of robbing a hen roost! We will affirm, confidently, not merely that Mr. LORING, himself, would not convict a man on trial for his Life, if he were on his Jury, but that he would not, sitting as a Magistrate, send a newsboy, accused of stealing a pocket handkerchief, to the House of Correction, on such evidence as this! Such is the difference between white and black! And such, the perversion which Slavery works in minds not naturally unjust or inhuman! The leaning of the Commissioner to the side of the Slave-catcher, moreover, was shown in the intimation he must have given of his intended decision, long hours before he pronounced it. It might not have been by words, but it must have been well understood. The moment it was announced, on authority, the day before the certificate was signed, by HALLETT and the Marshal, that BURNS would not be seized again, if discharged by the Commissioner, the hearts of all thinking men sunk within them, for they knew it denoted a foregone conclusion. And so it proved. He wished, probably, to save the United States Government from the utter infamy of intending to make BURNS a Slave, even against the Fugitive Law, and

so gave them this chance to disclaim the design. And, perhaps, the certainty he felt, that his decision would make no difference in the fate of the man, might subdue his reluctance, if he felt any, at giving it against him.

We have accounted for the strange phenomena of Commissioner LORING's conduct in this case, from his first consenting to issue the Warrant to his final granting of the Certificate, by his want of the strength of mind to resist the malign influences of the United States Court-room. But we have suggested it only as an explanation — by no means as an excuse. God forbid! Want of strength to resist temptation, or to refrain from crime, is no palliation of guilt.

“————— If weakness may excuse,  
 What murderer, what traitor, parricide,  
 Incestuous, sacrilegious, but may plead it?  
 All wickedness is weakness; that plea, therefore,  
 With God or Man will gain thee no remission.”

The crime of making a Slave of a man, whether free by law, or who has achieved his own freedom, (for there can be no moral difference in the quality of the two actions,) is the same in the mild and refined LORING, as in the coarse and brutal HALLETT, or the hard-minded and saturnine CURTIS. It deserves the same meed of universal execration and detestation. It should never be forgotten, but rise up by his side, wherever he is met — in the street, in the drawing-room, on the bench — like an avenging spectre that haunts him for his sin.

The offence of Judge LORING, however, was doomed to a more substantial punishment than the mere detestation of all good men. Nemesis followed him with swifter footsteps than usual. The change in the political affairs of the State of Massachusetts, as well as of the Country at large, of which we shall have occasion to speak elsewhere, had much to do with this execution of justice; but the deep and strong sense of the disgrace he had brought upon the State, was the moving cause which thus found a way to its effect. It had so happened that his Lectureship, at Cambridge, to which we have alluded, though he had enjoyed it for two years, was held only by the appointment of the Corporation, and had not been submitted to the confirmation of the Overseers. Last winter, the question of confirming the nomination could be no longer postponed, and when it was voted upon, Judge LORING was rejected by a vote of *twenty to seven*. Though a portion of these negatives were given on the ground, only, of his incompetency for the

place ; still, his rejection was, beyond all question, occasioned by his decision in the BURNS Case. Considering the class and character of the gentlemen constituting that Board, this rebuke was, perhaps, the one that would be the most severely felt by himself, and the most telling abroad as an exponent of public feeling. But this was not the only form in which public indignation was to be visited on his crime. Previous to the Election, which broke up all the Great Deeps of party, and covered the land with a strange deluge of new opinions, petitions had been circulated, principally among women, asking the General Court to Address the Governor for the Removal of Judge LORING, on the ground that he had showed himself an unfit person to be entrusted with the interests of widows and orphans. After the great political revolution had occurred, perhaps a greater effort was made to circulate these petitions, so that more than twelve thousand persons approached the Legislature, demanding this Act of Justice at their hands.

At a proper time these petitions were referred, after some discrepancies between the two Houses as to the proper Committee to take charge of them, to the Committee on Federal Relations. This Committee did their duty faithfully in the matter of hearing all that was to be said on both sides. The petitioners were represented by Messrs. SETI WEBB, Jr., THEODORE PARKER, WENDELL PHILLIPS, CHARLES M. ELLIS, and others. The chief speech, however, that which exhausted the subject in the most thorough manner, and with the most masterly skill and effective eloquence, was that of Mr. PHILLIPS. It showed first, the *power*, and secondly, the *duty* of the Legislature, to do this thing. It was printed and widely distributed, and helped largely to confirm the wavering, and to establish the firm, in the Legislature, and in the public behind it. Mr. RICHARD H. DANA, Jr., was the principal advocate on the side of Judge LORING. As he had been one of the counsel of BURNS, his defence of Judge LORING attracted the more attention, and was likely to have more weight than that of any other person. His argument was threefold ; first, that the proposed removal would be of dangerous example, and endanger the independence of the Judiciary ; secondly, that there was nothing in Judge LORING's conduct, during the trial, to deserve so severe a censure ; and, thirdly, that the State had never taken such ground against the returning of Fugitives, as to justify her in disgracing a public servant for helping in it. His argument was, also, printed and distributed. The Legislature, however, did not appear to have been convinced by it. The majority of the Committee reported the Address. It was very

fully discussed, and on the 24th of April, passed the House by a vote of 207 to 111. In the Senate, after full debate, the Address was voted by 28 to 11, and sent up to the Governor for his action. This gratifying result was owing, doubtless, to the recent political changes. The people were, for the first time for many years, represented by men of their own choice, instead of the nominees of *cliques* and cabals, and the Legislature, consequently, really expressed the popular voice in this matter, which loudly demanded the removal. We think this action of the Legislature, and the public feeling which induced it, the most hopeful symptom of life and spirit which the Bay State has shown since the Revolution. We trust that there may yet be blood enough left in her veins to lead in the greater Revolution, which is yet to come; or, at least, not to be behind her fellows.

This hope and belief is in no wise shaken by the circumstance that the Governor of that State, HENRY J. GARDNER, saw fit to refuse to comply with this just demand of the People, through the Legislature. Though the Council, who are his constitutional advisers, were in favor of compliance with the Address, in the proportion of *seven to two*, that functionary saw fit to take the sole responsibility, without consulting them, and to retain this odious magistrate in his important place. This action of a political adventurer, of no weight of personal character, and of no influence beyond what he possessed by the accidental circumstances which had hoisted him from his natural insignificance to an important post, is immaterial, in the presence of the majestic majorities by which the people demanded the deposition of the unjust Judge. If the lip-service of the pro-slavery and vile of all parties, and the hope of possible promotion through the conciliated favor of the Slaveholding dictators of his own, can make amends to Governor GARDNER for the just contempt of the great bulk of his constituents, he can betake himself to that consolation. We trust that his own State will not be disgraced by his re-election to the post he now occupies, and the signs of the political skies towards the South are indicative of diminishing chances of a National reward. He may be left to the ignoble corner of history to which he will be relegated. But the State of Massachusetts owes it to herself not to let her just indignation be stayed by such an impediment as this. Let it be swept away at her next election, and no men allowed to enter any branch of her government who are not pledged to perform this great Act of Justice. That it is the voice of the people that has called for this purgation of the Bench is

unquestionable. We trust that it will not be hushed or weary of demanding its performance until it is done.

On the night of the attack on the Court-house, eleven persons were arrested and held over for the murder of **BATCHELDER**. Their examination continued for several days, and resulted in the committal, on a charge of murder, of **Mr. MARTIN STOWELL**, and three others, and the binding over of most of the rest to appear and answer to a charge of riot. The **Rev. T. W. HIGGINSON**, of Worcester, was subsequently arrested and held to bail on the same charge. The four persons charged with murder were kept in close confinement for several weeks, during the heat of summer, until the next session of the Grand Jury. No bills being found against any of them for the capital offence, they were discharged from custody, but held on bail, with the others, on indictments for riot. It is now nine or ten months since these indictments were found, and the County Attorney has always lacked either time or inclination to bring them to trial. Whether their trials will ever take place will probably be known by your next Anniversary.

But these were not the only indictments that were destined to grow out of this attempt. At the June term of the Circuit Court of the United States, **Mr. Justice CURTIS**, whose promotion to the Bench was due to unvarying Pro-Slavery antecedents, from his argument in favor of making Massachusetts a Slave State, "by the comity of nations," in the case of the slave child **MED** down to his speech in Faneuil Hall, in favor of the Fugitive Slave Bill, as much as to his eminent learning and consummate ability, Judge **CURTIS**, we say, charged the United States Grand Jury, on the subject of the crime of resistance to the United States officers. After disposing of the case of those actually engaged in the attack on the building, he turned to those who, he assumed, had incited it. He directed the Jury, in case they found that there were any persons who made speeches of an inflammatory nature immediately previous to the attack, which might be naturally supposed to have provoked it, to find indictments against them in the same manner as against the actual rioters. This was, of course, aimed at the speakers at the Faneuil Hall Meeting. This charge was one of the most extraordinary character, both for the skill with which it was done and for the blow aimed by it at freedom of speech. But the exhortations of the Judge and the exertions of the District Attorney **HALLETT**, were in vain. The Grand Jury was obdurate and only laughed at the proposition. So the matter went over to the March term. At that time, the zeal of the Judge had somewhat cooled, as he merely

referred the Grand Jury to the Attorney for the law of his former charge. This latter official had now found (or procured) a more manageable Jury, which brought indictments against Messrs. PHILLIPS and PARKER, for speaking in Faneuil Hall, and against Messrs. STOWELL, HIGGINSON, PROUDMAN, CLUER and MORRISON for the actual assault. When the day set down for these trials arrived, the case of Mr. STOWELL was the first taken up. His counsel moved to quash the indictment for various formal and substantial defects, and the points were argued at great length. After the reply of the District Attorney, Judge CURTIS intimated to Mr. JOHN P. HALE, who led for the defence, that he need not reply, and, when the Court came in again, he sustained the objections to the insufficiency of the indictment, and ordered it to be quashed. The ground on which this was done, was, that the indictment did not describe Commissioner LORING as a Commissioner authorized under the Fugitive Law to issue Warrants for the arrest of Slaves,—these being a class who are deprived of that prerogative. The Court also gave all concerned to understand that there were other and fatal objections to the indictments, which were passed over in silence, as this one was sufficient. This rebuff was the only reward Mr. HALLETT received for his fidelity in carrying out Judge CURTIS'S instructions in his charge, and for the devotion he has ever shown in the great behalf of Slave-catching. It is no wonder that he should be of the opinion, by no means confined to him, that Judge CURTIS was swift to find or make any way of escape, however small, from the consequences of the enormous blunder of his charge. The other indictments were then discontinued and the defendants discharged. Thus, what had been heralded as a telling tragedy, ended as the most feeble of farces.

During the transactions of the Black Week in Boston, that City was the object of universal interest and observation. The progress of the battle between Slavery and Liberty was watched with the most eager curiosity, and the final triumph of the worse side was hailed with joy or received with shame or grief, according to the different characters, opinions and interests of men. The President and Cabinet were fierce in urging on the chase, and honestly paid the blood-money to the Boston troops for their kidnapping services, which was received by them with grateful humility. Congress, though loud and fierce in talk, showed the true meanness of the Slaveholding spirit, when it came to the expenditure of money, except for the prospective benefit of Slavery. When the news of the death of BATCHELDER was received,

most liberal intentions were expressed towards his widow. It was proposed to grant her a pension of three thousand dollars *per annum*. This was cut down to a gift of two thousand dollars outright. And, finally Congress adjourned without giving her anything at all! It was loudly proclaimed that the South in general, and Alexandria in particular, would make ample provision for the martyr's widow. We believe the entire sum received by the unfortunate woman, from the entire South, is not much over one hundred dollars. The moral effect of this outrage and all its concomitants and consequences has been, on the whole, favorable to the right. The voice of the pulpit and of the press, though not without disgraceful exceptions, was more generally true and manly than ever before. The nature of Slavery naturally and necessarily aggressive and insolent, was seen by many as it had never been seen before. It was seen actually entering a Northern City, and demanding and receiving the help of a State Judge, of a City Mayor, of Lawyers, of the Militia, to catch, keep, and send back a Slave. What had been spoken of by way of illustration, by impassioned Anti-Slavery orators, but which had never been supposed a possibility, was forced upon the eyes and minds of the people as an accomplished fact. Slavery was no longer a distant evil, belonging to remote States. It had invaded New England, taken possession of her Capital, seized its victim and carried him off, with the drums beating and colors flying of the troops of the conquered City. Such things cannot be forgotten. They must be either a savor of life unto life, or a savor of death unto death. If anything can arouse a righteous spirit of resistance to Slavery in New England, it must be scenes like these. If these cannot, then the old spirit of Liberty has, indeed, died out, and she will deserve the disgraceful doom of all willing slaves. But we hope better things of her, and of the other Free States, and believe that all these things will yet help swell that tide of Northern feeling which can, when it is in earnest, sweep Slavery from the land.

#### OTHER SLAVE CASES.—JUDGE MCLEAN'S DECISION.

It would require a volume to attempt to recount even the most prominent of the other instances of the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law within the last two years. Those two years have furnished illustrations of all the hardships which had been foreseen as necessarily incident to that Law, but which had been represented, at the time of



its passage, as merely imaginary and impossible. Free people have been seized as Slaves, and carried into irremediable bondage. Freemen have been claimed by perjury, and have been imprisoned for long weeks, and have, at last, scarcely escaped from the impending doom. Men guilty only of exercising common humanity towards fellow creatures in the greatest need of help to which human beings can be reduced, have been mulcted of all their goods, and punished for their benevolence by bankruptcy. A man who had escaped from Slavery, into which he had been kidnapped, was restored again in spite of the clearest proofs that he was born free. And besides these instances of the natural operation of this fiendish statute on the bystanders, and those having no birthright connection with Slavery, multitudes of innocent beings, once Slaves, who had vindicated their right to freedom by the efforts they had made to obtain it, have been seized and hurried from the homes and hopes they had won for themselves back into the horror and despair of Slavery. We can only notice such cases as are distinguished from the ordinary course of this injustice, by circumstances or judicial decisions worthy of particular remembrance.

In August, 1853, GEORGE W. QUERRY was brought before Mr. Justice McLEAN, the senior Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, and an eminent member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as a Fugitive Slave. There was nothing peculiar about the case making it to differ from the mass of Slave cases in its facts. The man had been in Ohio for several years, supporting himself honestly by his labor, and reputed and believed to be a Freeman by all his neighbors and acquaintances. But there was a man who wanted his services for nothing, and he had no difficulty in finding the witnesses he needed, and the case made out was one that would have satisfied any Slave Commissioner that it was his duty to take Ten dollars, instead of Five, for his services. The interest peculiar to this case arises from its being the occasion of so eminent a Magistrate as Judge McLEAN sustaining the constitutionality of the Law, and remitting the party to his master on that ground. This he did in the fullest manner, setting up the Law in all its details and expressing, unquestionably, the sense of the Bar and Bench of the United States on the subject. As to the existence of Slavery in Kentucky, from which State the party claimed was said to have escaped, he ruled that it was not necessary to prove that it was legal there. The Courts of the United States and of the States are bound to recognize it as a local institution, which it had been adjudged

to be, in the case of *Groves vs. Slaughter*, (15 Peters, 450.) He went on:—

“Whether this law (of Slavery) was founded upon usage or express enactment, is of no importance. Usage of long continuance—so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary—has the force of law. It arises from long recognized rights, countervailed by no legislative action. This is the source of many of the principles of the Common Law. And this, for a century or more, may constitute Slavery, though it be opposed, as it is, to all the principles of the Common Law of England. I speak of African Slavery.”

This is a legal answer, repugnant as it may be to humanity and justice, to the argument which has been set up, of late years, against the legality of Slavery, by reason of its inconsistency with the Common Law of England. The Common Law of England recognized and maintained White Slavery for hundreds of years, until what Civilization and Christianity had left of it was swept away by the Statute of Charles II. So Negro Slavery was the Common Law of the North American Colonies as it was of that in the West Indies, excepting where abolished by Legislative Authority, or by the Supreme Power of the People acting in their Original capacity, as in Massachusetts, in 1780. It still remains the Common Law of the Slave States, and must be so regarded by the National Tribunals. As this Opinion of Judge McLEAN contains the substance of the Argument in defence of the Constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Act, and also expresses the sense of the Bench, the Bar, the Legislative and Executive Departments of the Government from its foundation, and of nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the people, of all parties and opinions, as to the Obligations of the Constitution on that matter, perhaps we shall be justified in recording here the most material parts of it.

“It is contended that the Law authorizing the reclamation of Fugitives from labor is unconstitutional; that the Constitution left the power with the States, and vested no power on the subject in the Federal Government.

“This argument has been sometimes advanced, and it may have been introduced into one or more political platforms. In regard to the soundness of this position, I will first refer to judicial decisions. In the case of *Prigg vs. The State of Pennsylvania*, (16 Peters, R., 539,) the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, without a dissenting voice, affirmed the doctrine that this power was in the Federal Government. A majority of them held that it was exclusively in the General Government. Some of the Judges thought that a State might

legislate in aid of the act of Congress ; but it was held by no one of them that the power could be exercised by a State, except in subordination to the Federal power.

“Every State Court which has decided the question, has decided it in accordance with the view of the Supreme Court. No respectable Court, it is believed, has sustained the view that the power is with the State. Such an array of authority can scarcely be found in favor of the construction of any part of the Constitution which has ever been doubted. But this construction, sanctioned as it is by the entire Judicial power — State as well as Federal — has also the sanction of the Legislative power.

“The Constitution of the United States, it will be observed, was formed in 1787. Afterward it was submitted to the respective States, for their ratification. The subject was not only largely discussed, in the Federal Convention, but also in every State Convention. No question has ever arisen, in regard to our Federal Relations, which was of equal importance to that of the adoption of the Constitution ; none in our political history was more thoroughly discussed. The men of that day may be emphatically said to have understood the Constitution.

“In a very few years after the Constitution was adopted by the States, the Fugitive Act of 1793 was passed. That Law is still in force, except where the Act of 1850 contains repugnant provisions. In the Congress which enacted the Act of 1793, it is believed that some of the members had been members of the Convention. They could not have been ignorant of the provisions of that instrument ; and by the passage of that Act they exercised the power as one that belonged to the Federal Government. Here is a force of authority, judicial and legislative, which cannot be found on my other seriously litigated point in the Constitution.

“Such a weight of authority is not to be shaken. If the question is not to be considered authoritatively settled, what part of that instrument can ever be settled ? The surrender of Fugitive Slaves was a matter deeply interesting to the Slave States. Under the Confederation there was no provision for their surrender. On the principles of comity amongst the States, the Fugitives were delivered up ; at other times, they were protected and defended. This state of things produced uneasiness and discontent in the Slave States. A remedy of this evil, as it was called, was provided in the Constitution.

“An individual who puts his opinion, as to the exercise of this power, against the authority of the Nation in its legislative and judicial action, must have no small degree of confidence in his own judgment. A few individuals, in Massachusetts, may have maintained, at one time, that the power was with the States ; but such views were, it is believed, long since abandoned, but they are reasserted now more as a matter of expediency than of principle.

“But whether we look at the weight of authority against State power, as asserted, or at the constitutional provision, we are led to the same

result. The provision reads :— ‘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 may be due.’

“This, in the first place, is a Federal measure. It was adopted by the National Convention, and was sanctioned as a Federal law by the respective States. It is the Supreme Law of the land. Now, a provision which cannot be enforced, and which has no penalty for its violation, is no law. The highly respectable gentleman who read an ingenious argument in support of these views, is too good a theologian to contend that any rule of action which may be disregarded without incurring a penalty, can be a law. This was the great objection to the Articles of Confederation. There was no power to enforce its provisions. They were recommendatory, and without sanctions.

“There is no regulation, divine, or human, which can be called a law, without a sanction. Our first parents, in the garden, felt the truth of this ; and it has been felt by violators of the divine or human laws, throughout the history of our race.

“The provision in the Constitution is prohibitory and positive. It prohibits the States from liberating Slaves which escape into them, and it enjoins a duty to deliver up such Fugitives, on claim being made. The Constitution vests no special power in Congress to prohibit the first, or to enforce the observance of the second. Does it, therefore, follow that effect can be given to neither, if a State shall disregard it ?

“Suppose a State declare a Slave, who escapes into it, shall be liberated, or that any one who shall assist in delivering him up, shall be punished. If this power belongs to the States, and not to the Federal Government, these regulations would be legal, as within the exercise of their discretion. This is not an ideal case. The principle was involved in the Prigg case, and the Supreme Court held the act of the State unconstitutional and void.

“It is admitted that there is no power in the Federal Government to force any legislative action on a State. But if the Constitution guarantees a right to the master of a Slave, and that he shall be delivered up, the power is given to effectuate that right. If this be not so, the Constitution is not what its framers supposed it to be. It was believed to be a fundamental law of the Union—a Federal law—a law to the States, and to the people of the States. It says that the States shall not do certain things. Is this the form of giving advice or recommendation ? It is the language of authority, to those who are bound to obey. If a State do the thing forbidden, its act will be declared void. If it refuse to do that which is enjoined, the Federal Government, *being a government*, has the means of executing it.

“The Constitution provides, ‘that full faith shall be given to public acts, records, and judicial proceedings,’ of one State, in every other. If an individual claim this provision as a right, and a State Court shall deny it, on a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the Union, such

judgment would be reversed. And so the provision that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.' Congress unquestionably may provide in what manner a right, claimed under this clause, and denied by a State, may be enforced. And if a case can be raised under it, without any further statutory provisions, so as to present the point to the Supreme Court, the decision of a State Court, denying the right, would be reversed. So a State is prohibited from passing a law that shall impair the obligations of a contract. Such a law the Supreme Court has declared void. In these cases, and in many others where a State is prohibited from doing a thing, the remedy is given by a writ of error, under the legislation of Congress. The same principle applies in regard to fugitives from labor.

"A fugitive from justice may be delivered up under a similar provision in the Constitution. It declares that 'a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the Executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.' This is contained in the same section as the clause in relation to fugitives from labor, and they both stand upon the same principle. In both cases, Congress has provided a mode in which effect shall be given to the provision. No one, it is believed, has doubted the constitutionality of the provision in regard to fugitives from justice.

"The men who framed the Constitution were adequate to the great duties which devolved upon them. They knew that a General Government was essential to preserve the fruits of the Revolution. They understood the necessities of the Country. The Articles of Confederation had been found as a rope of sand, in all matters of conflict between the different States, and the people of the different States. Without a General Government, commerce could not be regulated among the States, or with foreign nations; fugitives from labor could not be reclaimed; State boundaries could not be authoritatively established.

"I am aware it has been stated that the subject of Slavery was not discussed in the Convention, and that the reclamation of fugitives from labor was not, at that time, a subject of much interest. This is a mistake. It was a subject of deep and exciting interest, and without a provision on the subject, no Constitution could have been adopted. I speak from information received from the late Chief Justice MARSHALL, who was one of the chief actors in that day, than whom no man then living was of higher authority.

"The want of a general regulation on the subject of fugitives from justice and from labor was felt, and the above provisions in the Constitution were intended as a remedy. It has proved to be an adequate remedy, as against fugitives from justice. In no instance, it is believed, has the constitutionality of this provision been doubted. But the provision in relation to fugitives from labor, resting upon the same principle, is now opposed.

“If the introduction of this provision into the fundamental law of the Union was not intended to operate as the law of the Union — if it was recommendatory in its character only — it was useless. The power to surrender fugitives from labor, under the Confederacy, was with each State. It could be done, or refused, at the discretion of the State. Did the framers of the Constitution intend to leave this matter as it was under the Confederation? The provision introduced shows an intention to make some provision on the subject. But by the argument, it is said, the provision made left the power with the States, and did not vest it in the General Government. The answer to this is, it was in the States before the provision, and, on this view, it added nothing to the power of the States. If such be the true construction of the provision, it fixes an act of consummate folly on the framers of the Constitution, and on the members of the State Conventions who adopted it. In laying the foundation of a General Government, they incorporated into the fundamental law a useless provision, and omitted to provide for an emergency which was felt and complained of in one-half of the States. The men of that day were not likely to be guilty of such an omission. They understood the Federal and State powers too well, not to know that without some effective provision on this subject the superstructure which they were about to rear would soon be overthrown. These were the circumstances under which the Constitution was framed and adopted. With the abstract principles of Slavery, Courts called to administer the law have nothing to do. It is for the people, who are sovereign, and their representatives, in making constitutions, and in the enactment of laws, to consider the laws of Nature, and the immutable principles of right. This is a field which Judges cannot explore. Their action is limited to conventional rights. They look to the law, and to the law only. A disregard of this, by the judicial powers, would undermine and overturn the social compact. If the law be injudicious or oppressive, let it be repealed or modified. But this is a power which the Judiciary cannot reach.

“The citizen of a Slave State has a right, under the Constitution and laws of the Union, to have his Fugitive Slave ‘delivered up on claim being made,’ and no State can defeat or obstruct this constitutional right. The judicial power of the Union has the primary or eventual power to determine all rights arising under the Constitution. This will not be controverted by any legal mind, which has properly investigated the great principles of the Constitution. And the question now made is not, in principle, different from a numerous class of cases arising under powers prohibited to the States.

“This question has been largely discussed in Congress, in the public press, and in conventions of the people. It is not here raised as a question of expediency or policy, but of power. In that aspect only is it to be considered.

“The Act of 1793 has been in operation about sixty years. During that whole time it has been executed as occasion required, and it is not known that any Court, Judge, or other officer, has held the Act, in this

or any other respect, unconstitutional. This long course of decision, on a question so exciting as to call forth the sympathies of the people and the astuteness of lawyers, is no unsatisfactory evidence that the construction is correct.

“Under the Constitution and Act of Congress, the inquiry is not strictly whether the fugitive be a slave or a freeman, but whether he owe service to the claimant. This would be the precise question in the case of an apprentice. In such a case the inquiry would not be, whether the master had treated the apprentice so badly as to entitle him to his discharge. Such a question would more properly arise under the indenture of apprenticeship, and the laws under which it was executed. And if the apprentice be remanded to the service of his master, it would in no respect affect his right to a discharge, where he is held, for the cruelty of his master, or on any other ground.

“The same principle applies to fugitives from labor. It is true, in such cases, evidence is heard that he is a freeman. His freedom may be established, by acts done or suffered by his master, not necessarily within the jurisdiction where he is held as a Slave. Such an inquiry may be made, as it is required by the justice of the case. But on whatever ground the fugitive may be remanded, it cannot legally operate against his right to liberty. That right, when presented to a Court in a Slave State, has generally been acted upon with fairness and impartiality. Exceptions to this, if there be exceptions, would seem to have arisen on the claims of heirs or creditors, which are governed by local laws, with which the people of the other States are not presumed to be acquainted.

“If a fugitive from labor, after being liberated by a Judge or Commissioner, should voluntarily return to his master, Southern Courts have held that his original status would attach to him; he would be held as a Slave. And, of course, the decision of the Judge or Commissioner, having been that he did not owe service to the claimant, could not operate as a bar to the rights of the master. The claim to freedom, if made, in the Slave State, would be unaffected by the preliminary inquiry and decision. That decision is, that the Slave does, or does not finally establish the fact, whether the fugitive is a Freeman or a Slave. If the decision on such an inquiry as this should finally fix the seal of Slavery on the fugitive, I should hesitate long, notwithstanding the weight of precedent, without the aid of a jury, to pronounce his fate. But the inquiry is preliminary, and not final.

“It is true, it may be said, that the power of the master may be so exercised as to defeat a trial for the freedom of the fugitive. This must be admitted, but the hardship and injustice supposed arises out of the institution of Slavery, over which we have no control. Under such circumstances, we cannot be held answerable.

“It may be said that the seventh Article in the amended Constitution, which gives a trial by jury, ‘where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars,’ does not apply to a case like this. The provision is, ‘in suits at Common Law.’ This is not strictly a proceeding at

Common Law. The Common Law is opposed to the principle of Slavery. The proceeding is under constitutional and statutory provisions, under the forms specially provided, and not according to the course of the Common Law."

This calm and judicial exposition of the Constitutional Law of Slavery needs no comment. That it is substantially sound as Law, we cannot doubt. We doubt whether all the ingenuity of Senators, who would set up the doctrine that the Constitution is a mere treaty between separate Sovereignities, and that these extradition clauses are to be carried into effect by State Legislation, can prevail against the common sense of the matter, and the necessary results of the application of legal reasoning to it. That the doctrines thus coolly laid down and enforced, putting the Slave Laws on the same footing with those intended for the protection of rights, and indeed, with those ordained by God, himself, for the good of his creatures, are more revolting than when rendered into the coarse and furious jargon of the Slave-catcher and his accomplices, does not alter the essential fact that they set forth the Supreme Law of the Land, which we are all commanded to obey. Nor do we regard it as, practically, of much consequence whether Slaves are to be sent back to their masters by treaty stipulation, or by an enactment of Congress, provided that it be admitted that they are to be sent back at all. If the Constitution be a Treaty, its stipulations are to be observed, and their due execution provided for by the parties entering into it. Let it be which it may, a Supreme Law or a Binding Treaty, it is, in our view, an abominable thing, with which we cannot, as honest and honorable men, have anything to do, excepting to seek its destruction. The American Anti-Slavery Society deal with the Facts of the Nation as they find them. They have no faith in the magic of grammatical niceties or logical distinctions, to conjure away the black realities which confront them. It is the actual state of things with which they have to do, and as long as they find that they are required to agree, according to the adjudged and all but universally received meaning of the Constitution, to return fugitives, and do, or consent to, certain other things designed for the support of Slavery, before they can take part in the Government of the Nation, they elect to stand aside from it, and to seek the influence over it from without, which it is neither possible nor honest to attempt to use within it. When they have brought any integral part of the Union to the point of Dissolution, or even of open Nullification, then the power of direct political action may reattack, so far as to assist in bringing about, or in maintaining, the new and revo-



lutionary state of affairs. But, until that time shall come, they must be content with being the lever with which the world is to be moved into better relations.

### THE MILWAUKEE RESCUE AND DECISIONS.

We are happy to say that there have been signs of the times, within the last two years, which seem to indicate that this desirable result is not impossible. About the middle of March, 1854, a man named JOSHUA GLOVER, was seized near Racine, in Wisconsin, as a Fugitive Slave. His arrest was marked by the circumstances of cruelty and cowardice which seem to be essential to the execution of this Law above all others. He was brought, chained and bleeding, to Milwaukee, where he was lodged in jail. As soon as the news spread, an indignation, as general as it was righteous, prevailed throughout the City. A Public Meeting was forthwith called, and held in the open air, at which several of the principal citizens assisted. Stirring speeches were made, and strong resolutions passed, to the effect that the rights of the man should be asserted and defended to the utmost. Counsel learned in the Law volunteered, and all necessary process was issued, as well against the claimant for the assault and battery, as in behalf of the man restrained of his liberty. A Vigilance Committee was appointed to see that GLOVER was not secretly hurried off, and the bells were ordered to be rung in case any such attempt should be made. But the people were not disposed to trust to the operation of the Slave Law, administered by United States Judges or Commissioners, and they stepped in and settled the question for themselves, in a summary manner. A hundred men arrived, in the afternoon, from Racine, the town from which the man had been kidnapped, who marched in order to the jail. They were soon reinforced by multitudes more, and a formal demand was made for the Slave. This being denied, an attack was made upon the door, which was soon broken in, the man released, and carried back in triumph to Racine, whence he was afterwards conveyed beyond the jurisdiction of the Star Spangled Banner. A Mass Convention of the citizens of Wisconsin was afterwards held to provide for similar cases, should they occur, and a most sound and healthy tone of feeling appears to have pervaded that youthful Commonwealth.

After the rescue had been effected, the United States Marshal arrested several persons for the offence of resisting an officer in the

discharge of his duties. Among these was Mr. SHERMAN M. BOOTH, the Editor of the Free Democrat. When brought before a Commissioner, in the custody of the Marshal, a Writ of Habeas Corpus was sued out on his behalf, and he was brought before Judge A. D. SMITH, of the Supreme Court. After a full hearing, Judge SMITH granted him his discharge, on the ground that the Fugitive Slave Law was unconstitutional. The Marshal then had the proceedings removed by a Writ of Certiorari before a full bench of the Supreme Court, when the decision of Judge SMITH was confirmed and Mr. BOOTH discharged from custody. Immediately afterwards, Judge MILLER, of the United States District Court, issued another Warrant for the arrest of Mr. BOOTH, making no mention of the Fugitive Slave Act, but directing his arrest to answer to a charge for abetting the escape of a prisoner from the custody of the United States Marshal. Another Writ of Habeas Corpus was sued out, but it was denied by the Supreme Court, on the ground that there was nothing on the face of the record to bring it within range of their former decision. The Court refused to imitate the example of the United States Judges in the case of Marshal WYNCOOP, of which we shall speak presently, and to go behind the record to make out the case they wanted.

As this is the first instance of a State Court setting aside the Fugitive Slave Law on constitutional grounds, we think that it will not be a misuse of our space to occupy a portion of it with the substance of the opinion in the words of Chief Justice VINTON. After maintaining the right of the State Courts to examine into the grounds of the imprisonment of any citizen by a pretended authority of a United States Court, as well as by that of the State Courts, the Chief Justice proceeds to consider the main point of the constitutionality of the law itself. He says:—

“There being no valid objection to issuing the writ and bringing the prisoner before the officer, the question arises whether the discharge of the prisoner was in accordance with law. The return of the Marshal to the writ of Habeas Corpus sets out substantially the same reason for the detention of the prisoner as that stated in the petition for the writ above given, so that there is no necessity for restating it. The first objection taken to the return is, that it does not set forth a valid reason. Upon this subject we fully concur in the opinion of the Justice of this Court who discharged the prisoner. The warrant fails to state any offence under the Act of Congress in question, inasmuch as it does not show for what purpose JOSHUA GLOVER, therein named, was in the custody of the Deputy of the Marshal. He may have been

in custody pursuant to the Act of Congress, approved September 18, 1850, and not have been arrested as a fugitive from labor. The warrant does not, therefore, state that the petitioner aided, abetted, or assisted a person, who was arrested as a fugitive from labor, to escape from custody. This is essential, in order to constitute an offence against the Act of Congress. We are aware that it is sufficient in a warrant to state the offence without that particularity required in an indictment; but still there must be, at least, a general statement of the offence, in order to justify the arrest.

"It is further objected to the return of the Marshal that, admitting GLOVER to have been arrested as a fugitive from labor, under the Act of Congress, approved September 18, 1850, still his arrest was unlawful, for the reason that the Act is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void. And it is contended by the relator that it can be no crime to abet or assist a person to escape from illegal punishment. The principal reasons urged in favor of this position of the relator are, that the Constitution of the United States confers no power upon Congress to legislate upon the subject of the surrender of fugitives from labor; that the Act in question attempts to confer judicial power upon Commissioners, not upon Courts; and that, by virtue of the Act, a person may be deprived of his liberty 'without due process of law.'

"On the other hand, it is contended by the plaintiff in error that these questions are not now open for discussion, as they have all been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States; and as that Court is the only one which can, which has the power to settle finally the question of the constitutionality of an Act of Congress, all other Courts are bound to acquiesce in their decision. It is not, of course, claimed by the plaintiff in error that the Act of Congress in question has been before that Court for consideration, but it is contended that an Act passed by Congress, February 12, 1793, (1st U. S. Stat. at large, 302) contains provisions not distinguishable in principle from those of the Act of September 18, 1850, and that the Court has decided this Act to be valid and obligatory. We do not understand that the two Acts are in all respects alike in principle, or even similar. The Act of 1793 provides for the surrender of fugitives from labor, and so far as it relates to the latter description of persons, it is similar to the Act of 1850. But the two Acts differ essentially in the manner in which the surrender is to be effected. By the former, the person to whom the service or labor was due was authorized to seize or arrest the fugitive, and to take him before any Judge of the Circuit or District Court of the United States, residing or being within the State, or before any Magistrate of a County, City, or Town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest was made, and upon proof to the satisfaction of such Judge or Magistrate, either by oral testimony or affidavit taken and certified by a Magistrate of any such State or Territory, that the person so seized owed service or labor under the laws of the State to the claimant, it became the duty of the Judge or Magistrate to give a certificate

thereof to the claimant, his agent or attorney, which was sufficient warrant for the removal of the fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped. It will be observed that the alleged fugitive was to be taken before some Judge of the Circuit or District Court of the United States, or before some State Magistrate, who decided upon the question of the surrender of the fugitive to the claimant, upon proof to be submitted to him. He had the power to weigh the testimony and to decide upon its sufficiency. The Act of September 18, 1850, differs from that of 1793 in two essential particulars. By the former, certain officers, called Commissioners, are authorized to make the surrender and give the certificate, and the testimony to show the fact that the alleged fugitive owes service or labor, and that he has escaped, is not to be weighed by the Commissioner, but has an effect given to it by the Act independent entirely of the opinion of the Commissioner in regard to its sufficiency. The 10th section of the Act provides that when any persons held to service or labor, in any State or Territory in the District of Columbia shall escape therefrom, the party to whom such labor or service shall be due, or his agent or attorney, may apply to any Court of Record therein, or Judge thereof in vacation, and make satisfactory proof to such Court, or Judge in vacation, of the escape aforesaid, and that the person escaping owed service or labor to such party. Whereupon the Court shall cause a record to be made of the matter so proved, and also a general description of the person so escaping, with such convenient certainty as may be; and a transcript of such record, authenticated by the attestation of the Clerk and of the seal of said Court, being produced in any other State, Territory, or District, in which the person so escaping may be found, and being exhibited to any Judge, Commissioner, or other officer, authorized by the law of the United States to cause persons escaping from service or labor to be delivered up, shall be held and taken to be full and conclusive evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labor of the person escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned.

“It can hardly be claimed, we think, that any adjudication upon the Act of 1793 could decide all the questions involved in the Act of 1850. But we will examine the cases referred to by the counsel for the plaintiff in error, upon this point. The Act of 1793 received a very elaborate examination in the case of *Prigg vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (16th Peters’ R. 640). The question, however, involved in the record before the Court was, simply, whether Prigg, the plaintiff, had the right to seize, without process, in the State of Pennsylvania, MARGARET MORGAN, a Fugitive Slave, and remand her to the State of Maryland, from which she had escaped, contrary to the Statute of the former State. The decision of the Court was, that he had the power, and the Court reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which had affirmed the judgment of the Court in which Prigg was convicted. The principal question discussed by the Justices of the Court who gave opinions was, the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of the reclamation of fugitives from labor, and they

were all of opinion that Congress had the power; a majority holding that the power was exclusive, and that the State could not pass laws even in aid of the legislation of Congress. In the course of this discussion, nothing was said in relation to the powers of Commissioners, for those officers did not exist at the time when the Act of Congress was passed, nor of the right of the alleged fugitive to a trial by Jury, to decide the question of fact upon which his surrender depends. In the case of *Jones vs. Van Zandt*, (5th How. R. 215) the Act of 1793 came again before the Court for its consideration, and, in the course of the opinion given in that case, the Court says: 'This Court has already, after much deliberation, decided that the Act of February 12, 1793, was not repugnant to the Constitution. The reasons for their opinion are fully explained by Justice Story, in *Prigg vs. Penn.*, 16 Peters, 611.' In the case of *Moore vs. Illinois*, (14th How. R. 13,) the Court states what was decided in the case of *Prigg vs. Pennsylvania*, and among the questions said to be decided in that case was this: 'That the government is clothed with appropriate authority and functions to enforce the delivery [of Fugitive Slaves] on claim of the owner, and has properly exercised it in the Act of Congress of 12th February, 1793.' These are all the cases which we have been able to find where the Act of 1793 has come before the Supreme Court of the United States for review, and in none of them is the question of the power of Commissioners to give the certificate to the claimant which authorizes the removal of the fugitive discussed or decided.

"These cases are equally silent upon the question (a most important one) raised in this case, as to the right of a person claimed as a fugitive from labor, to have the facts which must be proved before he can be surrendered to the claimant tried and decided by a Jury. It is true that the Act of 1793 provides for the surrender of the person claimed as a fugitive without such a trial and decision, and it is said in substance by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Jones vs. Van Zandt*, and *Moore vs. Illinois*, that the Court did decide in the case of *Prigg vs. Penn.*, that the Act of February 12, 1793, was constitutional. But, upon looking at that case, we find that the question of a trial by Jury, to determine the facts of the case, was not raised by the record, and was not discussed by the Court in giving its opinion. We think it would be most unjust to that Court to hold that it has decided questions which its Judges have not even discussed, and which have not been before it for adjudication.

"We are of opinion, therefore, that, whatever may be the duty of this Court, in relation to the question of the power of Congress to provide by law for the surrender of fugitives from labor to the person to whom their labor is due, we are not at liberty to consider the question of the right of a person claimed as a fugitive to a trial by Jury before he can be surrendered or delivered up to the claimant, as already settled by the Court which has the power finally to decide all questions growing out of an alleged violation of the Constitution of the United States, by an Act of Congress. We must consider the question as an open one.

“It becomes, therefore, our duty to decide whether so much of the Act of Congress, of September 18, 1850, as provides that certain officers, called Commissioners, shall decide the questions of fact, which must be proved before the surrender of the alleged fugitive can take place, is valid and obligatory. We think that we are also called upon to decide whether the proceedings provided for in the Act for establishing judicially the fact of the escape of the alleged fugitive, and the fact that he owes service or labor, are in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. These questions are most grave and important; we would that we could avoid them, but they are forced upon us, and we are not at liberty to refuse to consider them.

“We are of opinion that so much of the Act of Congress in question as refers to the Commissioners for decision, the questions of fact which are to be established by evidence, before the alleged fugitive can be delivered up to the claimant, is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void, for two reasons—1st, because it attempts to confer upon those officers judicial powers; and, 2d, because it is a denial of the right of the alleged fugitive to have those questions tried and decided by a Jury, which, we think, is given him by the Constitution of the United States. We have referred to the case of *Martin vs. Hunter's Lessees*, (1 Wheaton, p. 305,) and to Art. 3, Sec. 1, of the Constitution of the United States, to show that Congress cannot vest any judicial power, under the Constitution, except in Courts. We are aware that Congress has established Courts in the various territories, and has provided for the appointment of Judges with a different tenure of office from that fixed by the Constitution; but the power to appoint these Judges is supposed to be derived from Art. 4, Sec. 2, of the Constitution, which provides that ‘Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States.’

“But, however this may be, we are not aware that the authority to vest any portion of the judicial power in any tribunals created by itself, except those mentioned in Sec. 1 of Art. 3 of the Constitution, is claimed for Congress by any one, save in the single instance of judicial officers for the territories belonging to the United States and for the District of Columbia. We think that the duties performed by the Commissioners, under the Act in question, are judicial in their character; as clearly so as those performed by a Judge in the ordinary administration of justice. He is obliged to decide upon the questions presented judicially, and to give a certificate to the person claiming the alleged fugitive, which authorizes his transportation to the State from whence he is alleged to have escaped, or withhold it, as he shall think proper, in view of the evidence submitted for his consideration. It is true that the Act, by providing that the record made in the State from whence the alleged fugitive may have escaped, shall be conclusive evidence of the escape, and of the fact that the person claimed owed service or labor to the claimant, materially lessens the labor of the Commissioner, but this does not alter the nature of the Act which he

performs ; it must be regarded as a judicial determination of the matter submitted to him. We are, therefore, of opinion, that the Act under consideration, by attempting to vest judicial power in officers created by Congress and unknown to the Constitution, is repugnant to that instrument, and for that reason void.

“ And we think it equally clear that the Constitution is violated by withholding from the person claimed the right to a trial by Jury, before he can be delivered up to the claimant.

“ The fifth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States provides, among other things, that ‘ no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.’ Chancellor KENT, in his Commentaries, (Kent, Com. 3,) says, ‘ it may be received as a self-evident proposition, universally understood and acknowledged throughout this country, that no person can be taken or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, or liberties, or estate, or exiled, or condemned, or deprived of life, liberty, or property, unless by the law of the land, or the judgment of his peers.’

“ ‘The words (*law of the land*) as used in *Magna Charta* in reference to this subject, are understood to mean due process of law ; this is, by indictment, or presentment of good and lawful men ; and this, says Lord COKE, is the true sense and exposition of these words.’ We are aware that it has been said that Slaves are not persons, in the sense in which that term is used in the Amendment to the Constitution above referred to. But this, admitting it to be true, does not affect the question under consideration, as persons who are free are liable to be arrested and deprived of their liberty by virtue of this Act, without having had a trial by Jury of their peers. We do not propose to discuss the question whether a Slave escaping from the State where he is held to service or labor, into a State where Slavery does not exist, thereby becomes free by virtue of the local law, subject only to be delivered up, to be returned again to servitude, as it is a question not necessarily involved in the consideration of the subject before us. But we propose to examine the operation of the Act upon a free citizen of a free State, and to show that by it such a person may be deprived of his liberty ‘ without due process of law.’ It will be observed that the claimant can go before any Court of Record, or any Judge thereof, in vacation, and make satisfactory proof to such Court or Judge, of the escape, and that the person escaping owes service or labor to such party.

“ It then becomes the duty of the Court to cause a record to be made of the matters so proved, and also a description of the person escaping, and such record, being exhibited to any Judge, Commissioner, or other officer authorized by law to cause persons escaping from service or labor to be delivered up, shall be held and taken to be conclusive evidence of the fact of escape, and that the service or labor of the person escaping is due to the party in such record mentioned. This testimony is taken and this record is made in the absence of the person to be affected by the proceeding ; he has no opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses who

depose to the facts which are thus conclusively proved ; but, without his knowledge, evidence is manufactured, which, by virtue of this Act, proves beyond question that he is a Slave, and that he has escaped from servitude. We are at a loss to perceive how this proceeding, by virtue of which a freeman becomes a Slave, can be justly called 'due process of law,' in the sense in which that language is used in the Constitution. We are aware that it has been said that the proceedings before the Commissioner do not determine the question of Freedom or Slavery, that the fugitive is only sent back to the State from which he is alleged to have escaped, and that when he reaches there he is a Freeman or a Slave, as his *status* shall be determined by the local law. It is further said that these proceedings are analogous to those by which the fugitive from justice is delivered up, to be taken to the State from which he has escaped ; that a person may be arrested by virtue merely of indictment, founded on an affidavit made before a Magistrate, charging him with treason, felony, or other crime, committed in some other State, and that upon the production of a copy of the indictment or affidavit, certified as authentic by the Governor or Chief Magistrate of the State or Territory from which he fled, he shall be delivered up to be taken back. It is said that as this proceeding does not deprive the person of his liberty in the sense in which that term is used in the Constitution, but merely delivers him up, to be taken to the State where, according to the indictment or affidavit, the offence was committed, to be dealt with according to the local law, so neither do those proceedings accomplish more than the mere transfer of the alleged fugitive to the State where, as is claimed, he owes service or labor by force of the local law. We think this is a mistaken view of the question. The fugitive from justice is delivered to an agent appointed by the Governor of the State where the offence is alleged to have been committed, without any adjudication upon the question of his guilt or innocence ; in other words, he is delivered to the officer of the law, and is in the custody of the law, for the purpose of being taken to the State where alone he can be tried for the alleged offence. But the case is very different with the alleged fugitive from labor. There is an adjudication before the Commissioner that he owes service or labor, and that he has escaped. By force of the Act of Congress under consideration, the record made in the State from which he is said to have escaped is conclusive evidence that his *status* is that of a Slave.

"The Commissioner is obliged, if his identity is proved, so to adjudge, and the certificate which is given to the claimant is given because the Commissioner has so adjudged. Moreover, the Commissioner can only give the certificate to the claimant who must be the person to whom the labor or service is due, his agent or attorney, and it is given to him for that reason. It is not material to inquire what the condition of the person will be when he has been taken to the State where the labor or service is said to be due. He may regain his freedom, but if he does, it will be by force of the law of the State, and not by virtue of the Act of Congress under consideration ; for under that he has been adjudged



a Slave, and by force of it he has been taken as a Slave by the person adjudged to be his owner, his agent or attorney, from the State where he was arrested to the State from which he is alleged to have escaped. We are, therefore, obliged to conclude, that the alleged fugitive from labor is taken back to the State from which he is said to have escaped, not as a person merely charged with being a Slave, but as a person who has been proved and adjudged to be a Slave, and, as we believe, without due process of law — without having his rights passed upon and determined by a jury of his peers. We think it essential that his rights should be maintained by all courts and all tribunals, and for the reasons above given, we must affirm the order made in this case, discharging the relator.”

It will be seen how very different are the views taken of the Fugitive Law by this Magistrate and by Judge McLEAN, whom we have quoted. We shall not enter into the consideration of the question as to which is right and which wrong, upon the strict technicalities of the legal interpretation of instruments; though we have no doubt whatever as to what the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States will be, when the point comes before it for adjudication. We hope that the Judges of Wisconsin will be as ready to set the wholesome example of protecting their own citizens from the tyranny of National Legislation and Adjudication, after that decision, as they were before. We do not regard this decision, lucid and able as it is, as of so much consequence in its legal bearings as in its political; not so important as an interpretation of the Constitution, as a declaration of reserved and necessary rights, which no Constitution should be allowed to override. It is as an indication of spirit rather than as a declaration of law that we value it. A Bench of Judges, capable of pronouncing such an opinion, and of following it up, as we shall presently see that they did, we may be sure has a people behind them. Judges are seldom, if ever, in advance of the average of the public opinion and feeling of the public they belong to. Highly honoring, as we do, these upright Magistrates for the independence of their action, we also recognize and honor the virtue and spirit of the people who have chosen such men to judge them. We may doubt whether their construction of the Constitution will be allowed, in the last analysis, to stand for Law; but we believe that it cannot be hindered from standing for something much better and more potent than Law — for that improving and strengthening sense of justice in the general mind, which is sure, sooner or later, to change or to overthrow Laws or Constitutions that contradict or defy it.

In the meantime the United States Judge and Marshal were busy

in their vocation. It is affirmed that the Grand Jury was packed in the most unblushing manner, until an inquest was made up that would answer the purpose of the Government. However this may have been, indictments were found in the District Court, against Mr. BOOTH and several other persons. A petty Jury, selected with the same care that had been bestowed on the composition of the Grand Jury, convicted Mr. BOOTH and Mr. RYECRAFT. All the weight of the Government was thrown against the defendants. Special counsel were retained to assist the District Attorney, the instructions of the Court were precise and definite against them, all motions in their behalf resting on the irregularities and injustices of the proceedings were overruled. So were all motions subsequent to the conviction for an arrest of judgment. They were sentenced to fine and imprisonment—Mr. BOOTH to pay one thousand dollars and costs, and to be imprisoned one month, and Mr. RYECRAFT to pay two hundred dollars, and to be imprisoned for ten days. On these sentences they were committed to jail. The public excitement in Milwaukee, and throughout the State, was intense. It was with difficulty that the people could be restrained from forcibly liberating the prisoners. Fortunately there was no occasion for any such extreme measures. They found protection, where it ought to be found, in the constituted authorities of their State. A Writ of Habeas Corpus was issued in their behalf by the Supreme Court, then sitting at Madison, the Capital of the State, returnable before them there. Escorted by two thousand of their fellow citizens, thither, in charge of the High Sheriff they had a hearing at once. After full deliberation, the Court unanimously ordered them to be discharged. The majority of the Court made this decision on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law, one Judge (CRAWFORD) sustaining the Law, but concurring in the order on the ground that no offence, under that Act, was charged in the indictment. So the prisoners were discharged, and brought home in triumph. The United States officials, we believe, have made no further attempt to molest them, but have taken measures to have the matter brought before the Supreme Court, at Washington.

These decisions of the Judiciary of the young State of Wisconsin, we are sorry to say, stand as yet alone. None of the elder States have earned the right to stand by the side of their younger sister in the defence of their common rights. That the United States Judges are ever true to the Power that has appointed them, we have already given ample proof. Mr. Justice GARET has not failed to distinguish himself,

whenever opportunity has offered, as the coarse and indecent champion of Slavery, and of its defenders. In a case of attempted Slave-catching, at Wilkesbarre, in Pennsylvania, the Deputy Marshal, WYNCOOP, and his assistants, had behaved with such atrocious and abominable cruelty, that the citizens felt that justice demanded their punishment for the outrage. They were, accordingly, arrested on a Warrant issued by a most respectable Magistrate, on the oath of one of the principal inhabitants of the place. A Writ of Habeas Corpus was forthwith sued out, returnable before Judge GRIER, whose conduct was well characterized by the New York Evening Post, (of which the poet, BRYANT, is the editor,) in the following pithy sentence. "Judge GRIER bears so strong a likeness to JEFFREYS, in his behavior on the bench, whenever a matter touching the Fugitive Slave Law comes before him, that, on reading a report of the proceedings, one might easily imagine himself reading an account of what happened under the latter Stuarts." That this description is not too severe, the language used by Judge GRIER when the parties were brought before him is proof enough. When the District Attorney, ASHMEAD, moved for discharge of the relators, (which, it is needless to say, was ordered,) Judge GRIER delivered himself to the following effect. "If *habeas corpus* are to be taken out after that manner, I will have an indictment sent to the United States Grand Jury against the person who applies for the Writ, or assists in getting it, the lawyer who defends it, and the sheriff who serves the Writ, to see whether the United States officers are to be arrested and harassed whenever they attempt to serve a process of the United States."

There is no truer test of the nature of the institutions of a country than the character of its Judges. The point at which the laws touch the citizen or the subject is precisely the one which reveals their real complexion. The man who connects the two together, who directs the machinery, and teaches it to perform its appropriate work, is not an unmeet expression of the spirit which informs the laws, and stands behind the institutions from which they spring. PEMBERTON, at the trial of Lord RUSSELL; JEFFREYS, at that of ALGERNON SYDNEY and the Bloody Assizes; the Committee of Public Safety, in the days of ROBESPIERRE; the Military Commissions, sitting at this day in France and Italy, all exemplify and incarnate the spirit of the Government which employs them. A corrupt Government is very sure of a base and servile Judiciary. When wickedness has been organized into law, or has exalted itself above law, there are never wanting men enough to

expound and apply it, and to exhibit, in their own persons, the quality of the legislation and the spirit of the lawgiver.

We have had proofs enough of the truth of these political truisms in the history of this Country for the last three years. When the Fugitive Slave Law was passed, the whole National Judiciary, at the North, made haste to accept and enforce it. The dirty part of the work was at first left to scrubby Commissioners, such as INGRAHAM and CURTIS ; but the higher authorities stood ready to back them up and confirm their doings. The dominant power had commanded that this thing should be done, and the tools were all ready to its hand. Judge GRIER has ever eminently distinguished himself among this tribe of subservient Magistrates. Insolent, overbearing, tyrannical, determined to make everything bend to the Sovereign's Will, he certainly reminds one of those former days when the plainest language was employed on the Bench or at the Bar towards State criminals, or of yet earlier times, when Sir EDWARD COKE called Lord BACON "a Spider of Hell!" His determination to proceed criminally against all persons who shall be guilty of attempting to bring Slave-hunters, who violate the laws of the several States, in the course of their laudable pursuits, to justice in the jurisdiction where the offence was committed, is, indeed, characterized by the spirit and the manners of the Lord Chancellor of JAMES II. He proceeded to judgment on the matter of the Slave-catchers brought before him on Habeas Corpus, and discharged them, of course. So the Union was saved for that time.

This decision and disposition on the part of this Judge should bring to the serious reflection of the Country the strides which the General Government is making towards Centralization. The processes of the State Courts are to be quashed when they issue against criminals who wear the cockade of the United States Marshal. The citizen of Pennsylvania or Massachusetts may be assaulted, wounded, chained, shot at, with impunity, if the assassins will but swear that it was a Slave that they took him for. The whole Country is made into one Great Slave State, and any outrage becomes legalized when exerted in furtherance of Slavery. Or, rather, the fact that the whole Nation is, in fact, one Great Slave State for this purpose, is thus authentically stated. And, after all, it is, perhaps, well that such cases as the Wilkesbarre one should occur, to bring it home to the minds of the lieges, that what the Abolitionists say is true, that there is no such thing as a Free State in the Union ; but that the condition of a Slave is not altered by his escape into any Free State, (so called,) but he remains a Slave, liable to recap-

ture, as much as when he was in Georgia or Carolina. This being the case, whatever is necessary to vindicate the conceded rights of the master, must be allowed and defended.

That the price of Liberty is perpetual vigilance, is none the less a true saying for being an old one. And no small part of this necessary vigilance has, in all times, been directed against the usurpations of the Courts, especially when acting in unison with a tyrannical and eneroaching Government. It is very well to keep a sharp look out on these tools of tyranny, and to try and thwart their operation, when it can be done. But it is better yet to consider, curiously and wisely, the reason why such vermin infest the land, as the GRIERS, and KANES, and JUDSONS, and the rest of them. They do not make themselves. They are bred from the corruption in which politicians and priests, of almost every shade, profess to think it life to live, and separation from which would be worse than death. If the Nation had not agreed that Slaves might be caught within its borders, these creatures of Slavery would not exist to do its filthy work. There is a fault behind the crimes of the Slave-catching Judges, and Commissioners, and Marshals, and underlying them all; and that is, the original guilt of the parties to the Original Compact, and the derived guilt of their successors, who agree to stand by it. The muck-worms should not monopolize our disgust and contempt. A portion of these feelings should redound to those of us, who are acting the part of the Old Man, in Pilgrim's Progress, who is so busy in stirring the heap which gives them being, with his muck-rake, that he cannot see the golden crown that is held by the Shining One, over his head.

All these excesses and outrages on the part of those that make and administer the laws, are not to be looked upon as misfortunes. The misfortune is, that a state of things exist in this Country, which makes them necessary. We need yet more active treatment. We have not yet had the full benefit of the yoke of the Slaveholders, to which we have voluntarily stooped our necks. We have scarcely yet been chastised with whips, while we need to be chastised with scorpions, to bring us to a sense of our condition. The more the United States Government centralizes power, the more contemptuously it tramples on the rights of the citizen and the sovereignty of the State; the more insolently and indecently these usurpations are enforced and justified by its judicial minions, the greater is the likelihood of some faint sensibility being aroused in the minds of the people to the degradation to which they have been reduced by their own consent. Things must be worse, we

fear, before they are better. And as it seems as if it could not be much darker than it was then everywhere, we may hope, on the strength of the proverb, that it was the herald of the dayspring. We wish that that great State had undertaken to vindicate her sovereignty against the Centralizing Power. She did it once, half a century ago, in a matter of property. It would not look ill in the eyes of the world, to see the two Powers face to face again in the streets of Philadelphia, in a matter of personal liberty. But this is a thing rather to be wished for, than expected.

Centralization is at once the natural tendency and the certain curse of modern governments. Power delights to lie ensconced in the centre of its domains, like a spider at the citadel of his radiating lines of entrenchment, ready to dart with equal ease and certainty upon any cause of offence, near or remote. There are certain conveniences, undoubtedly, gained by the simplification of the arrangements of government; but they are conveniences bought at a price greatly exceeding their real value. If the ardent aspirations of our United States Judges could be gratified, and the cumbrous machinery of trial by Jury be abolished, and the entire disposition of our lives and fortunes be put at the mercy of our KANES, GRIERS, CURTISES, and SPRAGUES, it would simplify matters very much; but we doubt whether, on the whole, we should be much the gainers by the process. So as to all matters of legislation, affecting individual conduct or industry, a general scheme for a wide extent of country often seems, in the abstract, to be convenient and beneficial, and yet is found in the concrete, to be tyrannical and oppressive. At any rate, it has the effect of dwarfing the extremities for the undue development of the head, and often results in the most fatal mischiefs to both.

In Europe, the last foot-holds which Liberty maintained on the continent were in the provinces and the free cities. As despotism advanced its meshes, and enclosed within their entangling snares one popular privilege after another, the franchises of the free cities, and the rights of the provincial, legislative, and judicial bodies were crushed in fatal succession. And at last Absolutism sat on all the continental thrones, and held the keys of life and death for all within the prisons called Kingdoms or Empires. It was a convenience, on many accounts, to have all governing powers concentrated in a single hand; but it was at the expense of all the contrivances by which the jealousy of Liberty had protected the exercise of individual or corporate rights. The wolves, in the fable, persuaded the sheep to give up the clumsy and

boisterous defence of their watch-dogs; but as soon as the guardians were disposed of, the silly sheep were at the mercy of the greed of the wolves. The Centralization of the British Empire may seem to be an exception to the general rule. But if it be one, it is owing to the popular character of the English Government, as compared with those of the continent, and the great British rights which were thus given a wider sphere of operation. Bad as the misgovernment of Ireland may have been since the Union, it has been certainly less gross in its abuses than it was before. And Scotland seems to have sat down contented, at last, with the material advantages which have accrued to her from her Union with England. But it has been done, in both cases, by the denationalizing of Nations. Scotland and Ireland are now but Provinces; Edinburgh and Dublin but Provincial Towns, with none of the attributes of Capitals. Though fewer mischiefs may have flowed from this Centralization than from those of the continental States, it does not follow that all the good that either of them derived from their Union with England might not have been acquired and maintained, with equal certainty and with more dignity, under their own nationalities.

The prophetic hearts of the generation that adopted the Constitution, divined the dangers which lurked under a Confederated Concentration of Government. Just apprehensions were felt lest the overshadowing influences of the Central Power would override and trample down the rights of the separate States and the individual citizens. It was from this wise jealousy that the original parties arose. Only it has happened that when the States Rights men have had the possession of the National Government, they have felt as strong a determination towards Centralization, and the strengthening of the hand of the General Government, as ever the Federal Party had done. The Party that trembled lest JOHN ADAMS should sap the foundations of popular Liberty with the Alien and Sedition Laws, had no scruple about buying Louisiana, and making States out of all that territory, even down to the present day. The natural and necessary tendency of power, is to consolidate and perpetuate itself, and Centralization is one of the favorite methods of doing both these things. The cruel injustice of the men that made the Constitution to their posterity, in making Slavery an integral power of the Government they created, has exaggerated and intensified this tendency. Tyrants by nature, education, and necessity, having given to them a determinate part in the Government; a part, which has at last grown to be the whole, and their controlling influence having been made to depend on the development and strengthening of

their tyranny, it is not to be wondered at that they should use every means they can to secure and enlarge their power. With every inducement to study and practice the peculiar state-craft which belongs to our politics, it is not remarkable that they should have become adepts in it. And with the increasing revenues of the Country and the widening patronage, which has grown from strength to strength with our years, it is by no means strange that they should have found pliant tools, ready to do their worst work. Things being as they are, in this Country, the necessary outgrowth of the character given to our institutions by their founders, it has been a necessity that Slavery should obtain the direction of our affairs, and that, having it, she should seek to make the whole frame of Government, and all its parts, tributary to her power.

Now the only effectual way of counteracting this tendency to vicious Centralization, is to set up the Rights of the Single States in active opposition to it. Liberty is only to be maintained, and, if lost, recovered, by an active conflict of opposing opinions. The wide field opened to ambition by the General Government, and the more ample rewards extended by it, gives it a fearful advantage in a country governed by the corrupt and profligate politicians that have so long reigned over us. A National Revolution is a Moral and Political Impossibility. It is a waste of energy and of means to expend them in the attempt to scale the battlements of that Pandemonium. They are so contrived and so manned as to be absolutely impregnable. The only hope for the preservation of the rights of States and individuals lies in the energies and virtue of the States and individuals themselves. Whether there be enough left of either to suffice for salvation remains to be seen. We are inclined to hope, from the indications shown by the people, when they can act independently of the tricky politicians, that a vindication of State Rights is not an impossibility. The insults to which the North has been subjected for the past four years, merely for the sake of insult, have not been without their effect. But great is the counteracting influence of political leaders and presses, pretending to sympathize with the popular indignation, but only for the purpose of thwarting it. There is to be a great struggle, first, for emancipation from Northern leaders, who hope one day to have the help of these very Slaveholding miscreants for their own political elevation, as a necessary preliminary to the one which is to free us from Southern domination.

A true Northern party must be aroused in the Free States, the ambitious hopes of which must depend on the predominance of the



North. The essential principle of the party should be the perfect purification of each Northern State from all connection with Slavery, whatever construction men choose to put on the Constitution. Fugitive Slaves should be openly protected by law. Masters in pursuit, and all in their employment, whether United States officials or not, should be virtually declared out of the protection of law, and whoever killed them should be adjudged to have done only an act of self-defence. If arrested, they should be subject to the punishment of felons. And no Governors or Judges should be chosen or endured who would not carry out these laws. These things can be done, for the converse of them are done, in behalf of Slavery, in all the Slaveholding States. What men have done, men may do, and it is not impossible that the bloody instructions the Slaveholders have given us, for the last sixty years, may yet return to plague the inventors. This seems to us the only platform on which an Anti-Slavery Party can establish itself. Having occupied this position, it may find itself strong enough to attack the National citadel with some good possibility of success. The destructive energies of the Know Nothings, which seem to be directed for the demolition of both parties, may produce a political Chaos, out of which a new and a better Creation may yet spring. It may be that they are not only pulling down, but that they are building better than they know. Anything that goes towards the destruction of the old, battered, vicious political organizations, must be accepted as the promise of something better. May it come, and speedily.

### THE POLITICAL PARTIES.

The position of the great political parties, with regard to Slavery, remained substantially unchanged up to the time when, in the Northern States, at least, they appeared to be swallowed up by a new and mysterious power. Rumors had been heard, from time to time, that there existed a secret political organization, resting on the doctrine of the exclusion of foreigners from office and political influence. The great parties showed no apprehension of the fate that impended over them. They could not believe that the course of things which had given power, now to one of them, and now to the other, could ever be changed. Here and there a contested election resulted in the choice of a new man, not directly nominated by either of them; but this was looked upon merely as the exceptional case which established the general rule.

But at the elections which took place last autumn, a change was shown in the affinities of the political elements, for which no one seemed to be prepared — not even those who had brought it about. In Massachusetts, where the Whigs have possessed the government, almost as a matter of hereditary right, with but a few accidental exceptions, ever since they were a party, they received so utter a rout, that not a single member of their party was chosen to either branch of the Legislature. In Pennsylvania, where the Democrats held almost as undisputed a sway, a result almost as astounding, swept them into political annihilation. And so in almost every State, new men, most of them unknown to politics, were put in the stead of the old hackneyed politicians, whose trade had been the public good. The astonishment and dismay that overtook both Democrats and Whigs were overwhelming. The leaders must have known that these amazing effects sprung from a deeper cause than that which was avowed, or perhaps recognized, by those who have produced them. They showed how deep and utter was the disaffection and disgust which the course of the old partizan leaders had provoked in the rank and file of the parties. An opportunity only was wanted to unseat these leaders, and to revolutionize the politics of the Country. A popular Cry was found, and under it the masses of both parties, joining themselves to a large proportion of the Free Soilers, marched on to victories, which surprised even themselves, over the prostrate bodies of the old organizations.

It is a curious, and not an unprofitable, speculation, to consider what change in the relations of things is to be wrought by the political deluge which has just swept away the old political landmarks. The windows of the Heavens have been opened and the fountains of the great deep violently broken up, and the old world of politics, in the Free States, at least, laid waste, and the few survivors left sadly contemplating the wreck of their deep-laid plans and long-cherished hopes. The corruptions and abominations of that World before the Flood, indeed, were sufficient to lead any moderate believer in Divine justice to expect that some measure of vengeance must be meted out to them. It had defied the Lord God so insolently, in its denial of His supremacy, and in its exalting their own devices and imaginations above His eternal law, and so small a remnant had even ventured so much as to try and argue that their organic wickedness was not what it had been deliberately ordained and solemnly adjudged to be, that no judicial blindness and no confusion of tongues or of hearts that had overtaken its inhabitants could have been disproportioned to the

offence. The Whig and Democratic parties have, for twenty years gone by, been making the hearts and souls of three millions of God's children, as good in His eyes as themselves, the pawns and counters, the cards and the dice, with which they have played their gambling game for the great stakes of National authority. They have each of them in turn, and both of them together, agreed to be the ready dupes of the more astute gamesters, who own the materials with which the gambling is conducted, so that they might receive a moderate proportion of the winnings for their reward. Chicanery, duplicity, craft, fraud, hypocrisy, and a cruel disregard of the rights of the most helpless of the helpless, have been branded deep into the forehead of both of these impudent parties, and it is a refreshment to the spirit to see that justice has overtaken them at last.

Their destruction has come suddenly upon them, and no just man can pity them. It is true that the occasion which has been taken against them is but a shade less black and a degree less despicable than that of which they had always been willing to avail themselves. They had built up their hopes of partisan success and of personal plunder on the consent they had been ready to give that certain weak inhabitants of the land should be deprived of their rights on account of the color of their skin and of the cruelties of which they were the prescriptive victims. These hopes have been blighted and disappointed by means of a new party agreeing with each other to trample upon a certain other weak portion of the inhabitants of the land, because of the country in which they were born and the religion in which they had been educated. Some element of hypocrisy and tyranny seems to be an essential element in any American political organization that looks to success. Of course, we do not mean to compare the actual degradation or oppression of the Irish Catholics, whose dangerous principles and conduct are the pretence of this revolutionary movement, with those the Slaves endure. But the principle, or the necessity, which demands that an American party, in order to be successful, should put their feet on the necks of the few, the ignorant, and the feeble, is satisfied in the one case as in the other. It is not necessary to say that we regard this fear of Foreign Influence as the merest pretence and hypocrisy. There may be, in remote districts, a few honest fanatics, nay, there may be a good many among the rank and file, who really believe that two million Catholics can put twenty million Protestants to the sword, and inaugurate a new St. Bartholomew's day; but it would be an insult to the intelligent and experienced leaders, who have conducted the movement

to the success it has already achieved, and who propose to lead it up to yet loftier heights, to suppose that they have ever shared in such absurd terrors. It would be as wild a supposition as that Mr. WEBSTER and the men of the Compromise of 1850 really believed that the Union was in danger and only to be saved by that fatal nostrum.

We Abolitionists have often been urgently entreated to join one or another of the political parties which made a profession of making the Rights of the Free, if not the Liberties of the Slaves, a main object of their schemes. And we have been regarded as pragmatical and impracticable, because we could never see our way clear to help any man to office, for any purpose, who must first step on the prostrate body of the Slave as the only bridge that led to the Paradise of office. We declined helping the Whigs when they put on their best Anti-Slavery looks, and we have had our wisdom justified by the Election of TAYLOR, by the Seventh of March, and by all the submissions of the Northern Whig States to the insults of the Slave-catchers. We even resented the voice of the charmer that charmed so wisely in 1848, and declined casting in our lot with a party that limited its scheme of policy to keeping Slavery where it is in the country, and submitting to it where it is in the Constitution. We have never doubted the policy of our course, as we have never hesitated as to its correctness. And, now that we see chosen chiefs and leaders of that party uniting in the new Crusade against a minority of their inhabitants, because of the color of their opinions and the place of their nativity, we cannot think our prophetic souls led us astray when they bade us beware of such leadership. We are not a numerous body; but we have stood together longer than any party in the field, without change of banner or of warfare. And we think that there never was a time that called for more patient and persevering endurance in this well-doing than this ignorant present.

That any general or particular good can come to the Anti-Slavery Movement from this late triumph of the Native Americanism, there is no reason to hope. The tone of its organs and of its orators is the same as that of the old parties when trying to conciliate the god of the South. Disclaimers of every issue besides that growing out of their *Alienophobia*, asseverations that their course knows no North, South, East, or West, and vamping protestations of fidelity to the Union, make up the staple of the web they weave. We know by long experience what all this means. We are not such Know Nothings as not to understand that when a man or a party says, "No North, South, East,

or West," it means just what the man that first said it meant, that it is *all* South, and the other points of the compass have no political existence. And when a politician brags about the Union, he is understood to mean, whether he do or not, that he is ready to catch negroes, and nothing else. Besides this, the Slaveholders are getting ready, nay, they are already in the field, to lay hold upon this new Order, and to make it the tool of its own purposes, as they have done with all that went before it. The Slaveholders will strive to nominate the candidate for the next Presidency, and the platform must be such a one as the Slaveholding Choice can stand on. What can be hoped from such an organization? Will the Free Soilers who have gone into the new party have the grace to come out of it, as they did out of their old ones? We fear that the strength will have gone out of them that enabled them in that hour. But, at any rate, they cannot undo the mischief which they have enabled this great new Pro-Slavery party to work.

It is possible, though it is hard to believe it, that in some of the Northern States a better legislation for the protection of freedom may be had. We do not see any reason for expecting much in this way, considering the materials of which the new party is made up. When any such blessing occurs, we will not fail to welcome it, and to give all concerned in procuring it all the credit they may deserve. But our chiefest reliance is in the power of repulsion, which must be strong in a body so strangely compacted, in proportion to the forced attraction that compelled it together. When they quarrel, as quarrel they must, there is a hope that parties may take up their natural relations, and the North and the South stand fairly and openly face to face, on the only real issue that exists, Slavery and Anti-Slavery. In the discomfiture of the Whigs and Democrats, we rejoice; but it is a joy that derives no relish from the triumph of the Know Nothings. We shall look upon their disintegration and demolition, after the course which they needs must run after the beginning they have made, with the same satisfaction with which we have witnessed their dealings with their adversaries. From this latest passage of history, as well as from all that have gone before it, we feel our faith in the position of the American Anti-Slavery Society increased from strength to strength. No political parties, under the existing Constitution, can do any Anti-Slavery work. That work is to be done over and in despite of the Constitution. It can only be done by the conversion of the hearts of the people from their indifference to Slavery and their prejudices

against the Slaves, and by their awakening to their own personal and political dangers, under the present state of things. This is a work wholly aside from American politics. How can these saving truths be preached by men who swear every time they vote that they will maintain the rights of Slavery as incorporated with the Constitution. This is a Service that must be approached with pure hands. This is a Faith that must be preached by a priesthood undefiled by the meats offered unto the Idol. This mission is the office of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It is called to be a Voice crying in the Wilderness, warning the People to Repent and Flee from the Wrath sure to Come. Until they repent, there is no hope of their forsaking their evil ways, and it is no part of our philosophy to help them to do an evil that they may help us undo it. And when their minds and hearts are changed, we have no fear that the change will not be instantly seen in the outward institutions which now express them fitly.

Still, we are glad to acknowledge that the political revolution which has seated the Know Nothings on the throne of the Whigs or the Democrats, in so many of the Northern States, has been of advantage to the general cause of Freedom. The majority against Judge LORING in Massachusetts, could not have been approached in any Legislature, elected under the influences of either of the old parties. The election of HENRY WILSON to fill the Senatorship vacant by the resignation of Mr. EVERETT was regarded by the South, and must be accepted by us, as a symptom of a growing Anti-Slavery spirit in the masses of the people. We trust that Mr. WILSON'S course in the Senate will fully justify all the hopes of the friends, and all the fears of the enemies, of Freedom throughout the country which his election excited. The re-election of Mr. SEWARD in New York could not, probably, have been effected, had it not been for the disturbance the introduction of this new element had created in local politics. And the election of Mr. HALE to the seat in the Senate left vacant by the death of Mr. ATHERTON, which has taken place while this Report is passing through the press, is another good thing which has come out of that Nazareth. The Personal Liberty Bill, too, which has become a part of the Statute Law of Massachusetts, by great majorities, in despite of the Veto of Governor GARDNER, is another proof that the People are better than their leaders. This Bill, if it do but find a Judiciary to sustain, and an Executive to enforce it, will save that State from the disgraceful scenes it has witnessed within the last four years. It is denounced by the Slaveholders and their Northern

creatures as treasonable, and so it is to the Slaveholding Sovereignty of the Nation. It is described as a virtual Nullification of a Law of Congress, — and so it will practically nullify a Law which is a disgrace to Republicanism, to Civilization, and to Christianity. That is to say, if there be really virtue enough in the People to compel the Supreme Court of the State to administer and the Governor to execute it. At any rate, it is a most encouraging sign of the progress of just ideas in the popular mind, — ideas, which must one day clothe themselves with form and manifest themselves with power. We think that it is worth the space it will take up to copy here this admirable Law in its entirety : —

AN ACT to protect the Rights and Liberties of the People of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

*Be it enacted by the Senate, &c.*

*Sect. 1.* All the provisions of the “ Act further to protect Personal Liberty,” passed the twenty-fourth day of March, in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, shall apply to the Act of Congress approved September eighteen, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty, entitled “ An Act to amend and supplementary to, the Act entitled ‘ An Act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters.’ ”

*Sect. 2.* The meaning of the one hundred and eleventh chapter of the Revised Statutes is hereby declared to be, that every person imprisoned or restrained of his liberty is entitled, as of right and of course, to the writ of *habeas corpus*, except in the cases mentioned in the second section of that chapter.

*Sect. 3.* The writ of *habeas corpus* may be issued by the Supreme Judicial Court, the Court of Common Pleas, by any Justice’s Court or Police Court of any town or city, by any Court of Record, or by any Justice of either of said Courts, or by any Judge of Probate ; and it may be issued by any Justice of the Peace, if no magistrate above named is known to said Justice of the Peace to be within five miles of the place where the party is imprisoned or restrained, and it shall be returnable before the Supreme Judicial Court, the Court of Common Pleas or other Court of Record, or any one of the Justices thereof, whether the Court may be in session or not, and in term time or vacation.

*Sect. 4.* The Supreme Judicial Court, the Court of Common Pleas or other Court of Record, or any Justice of either of said Courts before whom the writ of *habeas corpus* shall be made returnable, shall, on the application of any party to the proceeding, order a trial by jury as to any facts stated in the return of the officer, or as to any facts alleged, if it shall appear by the return of the officer or otherwise that the person whose restraint or imprisonment is in question is claimed to be held to service or labor in another State, and to have escaped from such

service or labor, and may admit said person to bail in a sum not exceeding two thousand dollars. In such case, issue may be joined by a general denial of the facts alleged, the plea may be not guilty, and the jury shall have the right to return a general verdict, and the same discretion as juries have in the trial of criminal cases; and the finding of a verdict of not guilty shall be final and conclusive.

*Sect. 5.* The Court or Justice before whom the writ of *habeas corpus* is returnable shall, unless a jury is already in attendance, by warrant, command the Sheriff of the county, or his Deputy, to summon a jury in the manner provided in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Revised Statutes, to attend at the time and place stated in the warrant, at which time and place they shall be empaneled, and, having elected a foreman by ballot, the issue so framed shall be put to them for their determination. In case one jury shall disagree, the issue may be submitted to the other jury, or continued to the next term, at the discretion of the Court. And in every case of disagreement, another jury may be summoned and qualified as above provided, forthwith or at a future day, in the discretion of the Court or Justice before whom the writ is returned, until a verdict shall finally be rendered upon the issue. If any person summoned as a juror, as aforesaid, shall fail to attend without sufficient cause, he shall pay a fine of fifty dollars: And if, by reason of challenges or otherwise, there shall not be a full jury of the persons summoned, the officer attending the hearing shall return some suitable person or persons to supply the deficiency.

*Sect. 6.* If any claimant shall appear to demand the custody or possession of the person for whose benefit said writ is sued out, such claimant shall state in writing the facts on which he relies with precision and certainty; and neither the claimant of the alleged fugitive, nor any person interested in his alleged obligation to service or labor, nor the alleged fugitive, shall be permitted to testify at the trial of the issue; and no confessions, admissions, or declarations of the alleged fugitive against himself shall be given in evidence. Upon every question of fact involved in the issue, the burden of proof shall be on the claimant, and the facts alleged and necessary to be established must be proved by the testimony of at least two credible witnesses, or other legal evidence equivalent thereto, and by the rules of evidence known and secured by the common law; and no *ex-parte* deposition or affidavit shall be received in proof in behalf of the claimant, and no presumption shall arise in favor of the claimant from any proof that the alleged fugitive or any of his ancestors had been actually held as a Slave, without proof that such holding was legal.

*Sect. 7.* If any person shall remove from the limits of this Commonwealth, or shall assist in removing therefrom, or shall come into the Commonwealth with the intention of removing or of assisting in the removing therefrom, or shall procure or assist in procuring to be so removed, any person being in the peace thereof, who is not "held to service or labor" by the "party" making "claim," or who has not



“escaped” from the “party” making “claim,” or whose “service or labor” is not “due” to the “party” making “claim,” within the meaning of those words in the Constitution of the United States, on the pretence that such person is so held or has so escaped, or that his “service or labor” is so “due,” or with the intent to subject him to such “service or labor,” he shall be punished by a fine not less than one thousand nor more than five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment in the State Prison not less than one nor more than five years.

*Sect. 8.* Any person sustaining wrong or injury by any proceeding punishable by the preceding Section, may maintain an action and recover damages therefor in any Court competent to try the same.

*Sect. 9.* No person, while holding any office of honor, trust, or emolument, under the Laws of this Commonwealth, shall, in any capacity, issue any warrant or other process, or grant any certificate, under or by virtue of an Act of Congress approved the twelfth day of February, in the year one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, entitled “An Act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters,” or under or by virtue of an Act of Congress, approved the eighteenth day of September, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty, entitled “An Act to amend, and supplementary to, ‘An Act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters,’” or shall, in any capacity, serve any such warrant or other process.

*Sect. 10.* Any person who shall grant any certificate under or by virtue of the Acts of Congress, mentioned in the preceding Section, shall be deemed to have resigned any commission from the Commonwealth which he may possess, his office shall be deemed vacant, and he shall be forever thereafter ineligible to any office of trust, honor, or emolument, under the Laws of this Commonwealth.

*Sect. 11.* Any person who shall act as counsel or attorney for any claimant of any alleged fugitive from service or labor, under or by virtue of the Acts of Congress, mentioned in the ninth Section of this Act, shall be deemed to have resigned any commission from the Commonwealth that he may possess, and he shall be thereafter incapacitated from appearing as counsel or attorney in the Courts of this Commonwealth.

*Sect. 12.* The two preceding Sections shall not apply to removal from judicial office; but if either of the actions there specified shall be performed by any person holding judicial office under this Commonwealth, it shall be considered as a violation of good behavior, as well as a reason for loss of public confidence, and as furnishing sufficient ground either for impeachment or for removal by address.

*Sect. 13.* Any sheriff, deputy sheriff, jailer, coroner, constable, or other officer of this Commonwealth, or the police of any city or town, or any district, county, city, or town officer, or any officer or other member of the volunteer militia of this Commonwealth, who shall hereafter arrest, imprison, detain, or return, or aid in arresting, imprisoning, detaining, or returning, any person for the reason that he is claimed or

adjudged to be a fugitive from service or labor, shall be punished by fine not less than one thousand and not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment in the State Prison for not less than one nor more than two years.

*Sect. 14.* The volunteer militia of this Commonwealth shall not act in any manner in the seizure, detention, or rendition of any person for the reason that he is claimed or adjudged to be a fugitive from service or labor. Any member of the same, who shall offend against the provisions of this Section, shall be punished by fine not less than one thousand and not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment in the State Prison for not less than one nor more than two years.

*Sect. 15.* The Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint in every county one or more Commissioners, learned in the law, whose duty it shall be, in their respective counties, when any person in this State is arrested or seized, or in danger of being arrested or seized, as a fugitive from service or labor, on being informed thereof, diligently and faithfully to use all lawful means to protect, defend, and secure to such alleged fugitive a fair and impartial trial by jury, and the benefits of the provisions of this Act; and any attorney, whose services are desired by the alleged fugitive, may also act as counsel in the case.

*Sect. 16.* The Commissioners shall defray all expenses of witnesses, clerks' fees, officers' fees, and other expenses which may be incurred in the protection and defence of any person seized or arrested as a fugitive from service or labor; and the same, together with the reasonable charges of the Commissioners for their services as attorneys and counsel in the case, shall be paid by the State Treasurer, on a warrant to be issued by the Governor.

*Sect. 17.* No jail, prison, or other place of confinement, belonging to or used by either the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any county therein, shall be used for the detention or imprisonment of any person accused or convicted of any offence created by either of the said Acts of Congress, mentioned in the ninth Section of this Act, or accused or convicted of obstructing or resisting any process, warrant, or order, issued under either of said Acts, or of rescuing, or attempting to rescue, any person arrested or detained under any of the provisions of either of said Acts, nor for the imprisonment of any person arrested on *mesne process*, or on execution in any suit for damages or penalties accruing, or being claimed to accrue, in consequence of any aid rendered to any escaping fugitive from service or labor.

*Sect. 18.* All the provisions of law as to the writ of *habeas corpus*, heretofore existing and in force, so far as applicable, and so far not hereby changed, shall apply to the cases arising under this Act.

*Sect. 19.* Nothing in this Act shall be construed to apply to so much of the Act of the twelfth of February, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three, as relates to fugitives from justice.

*Sect. 20.* All Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed.

*Sect. 21.* This Act shall take effect from and after its passage.

To *Sections 13 and 14*, the following amendments were made:—

*Sect. 13.* No person who holds any office under the Laws of the United States, which qualifies him to issue any warrant or other process, or to grant any certificate under the Acts of Congress, named in the ninth Section of this Act, or to serve the same, shall at the same time hold any office of honor, trust, or emolument, under the Laws of this Commonwealth.

*Sect. 14.* Any person holding any judicial office under the Constitution or Laws of this Commonwealth, who shall continue, for ten days after the passage of this Act, to hold the office of United States Commissioner, or any office under the Laws of the United States which qualifies him to issue any warrant or other process, or grant any certificate under the Acts of Congress, named in the ninth Section of this Act, shall be deemed to have violated good behavior, to have given reason for loss of public confidence, and furnished sufficient ground either for impeachment or for removal by address.

We have also to thank this upturning of the old foundations for the recognition of the equality before the law of the colored youth of Massachusetts, as to their educational rights, for which the Abolitionists of that State have been striving for so many years. The gradual change which has modified the public feeling as to the rights of that unfortunate race, had altered the customs of Massachusetts so far that Boston, we believe, was the only place in that State where a separate school was maintained for the children of color, which they were obliged to attend, however inconvenient it might be from the remoteness of their homes, or forego the benefits of public instruction, for which they paid, in proportion to their means, as much as the wealthiest of the whites. But, in Boston, it seemed impossible to overcome the opposition which the City Government and the School Committee made to the reformation. At last, however, the importunity of the lovers of fair play and of equal rights has prevailed, and the last Legislature of Massachusetts has given that State a law which will effectually remedy the abuse. After next September, at which time it becomes operative, there will be no such blemish on her boasted system of Common Schools as now deforms it, and every child will be entitled to be taught, at the public charge, at the school of his district, without any unjust and cruel distinction on account of the way in which his Creator has made him. We do not remember any legislation especially worthy of commendation in any of the other States which have changed masters under this new Crusade. In Connecticut and New York, attempts were made to

improve the position of those States towards the Nation, and towards their own oppressed inhabitants, but without success. There is no necessary element of progress, of course, in a Party resting on so narrow and sectarian a basis as National Antipathies. But, out of the destruction of the old Parties, there is reason to hope that a more natural and hopeful arrangement of the political elements will arise. It is possible, at least, that the Northern and Southern sections of the Know Nothings may fail to unite on a common Platform; in which case, the divided ranks can hardly be hindered from falling into the natural antagonism of North and South — of Slavery and Anti-Slavery. Whatever will hasten the day of the deliverance of the National politics from the fatal despotism of Slavery, is a just cause of rejoicing. National Parties must be Pro-Slavery; a Northern Party may be Anti-Slavery. Nothing can be worse than the old Parties as they were before they were broken up by the incursion of the Know Nothing hordes. Out of the confusion that must ensue, we shall hope to see the beginnings of a new and better state of things.

### THE CHURCH.

The attitude of the American Church, as represented by its Chief Denominations, in their organized action, remains the same as at the last recorded accounts. The belief that the Division, which took place several years ago in the Presbyterian Church, would result in an improved character of teaching and of action on the subject of Slavery, has been contradicted by the course of the New School Assemblies as well as of the Old. Early in June, 1853, the General Assembly of the New School was held in Buffalo. Its action and inaction may not be passed by in silence. Holy men came together, from the South and North, West and East, to take counsel for the edifying of the walls of Zion. They took the wings of the morning, and fled to the uttermost parts of the land, even to the very borders of the Canaanites of Canada, and yet they could not find rest to their souls. The spectre of Slavery would intrude itself in the midst of their Assembly. The national skeleton was found sitting at the head of their Feast. In vain did they protest and reclaim against its presence. It would not down at their bidding. Dr. EDDY, of Newark, took strong ground on the subject. It was not he, alone, that was tired of this impertinent intrusion of Slavery upon the Assembly. "He was tired of this discussion, and longed for repose; HE BELIEVED THE GREAT HEAD OF THE CHURCH ASKED

FOR REPOSE ON THIS SUBJECT.” Many other Reverend men also lamented that they could have no peace for those obtrusive blacks. We sympathize with these suffering brethren, but we fear that there is no help for them. There is nothing for it but to reorganize and form a Church under a Head, such as Dr. EDDY somewhat profanely (as it strikes us, Abolitionists,) believes the present Head of the Church to be — one who is tired of the incessant importunity of the Slave and his friends, and who requires that his praise should be muted by the expressive silence of the Saints on sins which they happen particularly to affect. The difficulty lies in the way in which the heart of man was originally made, and in the erroneous ideas which prevail as to the character of Jesus Christ, and the means and end of the Christian Religion. We need a new LUTHER in some Dr. EDDY, to reform these errors of doctrine and practice, and to put us all into the way wherein we should go.

The question was first brought up by a communication from the Oswego Presbytery, which body had the grave assurance to decline sending Commissioners to the General Assembly, till it be disconnected from Slavery! This disorderly and insolent intimation could not but excite a degree of righteous indignation, even in bosoms so long-suffering as those of this Assembly of the Saints. We are happy to say, however, that these reculant brethren were dealt with in a manner which, it cannot but be hoped, will prevent such irregularities for the future. The Assembly says, in its action on this subject, it “has heard this document read, only with grief and disapprobation. It is happily a strange or rather an unique paper; the Assembly hopes its like will never be reproduced, to do evil; since, it were hard for any wise man to think, that such a measure could do good, in a possible relation. The Assembly, remembering *the meekness and gentleness of Christ*, would treat the action of the Presbytery of Oswego, from which no such action was ever anticipated, with great forbearance; still hoping, from all its known antecedents, and from some or all of its minority, and from the better second thoughts of all its members, that its very censurable example will be wisely corrected before the next Assembly shall convene.”

The Assembly then proceeds to expostulate with its erring brethren in three suggestions, of which the last must suffice. “Whether the solemn import of their ordination vows and obligations, as personal Christians, has been more honored or more violated by their individual action in this matter, which the Assembly forbears largely to charac-

terize as it plainly deserves. This, the Assembly solemnly condemns; yet with paternal, or rather fraternal feelings, and in the name of the Great Head of the Church, commends it to their re-consideration, who have done this deed, and for which it is the prayer of the Assembly that God would give them the grace of repentance." We trust that these sinners who have thus been guilty, in the sight of God and Man, of the crime of refusing to act with an Ecclesiastical Body, which had connection with Slavery, will be brought to repentance. Else, let them be cut off, and given over to be buffeted. They are, very clearly, not fit to be of that Society of the Elect.

This was not the only Memorial on the subject, inasmuch as the Rev. Dr. Cox reported that there were several which he moved to refer to a Special and Wise Committee. For it is a melancholy fact that the progress of fanaticism has been such, that these Venerable Ecclesiastical bodies are compelled to stoop to the notice of such insignificant and perfectly foreign matters, as the buying and selling of their own ministers (possibly) and church members (certainly) in market overt and by public outcry. It is a sad desecration of their dignity, but they are obliged to bow their reverend heads to the hard necessity. This Special and Wise Committee, consisting of two from New York, one from Michigan, one from Indiana, one from Kentucky, one from Ohio, and one from Delaware, made a unanimous Report. After "much patient and prayerful consideration of the whole subject, in all its complicated and perplexing relations," it advised, 1, that the Assembly should reaffirm the doctrine of the Second Resolution of the General Assembly, at Detroit, in 1850, viz:—

*Resolved*, That the holding of our fellow men in the condition of Slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the Laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offence in the proper import of that term, as used in the Book of Discipline, Chapter I, Section 3, and should be regarded and treated in the same manner as other offences.

And 2, that the Synods of the Slaveholding States be requested to report to the next General Assembly,—

1. The number of Slaveholders in connection with the Churches, and the number of Slaves held by them.
2. The extent to which Slaves are held from an unavoidable necessity imposed by the Laws of the States, the obligations of guardianship, and the demands of humanity.
3. Whether the Southern Churches regard the sacredness of the

marriage relation as it exists among the Slaves; whether baptism is duly administered to the children of the Slaves, professing Christianity; and, in general, to what extent and in what manner provision is made for the religious well-being of the enslaved.

And 4,—

That this Assembly do earnestly exhort and beseech all those in our Church who are happily relieved from any personal connection with the institution of Slavery, to exercise due patience and forbearance toward their brethren less fortunate than themselves, remembering the embarrassments of their peculiar position, and to cherish for them that fraternal confidence and love to which, as Christian brethren, they are entitled, and which they the more need in consequence of the peculiar trials by which they are surrounded.

This Report, thus wise and temperate, met with a warm opposition. Not on account of the reaffirmation of the Detroit Resolution. For, as the Laws of no Slave State permit Emancipation on the soil, and as every Slave is held for his own good, of course,

“Its taxing, like a wild goose, flies,  
Unclaimed by any man.”

The objection was, the impertinence of the Assembly in presuming to inquire into the business arrangements and private amusements of the Southern Saints, at all. The Rev. Dr. Ross, of Tennessee, moved to amend the Report by adding a number of interrogatories, to be sent to the Northern Synods, of which the following are a part:—

1. The number of Northern Church members who traffic with Slaveholders, and are seeking to make money by selling them Negro clothing, hand-cuffs, and cowhides.

2. How many Northern Church members are concerned, directly or indirectly, in building and fitting out ships for the African Slave-trade, and the Slave-trade between the States.

3. How many Northern Church members have sent orders to New Orleans, and other Southern Cities, to have Slaves sold, to pay debts coming to them from the South. [See *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.]

\* \* \* \* \*

8. How many Northern Church members, ministers especially, have advocated *murder* in resistance to the laws of the land.

9. How many Northern Church members own stock in underground Railroads, running off Fugitive Slaves, and Sabbath-breaking Railroads and Canals.

10. That a Special Committee be sent up Red River, to ascertain

whether *Legree*, who whipped Uncle Tom to death, (and a Northern gentleman) be not still in connection with some Northern Church, in good and regular standing.

11. How many Northern Church members attend meetings of Spiritual Rappers — are Bloomers — or Women's Rights convention-  
alists.

12. How many are cruel husbands.

13. How many are hen-pecked husbands.

The Report, after a long discussion, mainly turning on the question of impertinent interference, was indefinitely postponed, under the pressure of the Previous Question. Such strong remonstrances, however, were made by the Rev. Messrs. SPEERS, of Galena, SHUMWAY, of Geneva, and HOPKINS, of Elyria, the last of whom said that "he knew there were presbyteries, and more than one, that were represented here *for the last time*, if this were to be the law," that the postponement was reconsidered. It was discussed at subsequent sessions, and finally adopted by a vote of 84 to 35 — 89 being absent; in other words, dodging the question. Two Protests were offered, by members of the minority. Surely, our Southern brethren have no reason to complain of the treatment they have received, and the Evangelical Christians of the British Islands will see how false are the charges brought against the American Church, by such infidels as Mrs. STOWE, of any neglect of duty in the premises.

But this was not the only proof the Assembly gave of a wise spirit of conciliation. A History of the Division of the Church, it seems, has been published by the Rev. Dr. JUDD. We infer, from the discussions, that this Reverend gentleman was *left* to commit the imprudence (not to say, impropriety, in so grave a case,) of telling the truth as to the *momentum* which Slavery gave to the wedge which split the Presbyterian Church in two. An opportunity was now given to this erring brother to retrace his steps. It being understood that a new edition was to be published, the proper Committee reported that such alterations as the author and the Synod of New York and New Jersey might choose to make, be approved also by the Assembly. This gave rise to an animated discussion, in the course of which it was stated that the author had expressed a willingness "to alter the book *so as to answer its purpose in all parts of the Church.*" Mr. NILES, of Fox River, said that the book could not be circulated at the North with the parts relating to Slavery left out, and Mr. MAGRUDER, of Mississippi, said it could not circulate at the South if they were retained, and he, wisely,



suggested that there should be two editions, one for the South and one for the North. That valuable divine, Dr. EDDY, however, finally settled the matter by moving a substitute, which, instead of endorsing the book, commended it to the examination of all the members of the Church, with the view to the attainment of a correct history of the painful disruption of the Church. This passed unanimously.

But while so much of holy time was wasted on the immaterial and disorderly question of whether Christians can properly buy and sell one another, with all the incidents of ownership, we can relieve the distress of our readers by assuring them that the weightier matters of the law were not neglected. The subject of "a uniform posture in prayer, singing, and hearing, mode of administering the sacrament, and all other parts of public worship," was considered and referred to the next Assembly. The offence of promiscuous dancing was rebuked as follows:—

*Resolved*, That the fashionable amusement of promiscuous dancing is so entirely unscriptural, and eminently and exclusively that of the "world which lieh in wickedness," and so wholly inconsistent with the spirit of Christ, and with that propriety of Christian deportment, and that purity of heart which his followers are bound to maintain, as to render it not only improper and injurious for professing Christians either to partake in it, or qualify their children for it by teaching them the art; but also to call for the faithful and judicious exercise of discipline on the part of the Church Sessions, when any of the members of their Churches have been guilty.

Also, it was decided that a man may not marry *his own sister's daughter!* A question which we had never conceived could have been suggested in any civilized Assembly, Religious or Secular. It was moved to postpone it indefinitely, which was lost. And on the final question, the Resolution passed, with *but two or three dissenting voices!* Perhaps the next Assembly will reaffirm the first prohibition in the list of Prohibited Degrees—"a man may not marry his Grandmother!" We commend the action of this venerable Assembly to the Christians of Great Britain and Ireland, hoping that they will see whether the accusations brought by the Abolitionists against the American Church be railing ones, or no.

In the General Assembly of the Old School, held in Philadelphia about the same time, the subject of Slavery was carefully and skillfully avoided. It came up accidentally, however, on a proposal to renew the Correspondence of the Assembly with the General Assembly of

Ireland, which had been broken off a few years before, because that body had presumed to remonstrate with the General Assembly of the United States against the sanction of Slavery by the Church. The Committee on Correspondence reported against the renewal and also against opening a Correspondence with the Free Church, (although it has not yet "sent back that money!") and with the United Presbyterian Church, of Scotland. In the discussion to which the subject gave rise, it was expressly avowed that it was because of the Public Opinion surrounding those Churches in the Mother Country that it would be unsafe to hold any Correspondence with them. We hope that these signs of sensitiveness will encourage British Christians to persist in pressing Anti-Slavery duty upon the men and bodies calling themselves by that name in this country. That their exhortations are rejected is no sign that they fail of their effect. And we trust that what we have told, out of their own mouths, as to the conduct of these bodies on the subject of Slavery, and what we have yet to tell, will instruct the Churches of the British Islands as to weight to be given to the charges of infidelity hurled by these men at the Abolitionists who expose their shortcomings.

Within the last year or two, a new organization, of a characteristic kind, has been gathered. It is called the Southern Aid Society, and is meant to fill the gap which the pertinacity of Abolitionism has made in the forces of the Home Missionary Society. The usefulness of that Society, it seems, has been crippled at the South by a rule which it has adopted refusing aid "to any minister or missionary, however faithful, laborious, or self-denying, who, under any circumstances, is a Slaveholder." This fanatical exclusiveness has shaken the confidence of Southern Christians in the Home Missionary Society, and they have preferred going without the advantages of Gospel preaching to having it administered by persons even suspected of the taint of the Anti-Slavery heresy. To supply this necessity, the Southern Aid Society has been formed, and when we say that the Rev. Drs. COX, BETHUNE, BAIRD and EDDY, and Mr. HALLOCK, of the Journal of Commerce, are on the Executive Committee, we are sure that none of our readers, who have ever heard of them, can doubt that the laborers they will send out into the Southern Vineyard will be free from all spot or blemish of Abolitionism. How the new Society has prospered in its Gospel Work we have not heard.

We are happy to say that many Churches and Religious Conventions have taken action on the subject of Slavery within the last two

years. Perhaps, the subject has never been more agitated in the pulpit than it has during that time. The indignities which were heaped upon the signers of the Clerical Remonstrance against the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise had the effect of arousing a natural resentment and of opening many mouths that had been usually dumb. Metropolitan congregations were startled and sometimes shocked by the extreme opinions uttered by lips which were supposed to be hermetically sealed on the forbidden theme. Many of these ebullitions were merely spasmodic and have, long since, subsided, and the old calm has settled down on pulpit and on pews. But in many a rural parish the Gospel of Freedom has been well preached, and we doubt not its fruits will yet be seen when the harvest comes in. Of these we can only speak in the gross, rejoicing to acknowledge fidelity wherever we can find it, and hoping for even better things in the time to come. While on this topic, we are happy to say that the faithful and persevering labors of Mr. JOHN JAY, in the Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of New York, for the recognition of the rights of the Colored Churches in the Convention, have met with the success they deserve. The ministers and delegates of the Colored Churches are now admitted to their canonical privileges and legal rights. The zeal and constancy with which Mr. JAY has maintained the cause of this oppressed and despised class of churchmen bears honorable witness to the consistency of his Christian character, and is worthy of the great Anti-Slavery name he bears.

#### THE AMERICAN BOARD.

It has been the business of the Anti-Slavery Annalist to watch and record the proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and to point out the particulars in which Slavery had interfered with its task of evangelizing the world. Scarcely a year, never a Triennial Meeting, has passed without bearing witness to the truth of Mr. BIRNEY'S assertion that the American Church is the Bulwark of Slavery. During the last year, at its Great Meeting at Hartford, the Board took action which has been claimed by its friends as a sufficient defence of its character from this terrible imputation. Several years ago, the Reports of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society contained an account of the letter of Mr. TREAT, one of the Secretaries of the Board, to the Missionaries among the

Indians, as to the course to be taken by them in regard to Converts who were Slaveholders and the course of the Board in regard to it. This Letter, such as it was, was never sanctioned directly by the Board, though it was permitted to rest uncondemned and to have such weight with the Missionaries as the character of the writer might give to it. It was never admitted by the Abolitionists to be in any sufficient measure what the exigencies of the case demanded. It was a time-serving device to put off the evil day when Slavery would have to be met face to face, if, indeed, that day could not be put off forever. And yet it is the passage of Resolutions by the Board, at the Hartford Meeting, which are regarded as an endorsement of the TREAT Letter, that is dwelt upon as the proof that the Board, if it ever occupied a Pro-Slavery position, has now nobly disentangled itself from it. This is the gloss put upon this action of the Board, not only by those who could never see anything in it to blame; but even by persons and presses claiming to rank as Anti-Slavery in principle, and deriving from that pretension no small part of their influence and reputation. A brief sketch of the occasion of this action of the Board, and a short analysis of the TREAT Letter, from which the healing virtue is assumed to have gone forth, will enable our members and readers to judge how far this good opinion is deserved.

In the year 1853, the Council of the Choctaw Nation (which is its Legislature) passed an Act prohibiting the Missionary Teachers in charge of the Schools in the Nation from teaching Slaves and the children of Slaves in the same Schools with the Choctaw children. All that the Missionaries obtained by their time-serving course in the Church was the reproach of being Abolitionists, because they carried out the instructions of the Board as to the manner of conducting the Schools of the Mission. The Missionaries laid the matter before the Board, and after discussion there was spirit enough roused in its torpid breast to pass a Resolution that, unless the Act just referred to were repealed by the Council, they would withdraw their Teachers and the sums of money they had been yearly contributing towards their support. This was well, but it was hardly enough to be accepted as a proof of a change of heart on the part of so old an offender. The following series of Resolutions were therefore introduced, which it is assumed takes the ground of Mr. TREAT in his famous Letter, and is, therefore, to be allowed to cover up all former short-comings and far-reaching of the Board:—

*Resolved*, That the Board acknowledge with gratitude to God, the wisdom and fidelity with which, so far as appears from the documents that have been submitted to them, the Prudential Committee are advising and directing the Missionaries among the Choctaws, in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence with that Mission, reported to the Board in 1845.

*Resolved*, That the decision of the Prudential Committee, with the concurrence of the Missionaries, not to conduct the Boarding Schools of the Choctaw Nation, in conformity with the principles presented by the recent legislation of the Choctaw Council, meets the cordial approbation of the Board.

*Resolved*, That the commission given by Christ to his disciples to go and teach all nations, and to preach the gospel to every creature, which is the warrant of Christian Missions, is to be respected and obeyed in all the operations and by all the Missionaries of this Board; and that while our Missionaries among the Choctaws are allowed, in fact, to preach the gospel to all persons, of whatever complexion or condition, as they have opportunity, and to preach it in all its applications to human character and duty, they are to continue patiently in their work.

It is worth while, now, briefly to recur to the TREAT Letter, and see whether its formal assumption could have such plenary power of absolution as is claimed for it. We have not room for the whole paper; but we believe that its substance may be summed up as follows:—

It declares Slavery to be an unchristian, corrupt, wicked, and grossly demoralizing system, but maintains that *slaveholding* is not necessarily sinful.

It affirms that the truth respecting Slavery and Slaveholding (i. e., the doctrine above stated) should be communicated, at some time and in some manner, by the Missionaries, to their congregations in general and their converts in particular.

It assumes that Slaveholders, intending to continue such, may give credible evidence of piety, and must *not*, for their Slaveholding, be *refused* admission to the Church; but intimates that they ought to prove themselves free from the *guilt* of Slavery, and *suggests several ways in which they may satisfactorily do this*.

In regard to the treatment, by the Missionaries, of Slaveholding church-members, (intending to continue such,) it recommends that emancipation be advised *where duty to the Slaves admits of that*; and *where it does not*, advises that special pains be taken to promote their social and religious welfare.

Reminding the Missionaries of a former letter, in which they were directed not to buy, and *advised* not to *hire* Slaves, it expresses profound regret at the number still hired, and recommends further inquiry into the supposed necessity of this practice.

The phraseology of this letter constantly reminds one of that item of the Southern code which treats of the death of a Slave "under *moderate* correction." Amidst a vast amount of very edifying talk about the wickedness of Slavery *in general*, it distinctly makes these concessions: That the Missionaries may hire Slaves if they choose, and that any church-member may hold, buy and sell them, if he will only say, persistently, that he does not hold them "with a selfish spirit and for selfish purposes," and does not buy and sell them "as articles of merchandize."

The utmost that has been claimed for the Resolutions of the Board, is, that they amount to an endorsement of the letter of which we have thus given a summary. We humbly submit, that if the Board had, categorically, accepted the TREAT Letter as their own, and had put it forth under their own hand and seal, it would be rather a confirmation than a contradiction of the charges brought against them by the Abolitionists. And, as it was, the passage of the Resolutions was strenuously opposed by the President of the Board, and by other weighty members, on the very ground that they contained a virtual endorsement of the TREAT Letter! which, it will be remembered, had never been adopted by the Board, but allowed to lay on its table, after strong opposition to it at the beginning, from 1848 to 1854, not on account of its Pro-Slavery concessions, but of the censure of Slavery, in the abstract, which attended them. When we remember this, and remember also that it was with the full concurrence of the Board that Slaveholders were, at first, received into the Mission Churches — that the matter of acceptance or rejection was then in their own power, and that the corruption of the Mission Churches has directly resulted from that of the Missionaries and their employers — that they suffered this "Anti-Christian system" to remain in their Churches, undisturbed by even a remonstrance, until it was assailed by "the world" without — and that they now venture to assail a single item of the Slave system (the prohibition of teaching Slaves to read) only after the assurance that they must lose, else, the support of their largest contributors in the North or West — we shall begin to appreciate the guilt and the difficulty of their position. The guilt they do not fear to retain; but the difficulty, strange to say, they seem successfully to have evaded;

for that portion of the religious and secular press, which called upon them for more efficient action, (including the *Tribune*, the *Evangelist*, and the *Independent*,) regard their late Resolutions as an endorsement of the "TREAT Letter," and that letter as perfectly satisfactory!

That the Churches of the North, East, and West, and their intelligent representatives, lay and clerical, at the meeting just finished, should be willing to accept such action as satisfactory, shows that their standard of right is too low, and their spirit of enterprise too small to make them useful, even as co-operators in their own special department of Church action against Slavery. It seems to be settled that even the average body of what they superciliously call "the world," is to precede the Church in Anti-Slavery labor. But this state of things is easily explained. "The disciple is not above his master," and where the Clergy hold back, we cannot expect the Churches to go forward.

The turning point of the adoption of the Resolutions was clearly a pecuniary one. Dr. BACON said, "*The views of those who furnish our funds must guide our action.*" The Rev. Mr. PATTEN said, "These views are essential to the perfection of the Report, and nothing else will satisfy the People and Clergy of New England." Dr. STURTEVANT, of Illinois, said, "The Western Churches distrust the position of this Board on the subject of Slavery, and nothing less than the adoption of these Resolutions will retain them in connection with it." Dr. BEECHER said of the Western people, "They love this Board; but if you wish to retain their sympathy, you must adopt these Resolutions." Rev. Dr. HOLBROOK, of Chicago, asserted the same thing of the North-west, and Dr. TODD of the Bay State and the Granite State. And the Rev. Dr. POMROY, whose official connection with the Board gave great weight to his testimony, affirmed that "no action, less than or different from the Resolutions, would harmonize the Churches of the North." Under the urgency of these statements, in spite of the desire of weighty members for indefinite postponement, the Resolutions were adopted.

Unfortunately for the young Anti-Slavery character of the Board, and for the presses and persons who had hailed these Resolutions, endorsing, as it was said, the TREAT Letter, a second TREAT Letter appeared soon after, which was but too plain a commentary on the first. If it were the Anti-Slavery spirit Mr. TREAT had infused into his famous Letter, which, in a second decoction, was potent enough to cure the chronic Pro-Slavery of the Board, in the opinion of such papers as the *Evangelist* and the *Independent*, it is instructive to learn from

head quarters what Mr. TREAT thought of his sovereign panacea himself. This action of the Board having naturally excited observation and censure in the South, Mr. TREAT thought it necessary to make his own position clear, and accordingly he addressed the following Letter from the Missionary House to the editor of a paper which had criticised his conduct in the matter.

MISSIONARY HOUSE, BOSTON, }  
October 7, 1854. }

DEAR SIR:—

In your paper of this date, you publish an extract from the *Watchman and Observer*, and then inquire—"Is this a fair and truthful statement? Did Mr. TREAT endeavor to persuade Missionaries to *exclude* Slaveholders from the communion? Did he treat them with *threats* that, if they persisted in their course, the Board would *cut them off*? Did he thus undertake to speak for the Board?" To each and all these interrogatories, I answer "No." And I must be allowed to express my great surprise that any one should have supposed me capable of such conduct.

Very sincerely yours,

S. B. TREAT,  
*Sec. of the A. B. C. F. M.*

Now as these were the very things which the defenders of the Board thought, or pretended to think, formed the essence of the TREAT Letter, by the endorsement of which in their Resolutions, the Board had purged itself of all complicity with Slavery, this explanatory codicil was a staggering blow to those who had committed themselves to that opinion. That they rallied from it, however, may be inferred from their tone since, in England and in this Country. The *Independent* soon recovered so far as to attack Mr. PILLSBURY, last winter, with brutal scurrility, for simply stating and proving out of its mouth, how the Board stood towards Slavery. To the slanderous venom of its assault it added the amazing meanness of refusing to insert a temperate reply! When it is remembered that HENRY WARD BEECHER is one of the editors, or stated contributors, of the *Independent*, and that it professes to be the soundest of Anti-Slavery papers, could we have a stronger proof than this of the palsy influence of Slavery on even generous natures, when they stand in electrical connection with those who hold the chain?

Now, although it is plain enough that both the Letters in question and the Resolutions of the Board have been framed with a studied indefiniteness of expression, which might be adapted, by the same skill-



ful rhetoricians, to whatever turn the popular mind may take, towards either Slavery or Freedom, in the coming year, they contain a certain amount of positive meaning—a committal of the writers and the Board to certain definite things—which may be plainly distinguished by the *unbiased* searcher, and are doubtful only to those who insist on assuming the fair and honest dealing of the writers. Viewed without this prepossession, it is manifest, first, that the Board have chosen not to relinquish their connection with Slavery, and not to recall their explicit permission, given in the first “TREAT Letter,” that Slaveholders, intending to continue such, *may join their Churches*; and next, that they have chosen to wrap this action or inaction in such a cloud of words, to surround it with so much censure of the system of Slavery *in general*, to interweave with it so many cheap technicalities of piety and charity, and, by the partial quotation and distorted use of Scriptural language, so (falsely) to represent themselves as occupying the same position with Christ and the Apostles—that we are justified in supposing that they *intended* to do what they have actually done, namely, to bewilder and mislead the simple men who trusted in their piety and honesty.

Indeed, in any other case, so triumphant an exultation over so very moderate an expenditure of virtue as is displayed in these Resolutions, and the TREAT Letter itself, had the Board adopted it, would be regarded as showing how profound was the humiliation, from which this was regarded as an advance. But we are compelled to say, that it is not so in this case. In looking back at the antecedents of the Board, it is, perhaps, no wonder that even so small a favor as this should be thankfully received, and put down in large figures on the credit side of its account. When we remember how the question of the admission of Slaveholding Indians to the Mission Churches was put off from year to year; how the Missionaries had employed, and even owned Slaves, to assist them in tilling that portion of the Vineyard without censure; how insolently, and in the true spirit of Slave-drivers, they replied to the suggestions of the Secretary, who had been sent to look into the matter; how they found no condemnation of Slavery by Christ, and a recognition and regulation of it by the Apostles; how they avowed that they had admitted Slaveholders to the Churches, and would again, and defied the Board to do anything about it; we may, perhaps, not be surprised that the world should accept any concessions with gratitude. And when we recollect how the Board, in 1848, virtually endorsed the action of the Missionaries, showing the distinction between Slavery and Slaveholding, and pointing out cases in which it was inno-

cent and even laudable to hold Slaves, and how they disclaimed the idea that Slaveholding was incompatible with Church-membership ; and how the Board, the next year, got down on their bended knees to the Slaveholding Missionaries and their converts, and apologized for their interference with so delicate a question, and assured the world of "their undiminished confidence in those servants of Christ ;" and how ingeniously they evaded the responsibility by taking the position that the Missionaries are *not amenable to them, but to the Ecclesiastical Bodies with which they are connected*, for their faith and conduct ; in view of all these things, we cannot marvel that even so small an offering as this should be hailed as if it were a holocaust. With so very small a capital of Anti-Slavery grace, it is nothing surprising that the Board should desire to bolster up its credit by all the external aid it could command.

In every commercial community, the value of a good endorsement is well understood. It has saved many a tottering credit, and bolstered up many a rotten character. It is not necessarily a bad thing in itself. The best names on 'Change would, probably, make no objections to having their paper voluntarily endorsed by almost anybody of a tolerable standing. Just as few of us would complain of our honest neighbors speaking a good word for our honesty and sufficiency. But it is not the best names that care the most about endorsements. They can stand alone. Probably neither Mr. ASTOR nor Mr. GIRARD ever thought the value of their notes of hand at all increased by having the name of anybody else on the back of them. The more anxious, as a general thing, a man is to get endorsers and guarantees, the more doubtful is his standing. He must have somebody to lean upon, because he cannot stand by himself.

This application of the Christian doctrine, "Bear ye one another's burdens," is by no means confined to the "place where merchants most do congregate." It applies equally well to other Congregations, and to the burden of sin as well as to that of debt. Sinners, of all grades, are as desirous of finding some persons of a respectable standing to help them hold up the pack they are carrying on their shoulders, on their pilgrimage from the City of Destruction, as failing traders are to get substantial persons to help them hold together their crumbling credit. And it behooves those to whom they apply to be as wary in the one case as in the other ; lest, peradventure, they enable a fraudulent bankrupt to put off the evil day of his crash at the expense of honest tradesmen. In case any one is taken in, in consequence of the faith

given to the endorser, it is quite clear that the moral responsibility, to a yet greater extent than the pecuniary one, would rest with the guarantor of the bankrupt's character. And this, in matters of Morals as well as Money.

It is certainly not at all strange that the Board should be looking about for good and sufficient endorsers in order to keep up its character in the eyes of the world. They have done this before, and had claimed, in 1845, Dr. CHALMERS and the unanimous Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, as concurring with their position, that Slavery does not, in all cases, "involve individual guilt in such a manner that every person implicated in it can, on Scriptural grounds, be excluded from Christian fellowship!" This year, they have found great comfort in the words of encouragement held out to them (in ignorance, we are sure, of their history,) by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, Sir EDWARD NORTH BUXTON, and other English persons of distinction and of evangelical tendencies. And they have manifested their satisfaction by electing them Honorary Members of the Corporation. Nothing can be more natural than this wish of the Board to get the countenance of English Christians of distinction. Nothing can be more consistent with their own whole career of life and conversation. But, we apprehend, nothing could well be more inconsistent than for those to whom this compliment is offered to accept it, in the shape in which it offers itself to them.

If we do not much misremember the language held by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, at the Meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, at which he presided, in 1853, he alluded to the support which Slavery received from the public sentiment of the Religious Public of America. We are confident, from our recollections of his Speech, that he was deeply impressed with the guilt of the professing Christians of America in this behalf. Now, we feel assured that Lord SHAFTESBURY and Sir EDWARD BUXTON did not know, when they said the things touching American Missions, which incurred the approbation and gratitude of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, that this body was verily the very embodiment of the Pro-Slavery Religious Public Opinion of America—Pro-Slavery Religion incarnated and standing up between the natural sympathies of simple Christians and their brethren in bonds. Yet their whole history proves this to be true. For successive years, at every Anniversary, the most important and exciting business was to smother, or to postpone the consideration of its

Relations with Slavery, which some impracticable and pragmatical member of Anti-Slavery tendencies would persist in bringing before it. The leading men, without exception, set their faces like flints against any agitation of the subject. When they could not hinder its being stirred, they have used all the craft and subtlety they were masters of to huddle it out of the way. It has virtually proclaimed (see Report presented to Meeting of 1845,) that Slavery is no sin; that it is not the business of the Missionaries to meddle with it directly; and that the only hope of its Abolition is through "the influence of the Gospel, conveyed in a spirit of meekness and love!" Which is, being interpreted, conveyed so as not to disturb the equanimity or self-complacency of the masters. The Report, which embodied these sentiments, passed, not without opposition in debate, but without a dissenting voice, when it came to a vote.

We cannot recapitulate all the acts of the Board which identify it with the Slaveholding and Pro-Slavery Religion of the United States. Nor yet of the remarkable action of 1846, when the Board, with exemplary consistency, whatever may be thought of their Christian morality, refused to make polygamy a bar to admission to the Mission Churches. It is enough to say that the whole influence of the Board has been thrown into the Pro-Slavery scale, in every instance previous to this year, if its action, this year, be allowed to savor of any Anti-Slavery Grace. It is true, as we think Mr. BIRNEY proved satisfactorily, that "the American Church is the Bulwark of American Slavery," and as the Rev. ALBERT BARNES affirmed, that there is no power out of the Church that could maintain Slavery, if the Church attacked it in earnest. In other words, Slavery is maintained by the wicked public sentiment of the Nation. The sentiment of the embodied Religious Sentiment of the Nation, is the most fatal element of this Public Opinion. The American Board of Commissioners is the Representative Body, the Quintessence of this Pro-Slavery piety, which makes long prayers, kneeling on the prostrate bodies of three million Slaves, and ready to receive their value into the treasury of the Lord. We trust that Lord SHAFTESBURY, and Sir EDWARD BUXTON, and the other distinguished Englishmen who have been invited to cast in their lot among them, will look well into the history of the Board for the last twenty years, will see what it has done and what it has left undone, before they consent to lend their voice and countenance to the men who have proved themselves, by their sins of omission and of commission, to be the most insidious and virulent enemies that the American Slaves,

and their friends, have had to encounter in their life-long conflict. Such an action would much more than counteract all that they can do at home for the Slave, by encouraging the hearts and strengthening the hands of his deadliest enemies here.

### THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

This powerful organization still continues to afford the weight of its *vis inertia* to the aid and comfort of Slavery. Existing to disseminate religious truth, and covering the whole Country as its field, it carefully refuses to circulate any Tract which contains, even by allusion, a censure upon Slavery. The Censorship of France, or Rome, or Austria, is not more strict in the denunciation of everything that looks towards political freedom in any publication offered for the press, in those Countries, than is this self-appointed Inquisition in expurgating every work that is offered to it, or to which it helps itself, of everything that might be dangerous or offensive to the power that rules our Church and State. Neutrality on the Slavery Question is the open policy, officially avowed of this mighty manufacturer of Public Opinion. And what Neutrality means, in a case like this, is too plain to need explanation. When a rich and powerful Society, claiming to be composed of the selectest spirits of the Evangelical Churches, professing to be arrayed against all Theological and Moral evil, refuses to notice, in any way, a particular institution or practice, the conclusion is inevitable, that it does not regard that institution or practice as sinful. And, consequently, the silence of such a Body is the strongest kind of consent to the thing it refuses to condemn, and all that the doers thereof can desire.

An instance or two, out of many, of the purifying process to which publications issued by the Society are subjected before they are suffered to pass its Quarantine, may not be unedifying—the rather that some of its friends have ventured to interpose a denial of the fact between the Society and its accusers. In Mr. GURNEY'S "Habitual Exercise of Love to God," on page 142 of the original edition, is the following passage:—

"If this love had always prevailed among professing Christians, where would have been the sword of the Crusader? Where the African Slave Trade? Where the odious system which permits to man a property in his fellow men, and converts rational beings into marketable chattels?"

In the Tract Society's edition, the passage stands thus :—

“If this love had always prevailed among professing Christians, where would have been the sword of the Crusader? Where the tortures of the Inquisition? Where every system of oppression and wrong by which he who has the power revels in luxury and ease at the expense of his fellow men?”

The special allusion to the Slave Trade and to Slavery, it will be observed, is totally suppressed, and the thought in Mr. GURNEY'S mind travestied by a general reference to oppression and wrong which means nothing.

Among its publications the Society has reprinted Dr. COTTON MATHER'S well known “Essays to do Good,” admitting in the preface,—

“In this edition, such portions of the original Essays are omitted, and such changes have been made in the phraseology, as might be expected after the lapse of more than a century since the work was written.”

The natural inference from this language is that nothing had been omitted which could be of any interest to the reader of our time—a change, by-the-bye, in itself bad enough, and a liberty with any author not often excusable. But that is not all. On page 44 of the Tract Society's edition is this passage :—

“O that the souls of our servants were more regarded by us! that we might give a better demonstration that we despise not our own souls, by doing what we can for the souls of our servants. How can we pretend to Christianity, when we do no more to christianize our servants?”

Now, if the reader will read this as COTTON MATHER wrote it, and for “*Servants*” substitute the word “*Slaves*,” he will find a difference, and still greater will he find it if, after the word “*Servants*,” at the end of the first sentence, he will add what COTTON MATHER wrote, and what the Tract Society has altogether suppressed, namely :—

“and not using them as if they had no souls! That the poor Slaves and blacks which live with us may, by our means, be made the candidates of the heavenly life!”

And on the same page with this passage a whole paragraph of strong condemnation of Slavery and the Slave Trade is entirely omitted.

This is an act of an old date, but a more recent instance is to be found in the mutilation of the Memoir of MARY LUNDIE DUNCAN, which has been incorporated with its publications. The following passage, occurring on page 67 of the English edition, is entirely omitted :—

“We have been lately much interested in the emancipation of Slaves. I never heard eloquence more overpowering than that of GEORGE THOMPSON. I am most thankful that he has been raised up. O that the measure soon to be proposed in Parliament may be effectual.”

The passage on page 87 referring to Mr. THOMPSON'S visit to this country and the aspiration in verse for its success is also struck out. So, in other places, similar suppressions are made relating to the emancipated West Indian Negroes as “no more degraded lower than the brutes—no more bowed down with suffering from which there is no redress,” and as now being able to “seek the sanctuary fearless of the lash,” and “to call their children their own.”

It has been intimated that these suppressions were made with the consent of Mrs. LUNDIE, the authoress of the work, rather than have it wholly suppressed. But the Remonstrance of the Fourth Congregational Church in Hartford, which brought these mutilations before the Society and the world, says authoritatively—“we *know* that the author, Mrs. LUNDIE, while in this country, was seen by one of your Secretaries before the Society republished the work, and though urged to consent to this mutilation, absolutely refused, declaring that the lines sought to be suppressed were precious to her for their sentiment and for her daughter's sake; that the Secretary then reminded her that, as there was no copyright for it in this country, the Society could go on and publish it in such form as they pleased; and that she replied that she knew she was in their power and they could do as they pleased.”

It is immaterial to the question whether the changes were made with the consent of the authoress, or not. The fact that the Society will suffer none of its publications to appear until it has been expurgated of all that could appeal to a Slaveholder's conscience, or wound his prejudices, is equally established in both cases. It is needless to multiply instances,—these will suffice as a specimen. Perhaps, nothing shows more conclusively how deeply American Christianity is tainted by its connection with Slavery than the well established habits

of the great dispensers of the spiritual food of the nation. The Bible Society refuses to instruct its *colporteurs* to supply the bond as well as the free with the Bread of Life; the Tract Society permits none of its spiritual supplies to be dispensed until all savor of the wholesome bitter of Anti-Slavery truth has been withdrawn from them; and the American Board goes forth into all the World, except the plantation, and preaches the Gospel to every creature, excepting to the Slave, the most abject and wretched of all! If these be the Prophets and the Priests, what must be the People?

If the Tract Society needed any encouragement and comfort in the course, upon which we have just been animadverting, it might have found it in the cheerful coöperation and approbation of its own servants. The Colporteurs of that Society held a Convention at Rochester, last January, and discussed, among other things, "the difficult and perplexing subject of Slavery." Difficult and perplexing, however, as it may be, these devout agents found strength to disentangle or to cut it. After discussing the question with "a Christian feeling," which a pious correspondent of a religious paper wishes could have been seen and heard by both North and South, they settled the matter briefly and satisfactorily, by unanimously concurring in the position taken on this great question by the Society, to wit, entire neutrality and silence on the subject of Slavery! Verily, the servant is not better than his master, nor the disciple greater than his Lord! It may be noticed, moreover, that at the last Meeting of the Tract Society, the Rev. Dr. NEHEMIAH ADAMS was elected a member of its government to fill a vacancy. Inasmuch as that eminent divine had not long before put forth a tract entitled a "South-Side View of Slavery," in which he undertook to put the erring North right on the subject of Slavery, and to teach them "to conquer their prejudices" afresh and to admire the providential contrivances of the arrangement, we cannot but suppose that an unequivocal and unblushing Pro-Slavery character is thought to be no bar to usefulness in the administration of the Tract Society's affairs. And, if we are not much mistaken the Rev. Dr. NATHAN LORD, the President of Dartmouth College, who had put forth a kind of Pastoral Letter to the Clergy, inviting them to reconsider the heresies which had been bringing scandal upon Religion and to see whether Slavery were not an institution divinely established, or, at least, not divinely condemned, we say we believe that leading divine is an officer of the Tract Society, notwithstanding his private departure from the boasted neutrality of the body. And we must say that we do not



think the Tract Society could find two men better qualified to sit on the inquisition seat of their Holy Office, keener to discern or sharper to cut off whatever is infected with the heresy of Freedom, than these two great Pro-Slavery polemics.

### THE BRITISH ISLANDS.

We have again to acknowledge the great help we have received in a multitude of ways from the true friends of the Slave in Great Britain and Ireland. The Anti-Slavery public sentiment of these islands, always strong, has been strengthened and reinforced by the new attention Mrs. Stowe's book and visit attracted to the subject of Slavery. The public sentiment of England and of the Continent is sure to react strongly upon the thin skinned sensitiveness of American feeling. Bluster and bully as we may, we have always an uneasy consciousness that the eye of Civilized Europe is upon us, and that it cannot avoid seeing many things we would gladly conceal. We cannot but be sensible that our public course for many years has been such as to bring shame on the Republican name, and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that as we become more and more an object of European attention, our true character is better and better understood. In former days, the Liberalism of Europe, stretching out its hands for help wherever it could hope to find it, was ready to take us at our own account of ourselves, and to believe that we were in earnest in our denunciations of all despotisms and our shoutings for Liberty everywhere. But we have not permitted the delusion to last. The open defence of Slavery, on its merits, not only by Slaveholding politicians, but by eminent clergymen, and these not only of the Slave States, but of the North Country as well, Doctors of Divinity in Philadelphia and New York and Boston, Theological Professors and Presidents of Colleges — these things may not sound so strangely to us who are to the manor born and who have had the blessings of religious education. But to simple Catholics and Protestants of the Continent and of Great Britain, they grate on their ears and are shocking to their moral sense as nothing short of blasphemous railing against God and Christianity.

It is the public sentiment of Europe, and especially of the British Islands, and above all the Public Sentiment of the Religious Public, that the American Abolitionists invoke. None know so well as we how powerful is the opinion of this public everywhere, and as we have strove

long and earnestly to array that of our own country on the side of the Slave, so we entreat the help of that of the Mother Country. In this endeavor we have been seconded by multitudes of warm-hearted Christians of every denomination. But it is also true that we have had to encounter sectarian opposition scarcely less bitter and malevolent than that we have met with at home. Members of powerful sects, connected by a common creed and common rites with sects of the same name in this country, find it hard to believe that the boasted light of the American Church is, indeed, but darkness. It is a hard thing to hear that eminent Doctors in the Divinity they love and prize are in league with those that make merchandize of the souls of men and baptize Slavery as a thing appointed and ordained of God. They have, some of them, refused to accept such a report, and have denounced and persecuted the faithful men that have borne it as blasphemers and evil-speakers. The most malignant slanders against prominent Abolitionists have been eagerly caught at, when extended to them from their enemies here, and spread abroad even by those who claim to be the chiefest of the English Abolitionists. This has been renewed even within a few months past with regard to Mr. PILLSBURY, now on an Anti-Slavery mission in England, a man of whom the world and the church are not worthy, than whom a purer, a more self-sacrificing, a more devoted spirit never gave itself to the deliverance of the poor and the outcast. We fully understand the shock which the statements made by the Abolitionists must give to the preconceptions of the English brethren of Pro-Slavery American ministers and professors, and we ask them to take none of our opinions upon trust. If we cannot substantiate what we say as to the malign influence of what may be called American Christianity as opposed to the Christianity of Christ, and that by the infallible evidence of their own words and admitted actions, let us receive any amount of condemnation that can be wreaked upon our heads.

It is from a strong sense, which none but those who have given their lives to this cause can adequately feel, of the responsibility of British Christians in this behalf that we feel it incumbent upon us to keep the subject constantly before them. It is for their sake, as well as for that of the Slave, that we entreat them to cease to add their weight to the burden which is crushing out his life. A unanimous feeling on their part, carried out in action, would do more to convert their brethren in this country than almost any conceivable influence. Let the Christian character of all religionists in America who are not out-spoken and

committed Abolitionists be denied, and with this let Christian communion and recognition be cut off, as in the case of notorious immorality or of deadly heresy, let the pulpits be shut to the most celebrated Doctors in Divinity and the Communion Table barred against the most distinguished lay members, who have the smell of the Slave's blood upon their garments, whether as Slaveholders or their apologists, and we are sure that a blessing would wait upon such fidelity. We are happy to believe that juster views as to the relations of American Religion to Slavery are spreading in the Mother Country. The Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin undoubtedly did much to open the eyes of the religious world abroad as to that matter. But the persistent fidelity of the British Abolitionists, who are in intimate connection with this Society, of their organ the Anti-Slavery Advocate, and of the faithful Americans who have labored there, in this regard, has been the chief means of enlightening honest ignorance on the subject. At the last Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the Report of the Secretary (Mr. CHAMEROVZOW) referred, in terms of condemnation, to "the deplorable position" of the American Churches, and especially of the American Board and other kindred Associations, towards Slavery. It also referred, with regret, to the formation of an Auxiliary to the American Board in London, under the style of the Western Turkey Missions-Aid Society. This brought the Rev. CUTHBERT G. YOUNG, the Secretary of this new Society, to the rescue of his own constituents and of the Board. An animated discussion of the subject ensued, in which Mr. CHAMEROVZOW and Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON participated. Mr. THOMPSON went into the subject at length and with great thoroughness and ability, and was listened to with evident sympathy, in spite of the impatience of the Chairman, Mr. SAMUEL GURNEY, to put an end to the subject. This gentleman was so disgusted at the speech of Mr. THOMPSON, and at the way in which it was received, that he refused the customary vote of thanks, and expressed his regret that he had ever taken the Chair, or that he did not vacate it rather than listen to such a speech. But the audience appeared to have been on Mr. THOMPSON'S side.

Their weight of character and social position, joined to their practical skill and cultivated ability, give the Pro-Slavery American Ministers a great advantage over the untitled and plain men who impugn their Christian character before the British Public. The leaning of the tribunal is almost necessarily on their side, and the desire of sectarian unity and of denominational success, is a strong temptation to the judges

to try and look at their short-comings with the eyes of the accused parties. It becomes the more imperative upon the true friends of the Slave to endeavor to set the truth in order before all willing to look at it, and to make it plain to them what it is that sustains Slavery. We think it can be demonstrated that the Slaveholders can hardly be expected to confess that Slaveholding is wrong, as long as the American Church, as a Body, refuses to treat it as sin. If the Organized Piety of the Country see nothing in the relation of a Master to a Slave necessarily inconsistent with the Christian character, why should the Master be expected to be wise above what is written, and to believe that he is a sinner more than other men for doing what the Church does not condemn? It is clear that Slaveholders cannot be persuaded to repent of the sin they are committing as long as the Great Religious Teachers of the Country treat it as if it were no wrong at all — admitting the Christian character and ecclesiastical equality of men living by this very wrong, and recognizing them as successors of the Apostles and Members of the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ. And how double will be their assurance if they find that the Christians of England, Scotland, and Ireland, removed to an impartial distance from the direct influence of Slavery, concur in this theological separation between a sin and the sinner that commits it — condemning the act, while they recognize the Christian character of the agent! The British Churches have a fearful responsibility in this matter, scarcely less awful than that resting on the American Churches themselves, so great is the influence for good or for evil that abides with them.

Feeling as we do the vital importance of just views prevailing as to what constitutes the strongest support of Slavery, we could not but feel very deep regret at the opinions expressed by Dr. Stowe, before the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, two years ago. We cannot believe this gentleman capable of wishing to divert the eyes of his hearers from the main obstacle in the way of Abolition, by the raising of a specious but illusory issue. But if he had designed to do this, he could hardly have done it more effectually than he did in laying down the propositions, that we could not expect to convince the Slaveholders of their sin as long as we continue to buy their cotton, and that the only possible way of abolishing Slavery was by making it unprofitable as compared with Free Labor. We think Dr. Stowe has read the "Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin" to very little purpose, if this be his deliberate opinion. Is this his doctrine as to the other evils and sins that are in the World? We presume that he is one of the Commissioners

for Foreign Missions. Does he propose to root out Idolatry among the Nations of the Earth, by making it less profitable than Christianity? Does he make Practical Religion a matter of Dollars and Cents? We do not believe that he does. And yet, if this is the *only possible way* of abolishing "the Sum of all Villanies," is there any more feasible one for removing the single sins which are the Units of that Sum? Is "the foolishness of preaching" effectual for the conversion of mankind from their lesser errors and sins, but utterly inefficient when brought to bear on the very grossest form that human avarice, and cruelty, and lust ever assumed? It is true, indeed, that a sound vision sees all vices, and crimes, and dishonesty to be less profitable, in the end, even in a money point of view, than their opposite virtues. But it is hardly the office of a Christian Minister, as it strikes us, to point to this as the only way of salvation.

We believe that the money made by Slavery is by no means the only or chief motive that induces the Master to hold on to his Slaves. The Slaveholders are, as a general thing, educated and intelligent men. Their business is Politics, and the Science and Practice of Government. We believe that they know, the leaders of them certainly, that they would make more money by Free than by Slave Labor. They know as well as we, or as Homer, that

————— "the day  
Makes man a Slave, takes half his worth away;"

more than half his worth as a producer of wealth. They know that the hope of improving his own condition, and that of his children, would be an infinitely stronger incentive to intelligent labor than the coarse stimulus of the cart-whip. Why, then, do they hold on to the System with such a death grasp? Because their ancestors and ours so constructed the frame of our National Government as to put the control of the whole machine into their hands, as long as they remain Slaveholders. Because, by the Constitution of our National Government, they were erected into an Oligarchy, the element of the existence of which was ownership in human beings, and which will disappear as soon as that element is eliminated. Perhaps this result was not intended. Perhaps it does not flow necessarily and logically from the premises of the Constitution. We will not stop to argue that matter. But the fact that the Slaveholders have ruled us, and still do, will hardly be denied by any one. It is written too palpably on every page of our history. Slavery *is*, indeed, a most fatal institution for the *South*. It sits like a Night-

mare on its prosperity and happiness. But it constitutes the essence of the political power of the *Slaveholders*—a very small minority of the white inhabitants, but absorbing nearly all the wealth and education—by which they have absolute control over the Southern States, and an eminently governing influence over the affairs of the Union. And what Aristocracy ever renounced the elementary principle of its power, except on compulsion, physical or moral? A single Tyrant has, three or four times in the world's history, abdicated his dominion; an Oligarchy, NEVER!!

Now, the object of the Anti-Slavery Movement is to organize a Moral Compulsion, which shall extirpate this Aristocracy. To bring together all the elements of moral hostility to Slavery, wherever they may exist, and direct them with terrible concentration against it. To bring every ray of intelligence and humanity to bear, in one focal blaze, upon this abnormal Abomination, and to destroy it, like a thing of darkness, by the light of Truth. And in this work we have had no help from the American Church. It has been busy, on the contrary, by the bands of its ministers, members, and presses, in calumniating the men who were engaged in it, and doing what in them lay to palsy their hands and hinder their fall success. Nay, worse; it has refused to reduce Slavery into the category of mortal sins. It welcomes to its pulpits and communion tables, and lifts to the high places of its Assemblies, men who live by robbing the poor of their wages, who deny "all the charities of father, son, and brother," by law, to men as good as themselves, and who refuse to them what they themselves profess to regard as the necessary means of Salvation. Who give the most effectual support to Slavery—these lights of American Christianity, or the Cotton-spinners of Manchester and Rochdale? We cannot but hope that Dr. STOWE will reconsider his positions, and see that Slavery is entrenched behind more effectual breastworks than Cotton bags—even pulpits and communion tables, and resolutions of General Assemblies, Associations, Conferences, Conventions, and Boards of Commissioners. Its roots extend deeper than to the pocket. They have twisted themselves about the very heart-strings of this people. They are not to be reached by Political Economy. It is Religion, in its highest and purest sense, the profoundest and most practical recognition of duty to God and Man, that must loosen their grasp. If the Abolitionists have been compelled to take the teaching of this Religion out of the hands of the Church, whose fault was it? If the Church will come up to this work, and put forth her irresistible power, for the destruction

instead of the comfort of Slavery, she shall meet with no obstruction from the Abolitionists. Most happy should we be to see her bringing forth figs and grapes, instead of thorns and thistles — putting forth her strength to break rather than to bind chains, to open the prison doors rather than to keep guard over them.

The British Abolitionists, who have always been in fellowship with this Society, have bated no jot of heart or hope in the good work to which they have put their hand. With a singleness of purpose and clearness of sight truly admirable, they have given themselves to their voluntary task. The establishment of the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, a monthly periodical, has been at once a sign and a means of their good wishes and good work. The *Advocate* has been chiefly under the editorial care of RICHARD D. WEBB, of Dublin, whose name is a sufficient guarantee of its ability and its thoroughness. As a mode of reaching well-disposed people, it has been of the greatest importance, while the perfect acquaintance of Mr. WEBB with the whole history and all the bearings of the Cause, in this Country, has made it the medium by which truths regarding men and things here could be laid before that public, which would reach them in no other way. We do not know whether the *Advocate* is a self-supporting instrumentality, or whether it is a pecuniary burden on the Abolitionists who have established it. It certainly deserves a liberal support on both sides the ocean, as containing a faithful account and wise commentary on the current history of the Cause in both hemispheres. It is a most valuable addition to our means of attacking Slavery, from the opportunity it gives us of laying the facts and philosophy of the Enterprise before British Abolitionists in the columns of a friendly and able print. We cordially thank the faithful friends who have established and conducted this new organ, and assure them we are deeply sensible of the service they are thus doing to our common Cause.

These faithful friends of ours have not been weary in their well-doing. Public Meetings of great interest, and largely attended, have been held in many different cities. In Perth, in Belfast, in Dundee, in Manchester, in Dublin, in London, and in many other places, important and influential Gatherings have assembled, to hear and to see for themselves what they could do for the help of the American Slave. The services of Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON have been called again into the Anti-Slavery field, and his voice has again been heard swaying and stimulating great masses of men. Last autumn, Mr. THOMPSON entered upon a new line of duty as editor of the *Empire*, a paper which represents the interests

of Peace and Free Trade, and the columns of which, we are sure, will continue to be used to advance those of Anti-Slavery as well. During parts of the two last years, we have been fortunate in having members of our Society doing good service in those Countries. Mr. McKIM's visit was of great service to us, through the clearness and force of his statements in public and through the social influences of private life. Mr. WILLIAM W. BROWN remained abroad until last autumn, having rendered efficient help to the enterprise with which he is especially connected by his descent and his personal experience in Slavery. His departure from England was regretted by many who had so long known and esteemed him, while he found a warm and cordial welcome back to his labors here. Mr. PILLSBURY has been abroad for something more than a year. During much of that time the precarious state of his health, injured by his long and incessant Anti-Slavery labors, has prevented him from doing much active service. His voice, however, has been heard in several most important Conventional Meetings, as well as on occasions made specially for him. And in private life he has done a work not less important than his public services. He has been received into the homes and hearts of the Abolitionists there with a heartiness and affection, at which those who had known the admirable and attractive traits of his life and conversation at home, were nothing surprised though they cordially rejoiced at it. The beauty and singleness of his daily life have quenched the fiery darts of calumny which have been aimed at his heart's heart, both from America and in England, by the bigotry and malice which his Christian faithfulness had provoked. We trust that many years of health and strength, and consequently of usefulness, are yet in store for him.

Of all the Meetings to which we have referred, perhaps none equalled in interest and importance the Conference held at Manchester, last summer. One of the principal Magistrates of the City, ABSOLOM WATKIN, Esq., was President and the Rev. Professor SCOTT, President of the Theological College, at Airdale, acted as Vice President, occupying the Chair for a good deal of the time, and the Rev. WILLIAM PARKES, pastor of the First Independent Church, in Manchester, being one of the Secretaries, Mr. F. W. CHESSON, acting as the other. These names show how differently the Clergy of England stand towards the Anti-Slavery Cause, and how powerful an instrumentality the united and practical testimony from such men, to the corresponding classes in the American Church, might be made. The Rev. Dr. BEARD, one of the oldest and most distinguished ministers of Manchester, distinguished



himself by a Speech replete with the eloquence of truth and of religion. Mr. THOMPSON distinguished himself by one of his most masterly Orations. Mr. PILLSBURY also made a most telling and effective Speech. The Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP, of Liverpool, whose Anti-Slavery was of a sufficiently robust character to survive a visit to America, took part in the Meeting, and delivered a Speech of great excellence, in the Town Hall, on the evening after the adjournment. Mr. PILLSBURY was also invited to deliver an Address on Slavery, in an Evangelical Chapel, by a delegation of its members. Forty ministers and multitudes of laymen assisted at the Conference. The only diversity of opinion which stirred the unanimity of the assembly, was as to the custom of the American Abolitionists, of holding Anti-Slavery Meetings on the Sunday. The Rev. Mr. GUEST, of Leeds, introduced the subject, expressing his disapproval of the usage, with which opinion the Chairman expressed his agreement. Mr. THOMPSON, with great clearness, gave the reasons which have moved the Abolitionists to this course. The Resolutions, which were very able and thorough, and drawn up by Mr. THOMPSON, were unanimously passed by the Conference, and it separated with the consciousness of having performed good service for the Slave.

At the Anti-Slavery Conference, which was held later in the year, in London, the question of the relations of the American Church, and particularly of the American Board, to Slavery, again came up on a Resolution condemning a Pro-Slavery Pulpit and Church, offered by the Rev. JAMES SHERMAN. In speaking to this Resolution, Mr. PILLSBURY again laid bare the actual character of the Board, in a Speech of great ability. Though his plainness of speech gave rise to slight interruptions, at times, the body of the Meeting seemed to be desirous of hearing him out. The Rev. CUTHBERT G. YOUNG, of whose championship of the Board, at the late Anniversary of the British and Foreign Society, we have spoken, rallied to its defence. He flatly contradicted Mr. PILLSBURY's statements, on the ground of the action of the Board at its Hartford Meeting, to which we have given so much room, and also of Mr. TREAT's Letter. The Rev. SAMUEL G. WARD, a colored member from Canada, vouched for the truth of Mr. PILLSBURY's statement, as did the Rev. EDWARD MATHEWS, whose experiences at the hands of the Slaveholders of Kentucky are fresh in the minds of all our readers. Mr. YOUNG still persisted in the exculpatory character of the late action of the Board; but as he had not the documents with him, the Conference had to take his word for it. Its feeling, however,

was clearly with Mr. PILLSBURY. We are not able to give as full an account of this important meeting as we could desire, owing to the very imperfect sketch of it in the *British and Foreign Reporter*, which had been relied on with a well-grounded expectation for a full and accurate Report. We have also to thank the people of Great Britain for many encouraging words sent over to us in the shape of Addresses or Remonstrances against Slavery. Among others we may mention, particularly, "The Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Axbridge and its Vicinity to the People of the United States." Well written and powerfully put, it showed a profound sensibility to the crimes of Slavery, and an intelligent rebuke of them on the part of its author, conveyed in an affectionate and candid spirit. It was authenticated by the signature of the Rev. GEORGE G. BEADON, the Rector of the Parish of Axbridge, and of fourteen hundred others. It arrived just on the eve of the Anniversary of 1853, and made a prominent and interesting part of its history. During the same summer, we were cheered by the appearance, in the *Tribune*, of an "Address from the Democrats of England to the Democrats of the United States." It was a manly and noble appeal, which could not be shouldered aside by the vulgar cry of Aristocratic Interference, as it came from men struggling against the Aristocratic element of British Institutions, and who find American Slavery a main obstacle in their way. It was signed by more than eighteen hundred persons.

About the same time arrived a Letter from the Kent and Sussex Association of Baptist Churches to the American Baptist Free Mission Society, bearing a faithful testimony against the Pro-Slavery Churches, and expressing a cordial unity with those that had honestly striven to clear their skirts of the blood of the Slave. The latest Remonstrance, and that representing the greatest number of persons, was that received late in the autumn from Scotland. This valuable document is entitled "The Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Scotland on the subject of Slavery." It is truly admirable in spirit, in matter, and in style. No denial can be made of its premises, and no answer made to its conclusions. It was read and exhibited, to the great interest of all, at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Society, at the Anniversary of the American Society, and at the recent New England Convention. It was signed by ministers and magistrates, on behalf of Congregations and of Public Meetings, and stood as the sense of no less than *forty thousand* souls. For all these demonstrations, we return our most sincere thanks on the part of the Slaves, whose servants we are. Among

the many Abolitionists to whom we are under great obligations for their zealous labors in our company, we must be allowed to mention WILSON ARMISTEAD, as eminently deserving of our gratitude. A member of the Society of Friends, he had visited America, and did not carry back with him any of the quietness of spirit which too many of that Society invoke as the proper way of dealing with Slavery. He has published and circulated an immense number of Tracts on the subject, besides a valuable work, entitled a "Cloud of Witnesses against Slavery." These publications have, doubtless, been of great effect in enlightening and influencing the mind of England. We wish him all the reward he asks -- the utmost possible success of his unselfish labors. The help of the Women and others of the British Islands has been continued and increased, from year to year, in their contributions to the Boston Bazaar, and other efforts of the kind. They have never shown themselves weary in this well-doing, and we are certain that they will continue faithful unto the end.

#### ANTI-SLAVERY OPERATIONS.

We have devoted so much space to the public history of what Slavery has been doing, and to the political and ecclesiastical aspects it has presented, during the past two years, that we have left ourselves but scanty room to detail the specific Anti-Slavery operations that have been employed by your Committee and our Auxiliary Societies. That we have been active according to our means and opportunities, we think the historical facts herein recorded furnish ample proof. The upturnings which have taken place, and the revolutions initiated in the Parties and in the Sects, are the work of Anti-Slavery labors, extending backward for a quarter of a century. We have but to look around us to see the monuments of our persistent agitation. For the third time, this year we hold our Anniversary in New York, after an interval of two years of exile by the compulsion of the Mob, under Captain RYNDERS, and of the Church, under the leadership of the Pro-Slavery piety of the Commercial Metropolis. This year, as the last, we have had extended to us the use of a Christian Church. Our Meetings, since we have recovered our position here, have excited an interest, and have attracted crowds unknown before. We believe that we have at last conquered a peace, as far as the right of Free Speech, in this City, is concerned. We accept this fact as a hopeful augury for the future.

If the most extreme doctrines of Anti-Slavery can be allowed an utterance in the City of New York, we are sure that they can find a hearing everywhere else in the Free States.

The State Societies have also held their Annual Meetings with increasing power and numbers. In Massachusetts, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Michigan, everywhere where the true Anti-Slavery sentiment has crystalized into an organization, there Public Meetings have been drawing to themselves, more and more, the attention and curiosity of all who are beginning to perceive the all-controlling and all-pervading influence of Slavery. In New York, for the last two winters, Courses of Anti-Slavery Lectures, under the auspices of the New York City Anti-Slavery Society, a most active and useful auxiliary of this Society, gathered two years ago, have been delivered by men of various creeds, political and theological, but of the highest grade of ability. These Lectures were admitted, even by the indifferent bystanders, to have been the feature of each winter in New York. The extremest opinions were set forth by such men as Messrs. GARRISON and PHILLIPS, while other doctrines and philosophies were applied to Slavery, by such others as RALPH WALDO EMERSON, THEODORE PARKER, and HENRY WARD BEECHER. In Boston, also, during the winter of 1853-4, a Course of Lectures was held, under the auspices of Mrs. STOWE and her brother, Dr. EDWARD BEECHER, and during the last winter, another Course was set on foot by a voluntary association of gentlemen, of whom Dr. S. G. HOWE was the foremost. The success of this Course was astonishing even to the most sanguine of its well-wishers. Not only was every ticket sold before the Course began, but they actually commanded a premium in the market. The audiences were truly immense, filling the great Hall of the Tremont Temple to its entire capacity. And the interest and enthusiasm were fully commensurate with the numbers. This certainly shows an advance in the state of feeling and opinion which the most ardent Abolitionists have hardly ventured to hope to see so soon.

Your Committee have used what means have been put into their hands, and which were applicable to that purpose, for the agitation of the question of Slavery, by the presence and voice of lecturing agents. In these efforts we have met with the cordial coöperation of the State Societies. Among the agents we have employed we may mention CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM, SAMUEL MAY, JR., STEPHEN FOSTER, ABBY KELLEY FOSTER, AARON M. POWELL, CHARLES L. REMOND, MISS SALLIE HOLLEY, Mr. and Mrs. GRIFFING, LEWIS FORD, WILLIAM H.

FISH. Mr. PILLSBURY also acted in our service until he went abroad, and Mr. BROWN has resumed his labors most acceptably since his return. Miss LUCY STONE has also given us occasional and much incidental assistance in the course of her labors in the cause of other Reforms, in the prosecution of which she made herself heard even within the charmed frontier of Slavery. The Rev. E. A. STOCKMAN and the Rev. ELNATHAN DAVIS have also rendered us valuable assistance. Besides the regular agents we have employed, we have had much occasional help from other Abolitionists. Mr. GARRISON has made two lecturing tours to the West, where he has been welcomed by numerous and sympathetic audiences, besides frequent labors of love at home. Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. QUINCY have also rendered us occasional services in Pennsylvania and Ohio, as well as in their own State. We think there has never been held so many and so beneficial Public Meetings since the beginning of the Movement, as have marked the two last years. The audacity of the Slaveholders, and the baseness of their Northern accomplices, have aroused the attention of the People to their relations with Slavery, in an unprecedented degree. And we believe that the opening thus made for the introduction of thorough Anti-Slavery truth has not been neglected by us. We think the popular mind was never so near ready for effectual action as now. While we do not expect that its principles and purposes will ripen into deeds until much more labor has been bestowed upon it, we are determined not to be wanting, on our part, in the prosecution of the measures which have been crowned with so promising a degree of success.

The expiration of the Second Decade since the formation of this Society, in 1833, was held in Philadelphia, on the Third, Fourth, and Fifth of December, 1853. The success of the Meeting far exceeded the expectations of those who had planned and promoted it. We had supposed that it would be mainly composed of the most active members of the Society — rather a Family Gathering than a Mass Meeting. It proved to be not merely well but numerously attended. The large and beautiful Hall in Sansom Street, was filled at all the Sessions from the very beginning, and generally crowded to its utmost available extent. We have seldom had larger, and never quieter and more attentive audiences than those gathered on this occasion. This was very different from the experience of the First Decade Meeting, held in the same City ten years before. Then it was the object of insult and disturbance, and, we believe, was finally broken up by a Mob.

This time there was none to molest. Every word was heard, if not with assent, at least with silence and respect. And this, notwithstanding the Meetings were by no means composed exclusively of avowed Abolitionists. Many persons of the mercantile and professional classes were present, and were content to hear what these troublers of the Nation's peace had to say. We could not but see in these things the proofs that the labors of Twenty Years had not been in vain, and that the change in Public Opinion which was the object of the Movement then initiated, had begun to be effected. Among those who took part in the discussions were Mr. GARRISON, Mrs. MOTT, Messrs. PHILLIPS, FURNESS, MAY, BARKER, H. C. WRIGHT, GEORGE SUNTER, of England, HENRY GREW, MCKIM, QUINCY, BURLEIGH, STEBBINS, and many others, women as well as men. We hope that the Third Decade Meeting will find us yet farther onward towards the Mark of our High Calling, if it shall not record that we have reached it.

The *National Anti-Slavery Standard* has been regularly issued as the Organ of this Society, and has, we believe, maintained the place in the confidence and good-will of our members, which it has long held. At the beginning of the Fourteenth Volume Mr. OLIVER JOHNSON took his place as joint editor with Mr. GAY, and has brought the help of his long practical experience and intimate acquaintance with the Cause from its beginning, to the service of the paper. Besides these gentlemen, Mr. QUINCY has been a regular contributor, and the paper has also enjoyed the frequent assistance of several of the ablest writers in the Country. Last summer, a union of the *Pennsylvania Freeman* with the *Standard* was suggested by the Board of the Pennsylvania Society. A Special Meeting of that Auxiliary was held in Philadelphia, on the 13th of June, to consider the proposition. The identity of the principles of the two papers, and also, to a considerable extent, of their fields, was urged in its favor. It was thought that one paper could do the work of both, with a large saving of expense, and an increased efficiency on the part of the *Standard*. There was a friendly difference of opinion as to the expediency of the plan, but the Society voted, by a large majority, in its favor. The union took place at the beginning of July, and we believe it has worked to the general satisfaction of all parties. We regretted that so able and faithful a sheet as the *Freeman* should be discontinued, and nothing but the hope and belief that the concentration of means and talent on the *Standard*, which had been bestowed on the two, would produce a result compensating for the sacrifice, would have induced us to consent to it. Mr.

McKIM, the last editor of the *Freeman*, has acted as the Philadelphia Correspondent of the *Standard*, and added much to its interest and usefulness. The *Anti-Slavery Bugle* has been faithfully maintained by the Abolitionists of the West, and continues the excellent and trustworthy paper that it has ever been. The *Liberator*, at Boston, we believe, was never in a better condition than it has enjoyed for the last two years. Still, its uncompromising tone and unflinching fidelity to its largest ideas of duty, it is likely, will prevent its ever being oppressed with patronage. We hope that the Abolitionists of the Country will never forget what they owe to the Pioneer Sheet of the Cause, and will never suffer it to languish for the want of a cordial and generous support.

In addition to the maintenance of the *Standard*, we have set on foot a system of *Tract* publication, from which we anticipate the happiest results. The *Tracts* are intended for gratuitous distribution, and those that have been issued have been widely spread over the whole Country. In this movement we have had the cheerful and gratuitous assistance of many eminent writers, as well as persons not immediately connected with the Society as our own members. When we mention the names of Mr. PHILLIPS, the Rev. O. B. FROTHINGHAM, the Rev. T. W. HIGGINSON, Mrs. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, the Hon. JOHN G. PALFREY, Mr. HILDRETH, Mrs. FOLLEN, Mr. BURLEIGH, the Rev. CHARLES E. HODGES, Mrs. CHAPMAN, and Miss SUSAN C. CABOT, as among the contributors to our publications, we need not vouch either for their quality or their execution. Fifteen *Tracts* have been issued and stereotyped, and great numbers distributed over the Country. Other *Tracts* will follow, according as we have the means put into our hands. Liberal donations have been made for this specific purpose, many of them from persons who would not be likely to contribute to our general funds. We urge a continuance and a large increase of this liberality. There was never a time when the public mind was more accessible, or when it was more hungry for Anti-Slavery facts and arguments. Our work is carried on by means of newspapers, books, tracts, agents, meetings, and conventions, and persons contributing to the treasury can indicate the direction they should prefer to have given to their funds. We entreat our members, and all who feel that Slavery is a thing with which they have some concern, to consider whether they can better employ their means than in assisting the American Anti-Slavery Society in carrying on the work by means of some or all of their instrumentalities. And we should say here, that the success of this Movement, as

well as our measure of success in other ways, is greatly owing to the untiring and faithful services of **ABBY KELLEY FOSTER**, who consented to act as our General Financial Agent about a year ago. Giving herself to this work with the earnest enthusiasm which has marked her whole Anti-Slavery life, she has produced results such as, we think, no other individual could have done. Her services, since she entered on her duties, have been most laborious in their nature, and most beneficent in their effects, and we trust that we shall long enjoy her invaluable coöperation in our efforts for the Slave.

The Abolitionists, in various parts of the Country, have continued to make use of the National and local holidays as favorable opportunities for collecting the people together, to hear Anti-Slavery truth. The Fourth of July has been made, where there was opportunity, an occasion of Anti-Slavery Assemblies. It is a fit use to make of the day. As celebrated throughout the land, it is a delusion and a mockery; a jubilee over a Deliverance which has given it up to a Tyranny beyond computation worse than that it overthrew. The Fourth of July, 1776, was indeed a memorable day, and produced effects over the world which the men of that day dreamed not of. But still less did they dream that they were founding a State with Slavery as its corner-stone, and with Slave-drivers as its lords. It is our business to supply the complement of the Revolution that day set up. We are preparing for the advent of a true Independence Day, when the world will have a genuine Festival of Freedom, mocked by no derisive contradictions, at which every inhabitant of the land may assist, and which will be really the inauguration of a true Republic. Till then, let our bastard Independence Day be used by the genuine friends of Freedom only for a text of rebuke and denunciation, as a Pretext, a Sham, and a Lie, until it be superseded by the Feast of that Freedom with which God would make His children free indeed. The Anniversary of the Emancipation of the British Slaves has been long marked with a Red Letter in the Anti-Slavery Calendar. The Abolitionists delight in meeting together on the First of August, and rejoicing with the rejoicing freedmen of the British Empire. That pure and bright example they hail, both for the hope and the guidance which beam from it. It has been celebrated in various parts of the Country, and for the two last years, in the immediate neighborhood of this City, with the most signal and gratifying success. The Abolitionists of Plymouth, Massachusetts, for several years past, have wisely turned the Anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims from a Service for the Dead to one for the Living. It has



been made a most interesting and instructive occasion. We cannot enumerate the multitudes of Conventions, Mass Meetings, and other demonstrations of an Anti-Slavery character, which have been held all over the Free States. Where we could, we have given them the assistance of our agents, or have stirred up voluntary help in their behalf. And we are bold to repeat, that never was there so much and so thorough Agitation of the matter of Slavery, or a greater eagerness to hear, since the Cause began, as during the past two years.

Nor must we omit to mention, as foremost among the instrumentalities by which the means of carrying forward the Cause have been furnished, the ANTI-SLAVERY FAIRS which have been held in many places, but especially in Boston, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati. These Sales, which have now settled into an Institution, have been growing in importance, both as respects their pecuniary receipts, and their influence on the Cities in which they are held. We believe they have never so fully rewarded the time and pains the Anti-Slavery women of the Country have bestowed upon them, as the last times they have been held. We have already expressed our gratitude to the women of England, Scotland, and Ireland, for the gifts they sent, valuable for the money they brought into the treasury, more valuable as telling us of intelligent zeal and sympathy for the suffering Slave. We have also to acknowledge important assistance from the Continent of Europe — from France, from Switzerland, from Germany, and elsewhere. Although these philanthropists have already received the thanks of the ladies engaged in the Bazaars, we think that the gratitude of the Abolitionists at large should be added to theirs, as common partakers of their goodness. The work in which we are engaged is the world's work — though it is our speciality — and we welcome every help that comes to our perishing clients, as a solemn recognition of the oneness of Humanity, and of the common duty of all human beings to unite for the destruction of the common enemy of the race.

## DEATHS.

The small band of our Anti-Slavery agents has been made yet less during the last two years, by the hand of death. On the 4th of April, 1854, the Cause in general, and particularly in the West, sustained a severe loss in the death of JAMES W. WALKER. He was one of the

few that have felt their humanity stronger than their sectarianism, and he gave himself with rare self-devotion to what he regarded as the first religious duty of an American. Enthusiastic in his temperament, impetuous and fervid in his eloquence, singularly disregarding of his personal interests and safety where there was a work to do, he probably contracted the disease of which he died, in the Anti-Slavery field. Possessed of eminent personal and moral courage, no dangers disheartened him, and no sacrifices seemed too great to make in a cause of duty. His period of Anti-Slavery service, though it did not extend over many years, was full of activity and of results. His memory will be ever cherished by all who knew him, for the purity, disinterestedness and energy of his character, and for the many souls he won over to Anti-Slavery truth. The Resolution offered at the Annual Meeting, of May, 1854, written by Mr. GARRISON, and which will be found in the Account of its Proceedings, in the Appendix, will be recognized by all who had watched his course, as no more than an adequate testimony of his worth.

On the 7th of March last, the Cause lost one of its most faithful and effective laborers in CYRUS M. BURLEIGH. He died at Sunnyside, Chester County, Pennsylvania, of a pulmonary consumption, at the age of thirty-five. His life had been devoted, from his earliest youth, to the Anti-Slavery Cause, and he had rendered it good service in the lecturing field, and more recently, as editor of the *Pennsylvania Freeman*. This arduous and important post he filled most usefully and acceptably for several years, with little relaxation, except Anti-Slavery lecturing excursions, until the failure of his health compelled him to give up active life. His time and his talents he gave cheerfully to the service of those that had none to help them. His cheerful and friendly spirit won for him the affection and friendship of those who knew him best; while his constant and faithful public services secured him the respect and esteem of all who knew anything of the American Movement against Slavery. Though he was called upon to give up life and its dearest relations in the very prime and flower of his age, he met death with all the firmness and composure a good conscience and a steadfast hope could supply. The following Resolutions, passed by the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, express the sense entertained of his character and of his loss by those who had known him latest and best. That passed by this Society will be found in its proper place in the Appendix.

At a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, held on the 15th inst., the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

*Resolved*, That in the death of CYRUS M. BURLEIGH, this Executive Committee has lost a valued member, and the members of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society a most earnest and faithful coadjutor, who, in the various offices which he was called to fill, labored with untiring devotedness to the cause of Human Freedom.

*Resolved*, That in the unswerving fidelity, the self-sacrificing zeal, the unfailing faith of our beloved brother, we have an example which should incite us to renewed diligence in our efforts in behalf of the Slave's redemption.

JAMES MOTT, *Chairman*.

MARY GREW, *Secretary*.

#### CONCLUSION.

It is now something more than a quarter of a century since the American Movement for the Abolition of Slavery on the principle of Immediate Emancipation, was set on foot by Mr. GARRISON, and nearly twenty-three years since this Society was gathered. The Abolitionists, whose memory runs back to that day of small things, have seen many changes in the world around, and may justly claim many of them as the work of their hands. Those of them who began at the beginning, and have persevered unto this Anniversary Week, constitute a sort of measure of the changes in Public Opinion for the last five and twenty years. As they marked on the Nilometer, in Egypt, the different points to which the Great River had risen in different years, so their memories and their contemporary records furnish unerring monuments of the flowings and the ebbings of that vast tide which sweeps nations on to glory or to ruin. They had no distinct idea of the work that lay before them, or of the instruments by which it was to be accomplished. They merely discerned the crying sin of the Nation, and thought, good easy men, that all that was necessary was to let the Nation know what it was about, when repentance and reformation would follow as the night the day. Of course, their first thoughts and their first appeals were made to those who had in charge the souls of the American People, and whose especial business it was to bring them from sin unto righteousness. Being earnestly religious persons themselves, and having taken up arms against this form that the Enemy of Souls had assumed, they never dreamed that these works of his, which looked so black and

horrible to them, could appear venial to any of the Shepherds of the Lord's Sheep, still less that he could assume to them, in this shape, above all, the garb of an angel of light. But it did not take many years to disabuse them of these delusions.

The Anniversaries of the American Anti-Slavery Society have been faithful types of the condition of the general mind. In the earlier days, the Platform bore the weight of a large proportion of Clergymen, of various denominations, within its ample verge. They were not, as a general thing, the most eminent, in rank, of their denominations, and the denominations were rather of the humbler and democratic, than of the wealthier and aristocratic descriptions. The very few Clergymen of worldly distinction, that were betrayed into a temporary sympathy with the Movement, in its earlier days, soon discovered and retraced the false steps they had made. The honest gentlemen who held by the Platform for awhile, (and we believe that most of them *were* honest then, whatever they might have become afterwards,) saw in the Slave Population a field for Missionary labor, unhappy fellow men, deprived of Gospel privileges and condemned to heathen darkness, in a land of Christian light, and they accepted the Anti-Slavery Movement as a new sort of Domestic Missions, which was to convert Masters and Slaves to the particular form of Christianity they received. And we include in this category many Laymen of piety and zeal for religion, who used to swarm upon the Platform. But, in due time, the Great American Church gave all these to understand, by the most unequivocal indications, that such was no part of its Creed. They were told, in significant signs or by emphatic silence, that any doctrines which went to unchurch the communicants and unfrock the ministers of one-half the Country, were damnable heresies—that the Church was the first love of the Lord, and that he would take measures for the redemption of those black confessors at the South when he could find leisure from the conversion of the superior class of sinners, who were better worth saving.

And so occasion was found, or made, to withdraw their countenance from our Platform, and they went their way and we saw them no more. The saints *par eminence* retired, and they who believed a black soul of as much value as a white one, and who were infidels to the Christianity which would exclude them from its benefits on account of the way that their Creator had been pleased to make them, were left in sole possession of it. But still it stood, and they stood on it, and managed to make themselves heard by the nation and the world. Then there

were those who were closely bound by political sympathies and affinities to one or the other of the great Parties, who had taken refuge on our raft after the Anti-Masonic Party went to pieces, or were misled to think that Slavery could be attacked and overthrown without touching either of the Parties which are its tools, there were not a few of such who went back and walked with us no more, when they saw whither they must needs go with us. Others, again, who were once ornaments of our Platform, and whose names illustrated our Official Lists, disappeared from our ranks, some to go to Congress, some to State Senates, some to comfortable official stations, and some to an unwelcome obscurity. But the Platform still stood, and those that remained seemed as stout of heart as before these apostacies. The rising waves of Public Opinion, stirred by the breath of Anti-Slavery, reached first the Church, and afterwards the State, and those who clung to the high places of either, betook themselves to other deliverances—but the Nilometer still stood firm, and marked the height to which it had risen when it swept them away.

There came a time yet harder to bide than any of these, and that was when the Idea first dawned, that Duty to the Slave required the Sacrifice of allegiance to the Constitution of the Country, and demanded Revolution as the only way of escape, for black Slaves or white Freemen, from the despotism which was organized into a fundamental necessity. Then, many who were precious to us could see no longer eye to eye with us, and left our company in much sorrow and in no anger. And so we were left with yet diminished ranks, but still presenting a front to the enemy, which was never misunderstood by them, at least. Our simple principle has been, from the beginning, to weigh all opinions, characters, and institutions in the balances of the Slave's instinct. We have tried truly to feel with them in bonds as bound with them, and to see whatever affected their condition with their eyes. We have believed this to be the true test of all institutions, ecclesiastical and political, in the Country, and we treated them as we found that they stood it. This is the true secret of the apparent weakness of our instrumentalities, and of the manifest and marvellous results they have brought about. We have used only the foolishness of preaching—setting forth the Anti-Slavery Gospel in all its keenness, telling the Nation the things that most of all pertained to its peace, calling things by their right names, showing the inevitable tendencies of the existing state of things in Church and State, pointing out the only way of escape, and exhorting the people to flee from the wrath that was sure

to come — and we see the effects of our persistent agitations on every side.

What do we see at this very moment of our Twenty-second Anniversary? We see the Slave Power raging, because its time is short. Not satiated with the sop of Texas, with which it had gorged itself, and of New Mexico, which it is even now lubricating before swallowing it, it is opening its hungry jaws for Nebraska and Kansas, and lying privily (and hardly so) in wait for Cuba, for Haïti, and for the Sandwich Islands. Twenty years ago, it felt no appetite for these morsels, and why? Because it had then all that its real necessities demanded, and no one molested or made it afraid. It now demands this fresh supply because it feels that it is no longer sure of what it now has within its coil. It is making provision against an evil day, which its unerring instinct tells it must overtake it. Though we fear Kansas and Cuba, too, will yet be seized upon by Slavery, as necessary to its defence, we believe, also, that it is because the citadel is weakened that these outworks are demanded. And whence this necessity? Because there have been men at the North determined to make themselves heard as to the condition to which Slavery reduces the Slaves and themselves. And they have made themselves heard. They have modified the sentiments and opinions of vast multitudes, who take not their name upon themselves. Opinions and sentiments are now uttered by weighty men and influential presses, which drew down upon us denunciation and even violence, not many years ago. The very question of Disunion, which has been regarded as the Shibboleth of the most fanatical of the Anti-Slavery tribes, is now bruited in popular assemblies, and discussed in popular newspapers. The wedge, of which we only inserted the edge, is receiving blows from without, which are driving it home.

Our conclusion of the whole matter is, that the American Anti-Slavery Society was never more justified, in all its ways, before men and before God, than it is now. It was never stronger. The virtue that goes out from it was never more potent for the healing of the Nation. And this, not because of our numbers, for we are few; nor of our influence, as men call influential, for not many rich or noble are called with us; but because of the fidelity with which we apply the Anti-Slavery test to all institutions and opinions, and the stern kindness with which we proclaim the results. This requires honest instinct and plain common sense, rather than genius or shrewdness, and simplicity of statement more than rhetoric and oratory. Our philosophy

has been effectual to this day, and it would be most unwise to change it for any less simple and less broad.

We have not taken counsel of flesh and blood, and consulted the blind and lying oracles of temporary expediency. Whatever crushed the Slave, we knew to be false and wicked, by whatsoever name it might baptize itself, or in whatever mask conceal its face. By this unerring test we have tried what named itself the Church of Christ, and we found it to be a synagogue of Satan. We denied not Christ or His Church, but that men who made merchandise of His brethren, and denied them all just knowledge of Him, that their ownership might be the surer, were not of Him, but of the Adversary. And so of those who, in pulpit or professor's chair, preached the Gospel of Slavery, and baptized the unclean thing into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. We refused to hold fellowship with these unfruitful works of darkness, and separated ourselves from them forever. So, when we saw that the political institutions of the Country were made the citadel of Slavery, contrived to shelter, and comfort, and protect it forever, and that all the inhabitants were called upon to be its garrison and defenders, we refused to recognize as a Republican government, institutions which rested on the denial of their right to themselves of one-sixth of the inhabitants. When we saw that we could hold no office under the Government without consenting to these things, we refused to enter into those wicked obligations ourselves, or to appoint others to assume them on our behalf. We have refused to listen to the voice of political charmers, how wisely soever they might charm. We would not cast in our lot with CLAY, nor with TAYLOR, nor with SCOTT, nor yet with the Free Soilers or the Know Nothings. And our wisdom has been justified by its fruits.

Our business is to make continual claim for the stolen rights of the Slaves; to make this guilty Nation forever mindful of the three million innocent victims it keeps chained in the Southern prison-house, for its own imagined safety and gain; to make it impossible that the existence of the Slaves should ever be forgotten again. The Abolitionists stand in the place of the Slave, pleading his cause, pointing to his wounds, demanding the restoration of his rights, and denouncing the judgments of God on all who molest or consume him. The Abolitionists are the Conscience of this wicked Nation, calling on it to repent. They cannot leave their vocation to be seared with the hot iron of sectarian struggles or partisan conflicts. They know that Slavery exists because the people love it, and think it for their own advantage. They know, too,

that as soon as the mind and heart of the people is changed, the outward institutions will change with them. To help to bring about this change is our Plan. As soon as the American People are in earnest and resolved to be rid of Slavery, they will provide the Method without our help. All half measures are useless, or worse. An uncompromising, unsparing, unselfish Testimony against Slavery, and the consenting to it of the Nation, is what the Time demands, and, God helping us, the Time shall have its need.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*

EDMUND QUINCY, }  
SYDNEY H. GAY, } *Secretaries.*



DR. *Annual Account of the American Anti-Slavery Society, from May 1st, 1854, to May 1st, 1855.* CR.

To Balance from old Account,.....	\$2,376 29
" Amount received by Donation, and Subscription to Anti-Slavery Standard,.....	14,524 18
" Publication Account, .....	52 19
" "Ames Fund,".....	995 00
	<hr/>
	\$17,947 68

By Standard Account,.....	\$7,003 38
" Agency Account,.....	3,304 83
" Expense Account,.....	1,583 30
" Publication Account,.....	1,102 78
	<hr/>
	\$12,594 33
By Balance to new Account,.....	4,953 88
	<hr/>
(E. E.)	\$17,947 68

FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer.*

Receipts for the Year, ending May 1st, 1855, of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its Auxiliaries,	\$35,466 69
Expenditures, .....	29,673 60
	<hr/>
Balance to new Account, .....	\$5,793 09

NEW YORK, May 1st, 1855.

NEW YORK, May 7, 1855.

I have examined the several items, and the vouchers of the above Account, and certify them to be correct, leaving a balance in the Treasury of Forty-nine Hundred and Fifty-three Dollars and Thirty-three Cents.

JAMES S. GIBBONS.

# OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY.

## PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, MASSACHUSETTS.

## VICE PRESIDENTS.

PETER LIBBEY, Maine.	THOMAS WHITSON, Pennsylvania.
LUTHER MELENDY, New Hampshire.	GEORGE ATKINSON, New Jersey.
THEODORE B. MOSES, “	ALFRED GIBBS CAMPBELL, “
JEHIEL C. CLAFLIN, Vermont.	THOMAS GARRETT, Delaware.
FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.	THOMAS DONALDSON, Ohio.
EDMUND QUINCY, “	WILLIAM STEDMAN, “
ASA FAIRBANKS, Rhode Island.	JOSEPH BARKER, “
JAMES B. WHITCOMB, Connecticut.	WILLIAM HEARN, Indiana.
SAMUEL J. MAY, New York.	JOSEPH MERRITT, Michigan.
THOMAS MCCLINTOCK, “	THOMAS CHANDLER, “
AMY POST, “	CYRUS FULLER, “
PLINY SEXTON, “	JOHN WICHELL, Illinois.
LUCRETIA MOTT, Pennsylvania.	JAMES A. SHEDD, Iowa.
ROBERT PURVIS, “	CALEB GREEN, Minnesota.
EDWARD M. DAVIS, “	GEORGIANA B. KIRBY, California.

## CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES.

EDMUND QUINCY, DEDHAM.

SYDNEY H. GAY, NEW YORK CITY.

## RECORDING SECRETARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, BOSTON.

## TREASURER.

FRANCIS JACKSON, BOSTON.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

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

# A P P E N D I X .

---

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, IN 1855.

The Twenty-second Anniversary of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was celebrated in New York, on Wednesday morning, May 9, at the Metropolitan Theatre, in Broadway.

The President of the Society, WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, called the meeting to order, and said that, in accordance with the usage of the Society, any person present who felt disposed to offer vocal prayer could do so.

The Rev. Mr. HILLIER, of the New Jersey Temperance Society, rose from among the audience, and delivered an impressive prayer.

The PRESIDENT then read selections of Scripture of remarkable appropriateness to the occasion and to the Country.

Mr. GARRISON said that the Annual Report would not then be presented, as the time was too limited to listen to it. It would be referred to the subsequent meetings for examination and discussion.

FRANCIS JACKSON, of Boston, as Treasurer of the Society, submitted his Annual Report, which will be found on a preceding page.

WENDELL PHILLIPS moved to lay the Report upon the table, to be taken up for consideration at future meetings, which was adopted.

The HUTCHINSON FAMILY were then introduced, and sang a beautiful song, entitled, "True Freedom—how to gain it," for which they were warmly applauded.

The subjoined Resolutions were read by the PRESIDENT, and warmly approved by the audience.

*Resolved*, That of all systems of despotism existing in the world, American Slavery is the most merciless to its victims, the most insidious in its assumptions, the most murderous in its spirit, the most demoralizing in its influences, the most hideous in its features, and the most calamitous in its operations.

*Resolved*, That its immediate and unconditional abolition is the primary and paramount duty of this Nation, before which all other questions fade into insignificance, all other issues are as dust in the balance.

*Resolved*, That for the continuance and extension of Slavery on our soil, the American Church and Clergy, with honorable but rare exceptions, are pre-eminently guilty; and that they have thrown over it the mantle of Christianity, declared it to be in accordance with the will and word of God, branded the Anti-Slavery Movement as infidel in its spirit and object, and admitted to the communion table such as make merchandise of human bodies and immortal souls.

*Resolved*, That such a Church is, in the graphic language of Scripture, "A cage of unclean birds and the synagogue of Satan," and that such religious teachers are "wolves in sheep's clothing," "watchmen that are blind," "shepherds that cannot understand, that all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter."

*Resolved*, That in the language of PATRICK HENRY, "It is a duty we owe the purity of our religion, to show that it is at variance with that law which warrants Slavery."

The PRESIDENT then addressed the audience, as follows:—

### MR. GARRISON'S SPEECH.

I am almost totally at variance with the Slaveholding portion of this great Nation; but in one thing I am at entire agreement with them. I agree entirely with the declaration of the *Richmond Examiner*, to this effect:—

"There is no intelligent man, of any party or section of the United States, who does not know and feel that the question of Slavery is the vital question of this Republic—more important in its bearings upon the destiny of the American People than all other questions, moral, political, and religious, combined. Politicians may cry peace, but there is no peace for the Slaveholder."

I endorse this statement as true in every particular. There is but one great issue before this Nation; there is but *one* issue, and that pertains to the triumph either of Liberty or Slavery—either to the salvation or to the overthrow of our Republic. It is also true, that "there is no peace for the Slaveholder;" and while there lives on the American soil one human being, in whose bosom there is a spark of Liberty left alive, there shall be no peace to the Slaveholder until he repents. (Applause.)

In the year 1829, I went from the old Bay State to the City of Baltimore for the purpose of editing an Anti-Slavery journal, with a design expressly and exclusively to seek the liberation of two million of Slaves, at that period held in bondage, whose complexion differed from my own. Little did I dream, at that hour, that it was not simply the cause of the black man that I went there to plead, but the cause of every man living in this Country; that it was a question wide as the whole world, in the settlement of which there is no nation or people not directly interested. Little did I think that I went there to seek the Liberty of white men! What had I to desire at that time? I was an American citizen, recognized as such; the star-spangled banner waved over my head triumphantly; I had my constitutional

rights guaranteed to me; the whole Land was my Country; wherever I might choose to go, I could travel safely; whenever I wished to speak, I could give free utterance to my thought. So it seemed to me then; so I then verily supposed; and in that respect it was a work of disinterested philanthropy to seek the deliverance of those who had no flag waving over their heads to protect them, no constitutional guarantees whereby their rights could be protected, no country which they could call their own. But in all this I found, at last, that I was entirely mistaken. I only, at that time, saw "men as trees walking" — only saw the black man; but now I see the white man — I see all men, in this Country, and so far as this Country has any influence upon the destinies of the world, I see all mankind embraced in this great question, directly or indirectly. In regard to constitutional rights, I stand here, not having forfeited my right to go where I please in the United States; I have a right to speak where I please, and as I please; but you all know that for me there is no country that I can call my own — that in two-thirds of the territory of this Nation I may not venture, except at the peril of my life. My crime is, that I believe in the Declaration of American Independence, and in its being carried out impartially towards all human beings existing on American soil. No man complains of me that I have injured him personally. I have sought no man's detriment, and I have endeavored to do humbly what I might to aid and to bless the land of my birth. But I am an outlaw to-day. There is no constitution for me; there is no nation for me; there is no law to protect me as an American citizen; and so the struggle has become a struggle for all men who desire to possess Liberty in their own persons, and to see Liberty prevail throughout the earth. My case is singular only because other men have not borne their testimony against this sum of all villainies. No matter who the man may be who shall desire to arraign Slavery as a sin against God, and an outrage upon our common humanity; no matter where the man may stand, or what may be his present popularity, or what may be the number of his friends, the moment he shall dare to call in question the divinity of Slavery, and its right to exist on our soil; the moment he shall say that it ought to be abolished sometime or other, a little while, at least, before the day of Judgment, if he says no more than that, he shall find that he can no longer travel safely in the Southern States, and that he is, to that extent, an outlaw in that portion of the Country.

I wish to give a little documentary evidence as it respects the treatment of the friends of Freedom at the South. Let me give you what a *reverend* gentleman, the Rev. Mr. BROWNLOW, says ought to be the treatment of all those found at the South, who have in their hearts any opposition to the horrible system of Slavery. In his paper, he says:—

"The true-hearted citizens of East Tennessee, and property holders, ought to enter into *leagues*, and whip, black, and ride on a rail, irrespective of age, calling, or family associations, every preacher, citizen, or traveller, who dares to utter one word in opposition to Slavery, or who is found in possession of an Abolition document. These are our sentiments, and we are willing and ready to help others to carry them out."

This is a specimen of Southern piety; it is a *reverend* gentleman who says this — that every preacher who dares to utter a single word against Slavery, ought to be tarred and feathered, and ridden on a rail, and otherwise despitefully used and ill-treated, because of his opposition to Slavery; and he says he is quite ready, for one, to help put on the tar and hold the rail.

Not long since, a man had to flee for his life from Mississippi; on what account? He had said nothing there against Slavery; the accusation is not that he undertook to meddle with the Slave question on the soil of Mississippi. What did he do that made it necessary for him finally to flee for his life? He wrote a letter to a friend in New Hampshire, the State from which he came. He was a school-teacher in Mississippi, and the letter, accidentally or by design, got opened at the post-office, and he was detected in having written to his friend in New Hampshire, these sentiments:—

“For Southern men, born and nurtured in the midst of Slavery, and even taught to believe it is right, and to uphold it, I have the deepest sympathy and respect; but for that Northern man, whose education, conscience, and experience, all teach him better, and yet who comes here, and becomes the apologist for, and uses his influence in favor of, Slavery, I have the most unmitigated contempt. It is the basest sacrifice of principle to selfish ends, and proving recreant to that which every Northern freeman, especially, must feel and know is the vitality of our Republic, the safeguard to society, the element of national prosperity in every institution that tends to elevate and dignify man.”

That was all that he did. He had respect and sympathy for Southern Slaveholders, born and nurtured in the midst of Slavery and surrounded by that institution, but for Northern men, who went South and became Slaveholders, and the worst defenders of the system, he had nothing but contempt. He put these sentiments on paper, in a letter intended to be seen by no other person than the one to whom it was addressed, in the State of New Hampshire; and yet, as soon as it was known what he had written, he had to flee for his life. I will give you what the editor of the *Mississippian* says on the subject:—

“Thus did the base wretch play the assassin on those who supported him — cherishing and propagating sentiments at war with their rights — fanning the flame of fanaticism, while living in the South and enjoying her means and hospitality. Of course, Jackson was a little too hot a place for him, and he at once absented himself. We hope our brethren of the press will pass him around. He is described as a man about twenty-five years of age, tall, with fair complexion, and black whiskers.”

And so he is to be identified somewhere, if possible, in the South; and if found, he is to be lynched. What becomes of your star-spangled banner? (Applause.) What is the value of the American Constitution? Where, I ask, in the name of God, is the American Union, and what is it? To this complexion it has come, at last, that a man may not put on paper a single word of reprobation of the conduct of Northern men going to the South and becoming Slaveholders, without being compelled, if detected, to flee for his

life out of the southern portion of our Country. This is the spirit of the South.

I said I began this enterprise with the design exclusively of emancipating blaek people, not dreaming that white people were held in bondage, or that any of them would be liable to be made Slaves of, and yet, at this very time, there is a case on trial, in New Orleans, in which a white female is claimed as a Slave. The suit is yet pending, and the *New Orleans Delta*, of the 12th instant, says:—

“A suit was yesterday filed in the Sixth District Court, on behalf of JOSEPHINE SMITH, alias BARRETT, in which the allegations are as follows:— That she is wrongfully and illegally claimed as a Slave, by LIONEL C. LEVY, whose residence is in the City of New Orleans, and by JOSEPH COHEN, who resides at Charleston, South Carolina.”

What does she say for herself?

“She alleges that when she lived in the house of said BARRETT, she lived there as a free white member of his family, and that said BARRETT then, and at all other times, treated her and presented her to the world as his own daughter, and as being both free and white. Petitioner further alleges that she has always associated with white persons, and has been considered a free white person; that she was educated as a free white person, at both English and French schools, where none but white children were knowingly admitted; that the said BARRETT recognized her, in various ways, and at all times, from her childhood to his death, as free and white, and used to take her to the public theatres, and seat her with himself in the dress circle, where none but white persons were knowingly admitted.”

This is the person claimed to-day as a Slave, in the State of Louisiana. I need not say to any of you in this audience, who are familiar with the complexion of the Slave system, through the bleaching process, at the present time, that the day has gone by for any distinction on the ground of color, and that persons of as fair complexion as can be found in the world are now groaning in the prison-house at the South, and are all the more valuable on account of their white complexion, if they are females, because they can then be sold for brutal purposes. You see, therefore, that we are all interested in this matter; that no person can say I am safe, my wife is safe, my mother, or my child is safe; that complexion settles the question in America, that none but black people can be enslaved. Slavery cares not for anybody's complexion; no person is safe.

Little did I think when I went to Baltimore, that I went there to rescue Christianity from the foulest stigma ever cast upon it, for at that time it was not the fashion to run to the Bible to vindicate Slavery as a Divine institution. Now, all over the South, and, indeed, all over the Country, with exceptions, they who claim to be the authorized expounders of the Word of God undertake to prove that Slavery is in accordance with the Old and New Testament, is consistent with natural and revealed religion, and, consequently, as a logical deduction, that the Anti-Slavery movement is an infidel movement, conflicting with the will and word of God. We have to vindicate the Christianity of Jesus Christ. We declare for ourselves that there is no

stain of blood upon it; that there is no oppression whatever which it sanctions; that it recognizes the brotherhood of the human race; that every human being is a dear child of God, and that all are alike precious in his estimation; and we affirm that whoever says that Jesus Christ winked at Slavery, connived at it, or sanctioned it, is one who casts the foulest imputation upon the character of Jesus Christ; and if he says that Christianity, as revealed, exemplified, and vindicated in the person of Jesus Christ, sustains and sanctions that system, "he is a liar, and the truth is not in him." (Applause.) I did not suppose that Slavery would at last find so much of support, on the part of the Nation, as to dare to throw off the mask, and avow its purpose of eternizing itself on the American soil. But the hour has come for it to throw away the mask. It has done so; it is against all mitigation of the system. In the language of the *Richmond Examiner*, it says:—

"It is all an hallucination to suppose that we are ever going to get rid of Slavery, or that it will ever be desirable to do so. It is a thing that we cannot do without—that is righteous, profitable, and permanent, and that belongs to Southern society as inherently, intrinsically, and durably as the white race itself. Southern men should act as if the canopy of heaven were inscribed with a covenant, in letters of fire, that the negro is here, and here forever—is our property, and ours forever—is never to be emancipated—is to be kept hard at work and in rigid subjection all his days."

This is now the attitude of the whole body of Slaveholders in our Country—that Slavery is a part of our national existence; that they no more dream of getting rid of it than they do of committing suicide; that it is indispensable to the safety and the prosperity of the Republic. They are hostile to every form of mitigation.

There are those who say they cannot go with the Abolitionists in denouncing Slavery, as such, as intrinsically evil. It is a system, they tell us, which has many abuses, and they are in favor of having the abuses all removed. What are the abuses of the Slave system? I never knew any such person to define those abuses, or attempt to remove them, if he himself could understand what they are. It seems to me, that we, as human beings, as fathers and mothers, as brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, might easily come to the conclusion that the putting of a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, on the auction block, to be sold to the highest bidder, was an abuse, an outrageous abuse of Slavery, if you please, something that ought to be put away forever. Well, a few months since, the Governor of Alabama seemed to think so, too, and so, in his Message to the Legislature of that State, he submitted a recommendation that a law should be passed, by which children under a certain age, five years, should not be allowed to be taken from their parents and sold away. The *Richmond Enquirer*, an oracular paper on this subject, came down upon the Governor of Alabama with much indignation, and said:—

"This recommendation strikes us as being most unwise and impolitic. If Slaves are property, then should they be at the absolute disposal of the



Master, or be subject only to such legal provisions as are designed for the protection of life and limb. If the relation of Master and Slave be infringed for one purpose, it would be difficult to fix any limit to the encroachment. If the Slaveholder yield one point to the demands of Abolition fanaticism, he will but embolden the spirit which he aims to conciliate, and will be driven to some more substantial concession."

The recommendation of the Governor fell to the ground, and nobody gave any heed to it, and the whole South, to-day, stands in the attitude of a determination to make Slavery eternal—never to mitigate any of its features, but to keep it always just what it is.

I did not expect to live to see such a development as this; but it shows what the crisis is in which we find ourselves. I did not suppose, when I began, that we should be called upon to advocate the dissolution of the union existing religiously between the North and South; but the hour has come when we must separate, or else our souls must be stained with the blood of the Slave. How any man, who can put two ideas together, who can calculate that two and two make four, can suppose, for a moment, that there can exist, by any possibility, a union between Slavery and Anti-Slavery, between Freemen and Slaveholders, is to me inexplicable. The very terms indicate everlasting antagonism and undying hostility. The one party in favor of justice, humanity, and freedom, and the other party in favor of oppression, and cruelty, and blood—how can they walk together? I fully agree with the *Mobile Tribune* on this subject, when it says:—

"No man with any knowledge, in the South, can for a moment believe that there is or can be any harmony between the Christian organizations of the Free and the Slave States. Why, then, patch up and endeavor to check the disruption which will presently be inevitable between them."

Yes, I ask the Clergy who will assemble, this week, in the City of New York—the Clergy, North, and the members of the Churches, North, who are here assembled—why this attempt to patch up a false union between yourselves and the Slaveholders of the South? Their condition of religious union is that you shall acknowledge Slavery as divinely instituted; as sustained by the Old and New Testaments; and that you shall declare Anti-Slavery to be infidelity. Unless you shall do this, they will cut the bonds of your union and separate from you. Certainly the language of the Slaveholding South is, "No union, religiously, with Abolitionists." They are consistent men; they cannot, as Slaveholders, say otherwise. On our part, as Abolitionists, we meet them as frankly and directly, and say, "No union with Slaveholders, religiously;" and so the hour has come that we separate. All this is logical; all this is a moral and a religious necessity.

I did not suppose, twenty-five years ago, that the time would ever come when it would be a duty to advocate the dissolution of the American Union, and yet the hour has come; and now, it is for us to determine whether we shall have any portion of our Country left to the cause of Freedom and of God, or whether, bowing down and doing the behest of the Slave Power,

the whole land shall be hurried to destruction. God knows that I desire no dissolution of any Union worthy of the name. We ought to be one people, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Our institutions ought to be homogeneous; our industry ought everywhere to be inspired by the same motives, and Freedom ought everywhere to reign. But, if we have a body of men in our Country, who have obtained the mastery over four million of the people, to make them their Slaves; if they declare to us that they will consider it a crime, not to be forgiven, on the part of any man, to refuse to bow down to their power and to sanction their cruelty; if they are resolved to make every friend of Freedom an outlaw, who shall never be permitted to tread on their soil; then, I say, that they have dissolved the Union already, and we have got to do one of two things: either to be Slaves always, or to declare that we wash our hands of blood-guiltiness in this matter, and leave them to take the dreadful responsibility upon their own heads. (Applause.)

I bring these remarks to a close, not wishing to trespass on your time at greater length, as others are to follow whom you would like to hear, by giving you the views of Dr. WAYLAND, of Brown University, on this question of the dissolution of the Union, a gentleman of great caution and the utmost circumspection—one who has never given any countenance to the American Anti-Slavery Society, or to any of its operations, and therefore, one whose words will weigh heavily on the mind of every one who knows who and what Dr. WAYLAND is. At a great Anti-Nebraska Meeting, held in the City of Providence, Rhode Island, while the Nebraska Bill was before Congress, in the course of a very able and powerful Speech made by Dr. WAYLAND, he said:—

“I value the Union as much as any man. I would cheerfully sacrifice to it everything but Justice, and Truth, and Liberty. When I must surrender these as the price of the Union, the Union becomes, at once, a thing which I abhor. To form a Union for the sake of perpetuating oppression, is to make myself an oppressor. This, I cannot be, for I love Liberty as much for my neighbor as myself. To sacrifice my Liberty for the sake of the Union is impossible. God made me free, and I cannot be in bondage to any man.

\* \* \* \* \*

“Taking Christ for my example, and striving to imbibe His spirit, can I do otherwise than to take to my bosom every oppressed and down-trodden child of humanity? Jesus Christ, my Master, is not ashamed to call them brethren, and can I have any partnership in an attempt to trample them under foot? The Union, itself, becomes to me an accursed thing if I must first steep it in the tears and blood of those for whom Christ died.”

I ask Dr. WAYLAND, and every other man, whether we have ever had any other Union than the one which he has here described; whether the tears and blood of the oppressed millions of our land have not always stained that Union; and whether, to purchase the Union at the outset, these oppressed people were not put upon the altar of destruction, and have ever since been given over to remediless ruin? I, too, will sacrifice, with Dr. WAYLAND or with any other man, everything for the Union of this Country, except Truth,

Justice, and Liberty; but, when I am called upon to sacrifice these, I say, no; I will be true to God, to my own soul, and to liberty, and let such a Union perish forever. (Loud applause.)

The HUTCHINSONS then came forward, and sang, with their usual depth of feeling and pathos, "*The Song of the Fugitive*," which was loudly applauded.

MR. JOHN MERCER LANGSTON, graduate of the Oberlin Institute, a colored gentleman, who has recently been elected Town Clerk of Brownhelm Township, Ohio, then addressed the meeting.

### MR. LANGSTON'S SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

Some great man has remarked that a nation may lose its Liberty in a day, and be a century in finding it out. There is not, within the length and breadth of this entire Country, from Maine to Georgia, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, a solitary man or woman, who is in the full possession of his or her share of civil, religious, and political Liberty. This is a startling announcement, perhaps, in the heart and centre of a Country loud in its boasts of its free institutions, its democratic organizations, its equality, its justice, and its liberality. We have been in the habit of boasting of our Declaration of Independence, of our Federal Constitution, of the Ordinance of 1787, and various enactments in favor of popular Liberty, for so long, that we verily believe that we are a Free people; and yet I am forced to declare, looking the truth directly in the face, and seeing the power of American Slavery, that there is not, within the bosom of this entire Country, a solitary man or woman who can say, I have my full share of Liberty. Let the President of this Society arm himself with the panoply of the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and the Word of God, and stand up in the presence of the people of South Carolina, and say, I believe in the sentiments contained in the Constitution of my Country, in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Word of God, respecting the rights of man, and where will be his legal protection? Massachusetts will sit quietly by and see him outraged; the President of the United States will not dare to interfere for his protection; he will be at the mercy of the tyrant Slaveholders. Why? Because Slavery is the great lord of this Country, and there is no power in this Nation, to-day, strong enough to withstand it.

It would afford me great pleasure, Mr. President, to dwell upon the achievements already gained by the Anti-Slavery Movement. I know that they have been great and glorious; I know that this Movement has taught the American people who the Slave is, and what his rights are—that he is a man, and entitled to all the rights of a man; I know that the attention of the public has been called to the consideration of the colored people, and the attention of the colored people, themselves, has been awakened to their own condition, so that, with longing expectations, they begin to say, in the language of the poet:—

"Oh tell me not that I am blessed,  
 Nor bid me glory in my lot,  
 While plebian freemen are oppressed  
 With wants and wocs that I have not.  
 So let a cage, with grates of gold,  
 And pearly roof, the eagle hold;  
 Let dainty viands be his fare,  
 And give the captive tend'rest care:  
 But say, in luxury's limits pent,  
 Find you the king of birds content?  
 No; oft he'll sound the startling shriek,  
 And beat the grates with angry beak.  
 Precarious Freedom's far more dear  
 Than all the prison's paupering cheer;  
 He longs to seek his Eyrle seat—  
 Some cliff on Ocean's lonely shore,  
 Whose old bare top the tempests beat,  
 And on whose base the billows roar;  
 When, dashed by gales, they yawn like graves,  
 He longs for joy to skim those waves,  
 Or rise through tempest shrouded air  
 All thick and dark with loud winds swelling,  
 To brave the lightning's lurid glare,  
 And talk with thunders in their dwelling."

As the mountain eagle hates the cage and loathes confinement, and longs to be free, so the colored man hates chains, loathes confinement, and longs to shoulder the responsibilities of a man. (Applause.) He longs to stand in the Church a man; he longs to stand up a man upon the great theatre of life, everywhere a man; for, verily, he is a man, and may well adopt the sentiment of the Roman, Terence, when he said, *Homo sum, et nihil humani a me alienum puto*. I am a man, and there is nothing of humanity, as I think, estranged to me. Yes, the Anti-Slavery Movement has done this; and it has done more. It has revolutionized, to a great degree, the theology and religion of this Country; it has taught the American people that the Bible is not on the side of American Slavery. No, it cannot be. It was written in characters of light across the gateway of the old Mosaic system, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." That is the only place in the Scriptures where the matter of chattel Slavery is mentioned, and the declaration of the Almighty, through Moses, is: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." (Applause.) THEODORE D. WELD was right when he said, "The Spirit of Slavery never takes refuge in the Bible of its own accord. The horns of the altar are its last resort. It seizes them, if at all, only in desperation—rushing from the terror of the avenger's arm. Like other unclean spirits, it hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest its deeds should be reprov'd. Goaded to madness in its conflicts with common sense and natural justice, denied all quarter, and hunted from every covert, it breaks, at last, into the sacred enclosure, and courses up and down the Bible, seeking rest and finding none. THE LAW OF LOVE, streaming from every page, flashes around it an omni-

present anguish and despair. It shrinks from the hated light, and howls under the consuming touch, as the demoniacs recoiled from the Son of God and shrieked, 'Torment us not.' At last it slinks among the shadows of the Mosaic system, and thinks to burrow out of sight among its types and symbols. Vain hope! Its asylum is its sepulchre; its city of refuge, the city of destruction. It rushes from light into the sun; from heat into devouring fire; and, from the voice of God, into the thickest of His thunders."

Yes, the Anti-Slavery Movement has taught the American people this, and more than this. It has taught them that no political party, established on the basis of ignoring the question of Slavery, can live and breathe in the North. (Applause.) Where is the Whig party?

"Gone glimmering through the dream of things that were;  
A schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour."

The Anti-Slavery Movement has dug its grave deep; it has buried it, and is writing for its epitaph, "It was, but is no more." (Applause.) With DANIEL WEBSTER, the Whig Party breathed its last breath.

And where is the Democratic Party? It is in power, but all over it is written, *Mene, mene, tekel upharsin*. (Applause.)

I would like to dwell on these results of the Anti-Slavery Movement, but I want to make good, before this audience, my proposition, that there is not, within the length and breadth of this land, a solitary Freeman. The American People may be divided into four classes: the Slaves, the Slaveholders, the Non-Slaveholding Whites, and the Free People of color.

I need not undertake to show to this audience, that the American Slave is deprived of his rights. He has none. He has a body, but it is not his own; he has an intellect, but he cannot think for himself; he has sensibility, but he must not feel for another. He can own nothing; all belongs to his master.

Then, as to the Slaveholder, we have all got to think that he has no rights. But a Slaveholder cannot sit on the bench or stand at the bar, in the forum or in the pulpit, and utter a solitary sentiment that could be construed as tending to create insubordination among the Free People of color, and insurrection among the Slaves. Look at the Press in the Southern States; it is muzzled, and dare not speak out a sentiment in favor of Freedom. Let but a sentiment tending towards abolition escape, and what is the consequence? Look at the *Parkville Luminary*, broken to atoms, and the people of that portion of Missouri avowing that that paper never uttered their sentiments or represented their views, and giving thanks to God Almighty that they have had the Mob spirit strong enough to destroy that Press. Is not this evidence sufficient to show that even Slaveholders, themselves, are not in possession of their full share of civil, religious, and political Liberty?

As to the great mass of the White People, at the North, have they their rights? I recollect, when the Anti-Slavery People held a Convention at Cleveland, in 1850, the question came up whether they should hold their

next National Convention in the City of Washington. The strong political Anti-Slavery men of the Country were there. There were CHASE and LEWIS, of Ohio; CASSIUS M. CLAY, of Kentucky; LEWIS TAPPAN, of New York, and a great many other strong men of the Party; and yet, when this question came up, how was it decided? That they would not hold the next National Convention at Washington. And what was the reason given? Because the people of that City may use violence towards us! Had the people their full share of Liberty, would they have been afraid to go to the Capital of the Country, and there utter their sentiments on the subject of Slavery, or any other topic?

But to make the fact more apparent, some two years afterwards, the great National Woman's Rights Convention was held in the same City; and there the very same question came up, whether they should hold their next Meeting at Washington or Pittsburg. How was it decided? As the question was about being put, LUCY STONE came forward, and said, "I am opposed to going to the City of Washington. They buy and sell women there, and they might outrage us." So the Convention voted to hold the next Meeting at Pittsburg. Were they in the possession of their full share of Liberty? Think of it; our mothers, our wives, and our sisters, of the North, dare not go to the Capital of the Country, to hold a meeting to discuss the question of the rights of their own sex. And yet the Constitution declares that the "citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the rights and immunities of citizens in the several States."

I now wish to speak of another class, and more at length — of that class which I have the honor to represent — the Free People of color. What is our condition in respect to civil, religious, and political Liberty? In the State in which I live, (Ohio,) they do not enjoy the elective franchise, and why? It is owing to the indirect influence of American Slavery. Slavery in Kentucky, the adjoining State, says to the people of Ohio, you must not allow colored people to vote and be elected to office, because our Slaves will hear of it and become restless, and directly we shall have an insurrection, and our throats will be cut. And so the people of Ohio say to the colored people, that they cannot allow them the privilege of voting, notwithstanding the colored people pay taxes like others, and in the face of the acknowledged principle that taxation and representation should always go together. And I understand that in the State of New York, the colored man is only allowed the elective franchise through a property qualification, which amounts to nothing short of an insult; for it is not the colored man that votes, but the two hundred and fifty dollars that he may possess. It is not his manhood, but his money, that is represented. But that is the Yankee idea — the dollar and the cent. (Laughter.) In the State of Ohio, the colored man has not the privilege of sending his child to the white schools. Nor is he placed even in the penitentiary on a fair footing. (Laughter.) If a colored man knocks a white man down — perhaps in defence of his rights — he is sent to the penitentiary; and when he gets there, there is no discrimination made between him and the worst white criminal; but when he marches out to take his meal, he is made to march behind the white criminal,

and you may see the prisoners marching — horse-thieves in front — colored people behind. (Laughter.)

All the prejudice against color that you see in the United States is the fruit of Slavery, and is a most effectual barrier to the rights of the colored man. In the State of Illinois, they have a law something like this: that if any man comes there with the intent to make it his residence, he shall be taken up and fined ten dollars for the first offence; and if he is unable to pay it, he is put up and sold, and the proceeds of the sale are to go, first, towards paying the costs that may accrue in the case, and the residue towards the support and maintenance of a charity fund for the benefit of the *poor whites* of that State. (Laughter.) That is a part of the legislation of the State that STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS has the honor to represent. (Renewed laughter.) The public sentiment that is growing up in this Country, however, will soon, I hope, be the death of DOUGLAS, and of that sort of legislation. (Applause.)

In the light, therefore, of all the facts, can there be any question that there is no full enjoyment of Freedom to any one in this Country. Could JOHN QUINCY ADAMS come forth from his mausoleum, shrouded in his grave clothes, and, in the name of the sovereignty of Massachusetts, stand up in Charleston, and protest against the imprisonment of the citizens of Massachusetts, as a violation of their constitutional rights, do you think the people of South Carolina would submit to it? Do you think the reverence due to his name and character, or even the habiliments of the grave about him, would protect him from insult and outrage? And so far are the people of this Country lost to all sense of shame, that many would laugh at such an outrage.

American Slavery has corrupted the whole mass of American society. Its influence has pervaded every crevice and cranny of society. But, Mr. President, I am glad to know that a great change is coming on, and that the American people are beginning to feel that the question of Slavery is not one which affects the colored people alone. I am glad to know that they are beginning to feel that it is a National question, in which every man and woman is more or less interested. And when the people of the North shall rise and put on their strength, powerful though Slavery is and well nigh omnipotent, it shall die. It is only for the people to will it, and it is done. But while the Church and the political parties continue to sustain it; while the people bow down at its bloody feet to worship it, it will live and breathe. Now, the question comes home to us, and it is a practical question, in the language of Mr. PHILLIPS, "Shall Liberty die in this Country? Has God Almighty scooped out the Mississippi Valley for its grave? Has he lifted up the Rocky Mountains for its monument? Has he set Niagara to hymn its requiem?" Sir, I hope not. I hope that the Mississippi Valley is to be its cradle; that the Rocky Mountains are to be the strong tablets upon which are to be written its glorious triumphs; and that Niagara has been set to hymn its triumphant song. (Applause.) But, my friends, the question is with us, Shall the Declaration of American Independence stand? Shall the Constitution of the United States, if it is Anti-Slavery, stand? Shall our

free institutions triumph, and our Country become the asylum of the oppressed of all climes? Shall our Government become, in the language of ex-Senator ALLEN, "a democracy which asks nothing but what it concedes, and concedes nothing but what it demands, destructive to despotism, the conservator of liberty, life, and property?" May God help the right. (Applause.)

The PRESIDENT said, in view of the fact, that one-half of the Slave population of the South were women, our poet had asked, —

"When woman's heart is bleeding,  
Shall woman's voice be hushed?"

He would leave the answer to be given by the Rev. ANTOINETTE L. BROWN. (Applause.)

The Meeting was then successively addressed by ANTOINETTE L. BROWN, and Messrs. THEODORE PARKER and WENDELL PHILLIPS, of Boston. [Full phonographic reports of these Speeches appeared in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, of May 19 and 26, 1855.]

After the Anniversary Meeting, held on Wednesday, May 9th, at the Metropolitan Theatre, the Society held a Meeting for Public Discussion, on Thursday, May 10th, at the Freewill Baptist Church, in Sullivan Street.

The Meeting was called to order at ten o'clock, A. M., by Mr. GARRISON, the President.

Prayer was offered by Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, of Mystic, Connecticut.

The PRESIDENT presented to the Meeting the original copy of the Remonstrance of the Clergy and People of Scotland, signed on behalf of one hundred and forty thousand persons, against Slavery in the United States of America. The document, which was neatly engrossed and mounted, was unrolled and exhibited to the audience, and much interest manifested therein.

On motion of J. MILLER McKIM, seconded by SAMUEL MAY, Jr., *Voted*, That the Society will hold Public Meetings through this day and evening, at this place, and that the Meeting to-morrow (Friday) be a strictly private Meeting of the Members of the Society, for consultation and action as to its operations for the ensuing year.

Inquiry being made, what constituted Membership of the Society, it was replied, that all persons who are in union with the principles and measures of this Society, and are contributors to its funds — including all Members of Societies auxiliary to this — are Members of this Society.

With this understanding, the vote was adopted without dissent.

On motion of SYDNEY H. GAY, SAMUEL MAY, Jr. was appointed Assistant Secretary.

On motion of EDMUND QUINCY, the following persons were nominated by the Chair, and accepted by the Society, as a Committee to nominate Officers of the Society for the ensuing year: —



EDMUND QUINCY, of Massachusetts; ROBERT PURVIS, of Byberry, Pennsylvania; SUSAN B. ANTHONY, of Rochester, New York; JAMES MOTT, of Philadelphia; JAMES BARNABY, of Salem, Ohio; H. C. HOWELLS, of New Jersey; LYDIA MOTT, of Albany; A. T. FOSS, of New Hampshire; S. S. GRISWOLD, of Connecticut.

The following persons also were nominated and chosen a Business Committee, the President of the Society being added to the Committee, as its Chairman, on the motion of J. M. MCKIM: WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, OLIVER JOHNSON, WILLIAM H. TOPP, MARLON B. LINTON, WILLIAM W. BROWN, CHARLES L. REMOND, ARBY KELLEY FOSTER.

The following Resolutions (presented at the Anniversary Meeting, yesterday) were read to the Meeting:—

1. *Resolved*, That, of all systems of despotism existing in the world, American Slavery is the most merciless to its victims, the most impious in its assumptions, the most murderous in its spirit, the most demoralizing in its influences, the most hideous in its features, and the most calamitous in its operations.

2. *Resolved*, That its immediate and unconditional abolition is the primary and paramount duty of this Nation, before which all other questions fade into insignificance, all other issues are as dust in the balance.

3. *Resolved*, That for the continuance and extension of Slavery on our soil, the American Church and Clergy, with honorable but rare exceptions, are pre-eminently guilty; and that they have thrown over it the mantle of Christianity, declared it to be in accordance with the will and word of God, branded the Anti-Slavery Movement as infidel in its spirit and object, and admitted to the communion table such as make merchandise of human bodies and immortal souls.

4. *Resolved*, That such a Church is, in the graphic language of Scripture, "a cage of unclean birds and the synagogue of Satan," and that such religious teachers are "wolves in sheep's clothing," "watchmen that are blind," "shepherds that cannot understand, that all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter."

5. *Resolved*, That in the language of PATRICK HENRY, "It is a duty we owe the purity of our religion to show that it is at variance with that law which warrants Slavery."

While the Business Committee were preparing to report further, the Meeting was addressed by Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, who read a recent letter from a friend in Indiana, in demonstration of the truth of that sentiment in the Resolutions, that the Churches of the Country were the guiltiest party in the land, in regard to Slavery.

The Business Committee reported the following Resolutions:—

6. *Resolved*, That the following religious organizations, namely—the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; the American Home Missionary Society; the American Bible Society; the American Bible Union; the American Tract Society; the American Sunday School Union; the American and Foreign Christian Union; the American and Foreign Bible Society; the American Baptist Publication Society; the American Baptist Missionary Union; the American Baptist Home Mission Society; the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions; the Missionary Societies of

the Protestant Methodist, Episcopal Methodist, Protestant Episcopal and Moravian bodies, respectively—being in league and fellowship with the Slaveholders of the South, utterly dumb in regard to the Slave system, and inflexibly hostile to the Anti-Slavery Movement, are not only wholly undeserving of any pecuniary aid or public countenance at the North, but cannot be supported without conniving at all the wrongs and outrages by which chattel Slavery is characterized, and, therefore, ought to be instantly abandoned by every one claiming to be the friend of Liberty, and a disciple of Christ the Redeemer.

7. *Resolved*, That the attempt of the New York *Independent*, and other religious journals, to shield the American Board of Foreign Missions from Anti-Slavery condemnation, and to represent it as occupying a sound position in regard to the enslaved millions in our land, because of its action at Hartford, respecting certain laws in the Choctaw Nation pertaining to the instruction of Slaves and Free colored Persons in the Mission Schools, is marked by fraud, Jesuitism, and the supremacy of sectarian exclusiveness over the instincts of humanity.

8. *Resolved*, That in the appointment of the Rev. Dr. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, of Boston, during the present week, in this City, as a Member of the Executive and Publishing Committee of the American Tract Society, notwithstanding the publication of his infamous book, entitled "A South-Side View of Slavery," wherein he ridicules the alleged sufferings and degradations of the Slaves, represents their condition as almost an enviable one, and proclaims a state of Slavery to be signally preventive of pauperism, crime, mobocracy, and popular delusions, and highly promotive of piety and its kindred virtues, that Society indicates a depth of depravity, and a hardihood of aspect, which no language is adequate to describe.

9. *Resolved*, That Liberty and Slavery are, in their nature, antagonisms, which no power in the universe can reconcile; and that any effort to make peace or to effect a compromise between them is an insult to God, a crime against nature, and an outrage upon man.

10. *Resolved*, That a Church or Government which accords the same rights and privileges to Slavery as to Liberty, is a house divided against itself, which cannot stand—is an attempt to pay equal honor to Belial and to Christ—is inherently corrupt and tyrannical, and deserving of universal execration.

11. *Resolved*, That the flag, under which three millions and a half of the people are held as chattel Slaves, and driven, under the lash, to unrequited toil—that the Constitution which grants to Slaveholders and to Slave-breeders an increase of political power in proportion to the multiplication of their victims—that the Union which is cemented with human blood, and perpetuated by a pledge of its entire military and naval power to keep the oppressed in their chains—is a flag to be trampled in the dust beneath the feet of Freemen; is a Constitution rightly described as "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell," and to be given to the consuming fire; is a Union to be assailed as the concentration and "sum of all villainies," and utterly destroyed. Therefore,

12. *Resolved*, That the time is fully come to form a Confederacy, in which no man shall be held as a Slave, nor allowed to be put on trial before any tribunal on the issue, "Is he a Man or a Beast, a Freeman or a Slave?"—and in which Slaveholding, under all circumstances, shall be placed in the same felonious category with highway robbery, piracy, and murder.

13. *Resolved*, That in refusing any longer to be in alliance, either religiously or politically, with those who "trade in Slaves and the souls of men," instead of leaving the victims in their chains, and withdrawing from the struggle for their emancipation, we are performing the first imperative duty, namely, to wash our hands in innocency, to occupy a sound moral

position, and to present a consistent attitude to the world; and thus proving, by word and deed, that we truly "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them," to whose cause we are pledged until not a single bondman is left to pine in his fetters.

HENRY C. WRIGHT moved to add the following:—

*Resolved*, That a Government thus constructed and administered can never be used as a means to abolish Slavery, or sustain and perpetuate Liberty.

This Resolution was, at the mover's suggestion, referred to the Business Committee.

Dr. J. E. SNODGRASS, of Baltimore, spoke to the subject of a Dissolution of the Union, and the formation of a new Northern Confederacy, based on impartial Freedom. He argued that no practical good would be attained by such a change. No doubt, he said, that even now there is a majority of the people in this Nation opposed to Slavery, and they are entitled to rule in the National Councils. The trouble is, that the Northern people are lacking in enthusiasm, in devotion to their principles, and in this particular might learn a lesson from Slaveholders, who never flinch from their principles, and are ready to sacrifice their property, and even their lives, to defend them.

A VOICE said—The North are bought by the South.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Yes! but you cannot buy the South.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH. The South has *two thousand millions of dollars* invested in Slave property, and that immense fund buys them all, body, soul, and spirit.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Vast numbers of Southern men, who own none of this property, and never expect to, are united in defending boldly their belief, or principles, on the subject of Slavery.

Mrs. ERNESTINE L. ROSE asked Mr. SNODGRASS, whether, provided the pecuniary interest of the Slaveholders in the institution of Slavery should cease, he thought they would be so eager to defend their principles on the subject?

Mrs. FOSTER also inquired of Mr. SNODGRASS, if those poor whites of the South, who own no Slaves, are not, themselves, in a very material sense, *the property* of the Slaveholders.

Mr. SNODGRASS admitted they were. He closed his Speech by expressing his deep regard for, and interest in, this Society, though not himself a member of it, and differing from its position in some respects. He admitted how much he was indebted, for his own Anti-Slavery faith, to the great founder of this Society, WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

The following persons were nominated a Committee of Finance:—

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER, SUSAN B. ANTHONY, AARON M. POWELL, ROWLAND JOHNSON, ANNA E. R. BARTLETT.

WILLIAM GOODELL, of New York, took the floor to offer some remarks upon the Resolutions. He dissented from the position of the Resolutions,

and of some of the speakers, that we could not rightfully be in political connection and relations with Slaveholders. He proceeded to argue that there is no countenance or support given by the United States Constitution to the institution of Slavery; and occupied about an hour and a half therein, having been repeatedly interrupted by inquiries from different persons.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH replied to Mr. GOODELL's various points. Mr. GOODELL, he said, has proved to us three things; 1st, That there never was any Slavery in the Constitution; 2d, That what Slavery there is in the Constitution was abolished by the amendments; and, 3d, That it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to abolish Slavery as it now exists in this Country. Mr. BURLEIGH proceeded to examine Mr. GOODELL's various positions, and in a masterly manner exposed the sophistry of the general argument that the United States Constitution gives no guarantees to Slaveholding.

Mr. BURLEIGH gave way to Mrs. ABBY KELLEY FOSTER, who, in the name of the Finance Committee, presented the Society's claims to the most generous pecuniary aid which its members and friends could afford. She stated that the balance now in the Treasuries of the American Society and its Auxiliaries was nearly all appropriated already to the papers, (the STANDARD and the BUGLE,) to the Tract publication, and to the States of Rhode Island and New Hampshire. The whole subject of the agitation of our Cause in the great Central and Western States is unprovided for. The interest to hear the Agents of this Society, in those States, never was so great as now, and never before could we do there so effective a work for Freedom. Able and devoted men and women are ready to give their time and their best powers to this work, and will do it, whether they are compensated by us or not; but it is right and necessary that they should be compensated, and so enabled to continue their labors.

Mr. BURLEIGH having concluded his argument, the floor was taken by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, who, in a rapid but very lucid exposition of the Pro-Slavery meaning and wording of the United States Constitution, answered Mr. GOODELL's Speech, and completely vindicated the position of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Mr. GOODELL replied to Mr. GARRISON.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER reviewed the discussion in which the Meeting had been engaged to-day. He thought it to have been of little value; and that the day had gone by for discussing the character of the Constitution. Let us take whatever view of it we may, there is a deeper question, and one which affects all personally, viz: Are we in union and fellowship with MEN-STEALERS?

Mr. FOSTER gave way for a motion to adjourn; and the Society adjourned at five o'clock, to meet again at half-past seven.

## THURSDAY EVENING.

Mr. GARRISON read a letter to the Meeting which he had received from JOSEPH BARKER, of Ohio.

Mr. GARRISON, from the Business Committee, reported the following Resolutions:—

14. *Resolved*, That in the removal from this earthly sphere of our early, faithful, and unwearied co-laborer, CYRUS M. BURLEIGH, this Society has lost one of its most valued members, the Anti-Slavery enterprise one of its most effective advocates, and the cause of progress universally one of its most intelligent, discriminating, and estimable supporters; that his memory will always deserve to be held in grateful appreciation, and his example of self-sacrifice and moral heroism commended as worthy of the closest imitation.

*Whereas*, our friend, PARKER PILLSBURY, now in England, has of late made some scorching and truthful exposures of the Pro-Slavery position of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which have awakened much interest and attention among the religious people of Great Britain, and has based those exposures on facts drawn from the records and writings of the Board and its friends; and, *whereas*, the New York *Independent* has characterized him as a "foul-mouthed libeller" for thus discharging his duty, and meanly refused him the use of its columns to defend himself from so calumnious a charge; therefore,

15. *Resolved*, That the *Independent* has, in so doing, sought basely to injure the reputation of a faithful and able friend of the Slave, and made a lame and impotent effort to defend the Board; and that we regret this all the more since the good words that journal has spoken against Slavery led us to hope for honor and truth, instead of detraction and falsehood on so important a subject.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr. spoke upon the remarkable similarity of the views entertained of the United States Constitution by the religious body of Covenanters in this Country, and by the American Anti-Slavery Society; and referred to the fact, that two ministers of the Covenanter Church were present with us this evening.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER continued the argument he had commenced this forenoon. It was of little consequence, in his view, what views men took of the United States Constitution. No man could act under the United States Constitution, and aid in carrying on the United States Government, without sin, without uniting with Slaveholders in acts which implied their general worthiness and honesty, without tacitly, at least, admitting them to be suitable legislators, &c. Ever: CHARLES SUMNER, and GERRITT SMITH, and WILLIAM GOODELL vote the money which pays the kidnappers of ANTHONY BURNS; and are, in that respect, far more guilty than those Pro-Slavery men, who deem it a political and social duty to send the Fugitive Slave back to his master.

Dr. SMITH objected to Mr. FOSTER's remarks about Mr. SUMNER and the Free Soil voters. He complained, also, that Mr. PHILLIPS yesterday had said that no Church in the City would open its doors to the American Anti-Slavery Society, and that it, therefore, had been compelled to hold its Meeting in a

Theatre; whereas, here the Society is in a Freewill Baptist Church, and, he believed, other Churches in the City might have been obtained.

Mr. GARRISON (in Mr. PHILLIPS's absence) explained Mr. PHILLIPS's meaning to be, that every one of those Churches, in which the religion of the popular and dominant sects bore sway, was shut against us.

WILLIAM WELLS BROWN spoke on the worthlessness of the Union to the Northern States on the one hand, and to the Slaves on the other; he believed that if the Slaveholders were left by us to sustain Slavery as they best could, the Slaves would soon work out their own deliverance. And with regard to the four or five hundred thousand Free colored People of the Northern States, of what possible use or value has the American Union been to them? If there is a class of people in the world who ought to be united, to a man, in opposition to the American Union, it is the Free colored People.

Mr. FREDERICK DOUGLASS said he arose to say a word in vindication of the colored people, who vote under and support the Constitution of the United States. He made a brief Speech to that effect.

Rev. Mr. WILSON, of Vermont, of the Church of the Covenanters, said that he looked upon the professed Anti-Slavery man, who voted under the United States Constitution, as bearing the same relation to the Anti-Slavery Reform, that the moderate drinker bears to the Temperance Cause. As to the meaning of the Constitution and its framers, we adopt the old common sense rule, and judge men by their actions. The only rule which *they* can adopt, who mean to bring any evil thing to an end, is to "touch not, taste not, handle not" that evil thing.

Mr. GARRISON reported the following Resolutions:—

16. *Resolved*, That the latest and most striking illustration of the efficacy of the American Union, in protecting the rights of Northern Freemen, is seen in the lawless and blood-thirsty invasion of Kansas Territory by a swarm of ruffians and cut-throats from Missouri, who have trampled under feet all right and justice, taken forcible possession of the ballot-box, electing men of their own stamp to office, and assumed the reins of government; in order to extend and perpetuate the damning system of Slavery.

17. *Resolved*, That the spirit of the Missouri press, and of certain Public Meetings, recently held in that State, (representing, unquestionably, the spirit of the ruling class of the South,) in regard to the Vandal invasion of Kansas, demonstrates that Slaveholders, as a body, are the fiercest enemies of Liberty, Justice, Law, and Order—a banditti of the most murderous and anarchical character—utterly beyond the pale of Civilization and Christianity—who respect the rights of no Freeman, and of no Free State, who are as perfidious in faith as they are lawless in action, and with whom it is degradation and abject servility for Freemen to be connected in religious or political bonds.

Adjourned, with the understanding that the Society will meet at nine o'clock, A. M., to-morrow, for a Private Meeting.

## SECOND DAY.

FRIDAY, May 11.—Met, according to adjournment, at the Sullivan Street Church.

Some discussion arose, at the outset, as to whether the present session should be considered a merely private one for the transaction of business, as was agreed, or a Public Meeting for general discussion, which many persons had come to attend. It was finally agreed to rescind the former vote, making it a strictly Private Meeting, though, on motion of STEPHEN S. FOSTER, it was voted to confine the discussion to business topics, and to members and sympathizers of the Society.

The first, second, third, and fourth Resolutions were then adopted.

The Rev. Mr. JOHNSTON, of Vermont, a clergyman of the Old School Covenant Church, addressed the Meeting. He came, he said, to "take sides" with this Society, with which he had long sympathized. He paid a deserved tribute to the minister of the Covenant Church, in this City, (the Rev. Mr. STEPHENSON,) who had long felt the same sympathy, and steadfastly adhered to the principles which distinguished this Society, whose yearly Meetings he had been in the habit of attending. Mr. JOHNSTON said, that he would rather lose his life than hold his fellow man as a Slave; and equally would he rather lose his life than be a voluntary supporter of the United States Constitution, pledged to Slavery, as he believed it to be. "I trample," he exclaimed, emphatically, "upon that Constitution, because it tramples upon the Slave!" Let that Union which enslaves men, women, and children, and riots in their misery and degradation, go to its own place—go, in the language of the story which WENDELL PHILLIPS told so admirably the other morning, "to the devil." Mr. JOHNSTON concluded, by offering the following Resolution, which was adopted:—

18. *Resolved*, That while it is true that many of the American Clergy, by employing the pulpit, the Bible, and the sanctions of religion, for the purpose of upholding the accursed system of American Slavery, have desecrated the pulpit, defamed the Bible, and basely belied the religion of Him who came "to preach deliverance to the captives"—and while it is true that the great mass of the so-called ministers of Christ have been "dumb dogs," that either cannot or will not bark—yet we rejoice that among the Clergy and the Churches there are men who have not bowed the knee to the American Baal nor kissed his image, and Churches that have not only refused to fellowship Slaveholders, but that have practised the motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society—No Union with Slaveholders, either religiously or politically.

The following Resolution was offered by the Chairman of the Business Committee, and adopted:—

19. *Resolved*, That this Society takes special pleasure in the recognition of the fact, that the religious body, known as the Reformed Presbyterians, or Old School Covenanters, nobly proclaimed and faithfully carried out the

doctrine, "No Union with Slaveholders, religiously or politically," long before the organization of this Society; and their example we urge upon all other religious bodies which are yet recognizing the Christian character of Slaveholders, or giving their sanction and support to the Constitution and Government of the United States, as worthy of all imitation.

Resolution No. 5 was then also adopted, and on the reading of that marked No. 6, the Rev. Mr. GRAHAM, pastor of the Church in which the Society was assembled, arose. No Resolution before the Society interested him so much as the one now before us. He felt that the religious and benevolent (professedly) Societies of the Country, in taking the stand they do in regard to Slavery and Slaveholders, have inflicted more serious injury on the cause of Christianity than has come from all other quarters. Mr. GRAHAM said he did not, in all respects, agree with this Society — yet, he was glad to see the Society here, and to render his homage to the great principle of Free Speech. One Society, named in the Resolution, he felt some interest in — the American and Foreign Bible Society. He had joined that Society in the assurance that they were ready to circulate the Bible among Slaves and Fugitives, and so far as he knew they had done so.

Rev. ANDREW T. FOSS replied. He felt, he said, that he should be false to the truth not to rise here and bear his testimony. He knew all about this American and Foreign Bible Society from the beginning. It had always received the contributions of Slaveholders, and still did. It has, at this moment, any number of Life Members in the Slave States. He remembered an incident that occurred at the Meeting of this Society, in Baltimore, in 1841. It was declared, with great solemnity, that the Bible should be given to every human being, and there seemed to brood over that great assembly a Sabbath stillness, and a feeling of intense religious fervor. It seemed almost that the angels hung over it, and all hearts were melted at the thought, that the Book of God was to be put into the hands of every creature. In the midst of all, Brother ABEL BROWN arose, and asked, "Is it meant to include the Slaves?" and immediately there arose a great uproar; it was as if the angels fled affrighted from the angry and aroused assembly, and the air was filled with the clamor and laughter of fiends. "Order! order! order!" was shouted on every side, and Rev. Dr. COXE, who was Chairman of the Meeting, imperiously commanded "Brother BROWN to sit down!" And the Society has never swerved from that position. I boldly aver it has never circulated the Bible among the Slaves, unless it has done so within two years. True, they *claim* that they did so, many years ago, but the only fact they could adduce in support of that assertion was, that two Slaveholders had sent money and bought Bibles, declaring that they wished them for circulation among the Slaves. And this the Society claimed as to their credit! But what was it? Giving Bibles to Slaves? No! but giving Bibles to Slaveholders, for them to give to Slaves — *if they pleased!* Mr. FOSS expressed his regret that his brother, GRAHAM, had been drawn into the slough of this Society — a slough of despond he was sure he would find it.



Mr. GARRISON said he did not ask whether the American and Foreign Bible Society had or had not Slaveholders among its members, but had it ever protested against the withholding of the Bible from three millions of Slaves? (Never! said Mr. Foss.) Has it ever, continued Mr. GARRISON, taken any measures to open a way to give the Bible to the Slaves? (No, never! again responded Mr. Foss.) Then, said Mr. GARRISON, it is to be condemned utterly.

Mr. GRAHAM rose to say, that he would not be understood as objecting to the Resolution. In the main, he agreed to it, and admitted its entire correctness and importance. He hoped it would draw such public attention to these faithless bodies that they would be compelled to cease from their wrong doing.

The question was then taken on Resolutions numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, which were all adopted, No. 12 being so amended as to read "That the times demand the formation of a Confederacy," instead of "the time is come to form a Northern Confederacy."

Resolutions No. 14, 15, 16, and 17, were then read, and unanimously adopted.

Mr. QUINCY, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, reported the following list of Officers for the ensuing year, which was accepted. (See the list in another place.)

*Voted*, unanimously, on motion of OLIVER JOHNSON, that the thanks of this Society be offered to the Proprietors of the Freewill Baptist Church, of New York, for the use of their house, granted to us on this occasion; and Mr. JOHNSON was appointed a Committee to communicate this vote to the Proprietors.

The Secretary read the following Letter from the Rev. Dr. BELLOWS, in reply to an invitation to him to speak at the Anniversary Meeting:—

NEW YORK, April 17, 1855.

OLIVER JOHNSON, Esq.:—

*Dear Sir*:—I am much obliged, by the invitation of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, to share in the public exercises of their coming Anniversary. The honor of the call I fully appreciate, and the terms in which it is conveyed are generous and attractive; so much so, that I find great difficulty in resisting your complimentary appeal.

Yet, after careful consideration, I am compelled to decline your invitation; and out of respect to your Society, I wish to state frankly my reasons for doing so. I might shroud them in equivocation, or gloss them with courtesy; but this would neither become me nor be just to you.

I decline your invitation explicitly on the ground of ministerial *prudence*; and this prudence I hold to be a more binding duty than the claims of your Platform.

There are two classes of persons interested in the Anti-Slavery Cause; those who make it the business of their lives, and who take it up as the Apostles took up the Gospel, determined to know nothing else, and those

who make it subsidiary to other interests and aims, and urge and sustain it only as those other interests and aims allow.

Now, I rejoice in the existence of the *first* class, as one indispensable and entitled to great gratitude—a class, without which, the Cause could not move at all; but I belong in the second class, and, for reasons entirely satisfactory to myself, reasons of providential position, temperament, and conviction, expect to stay there, and perform only the offices which belong to that class.

I am a preacher of the Gospel, a pastor, the head of a religious congregation. The plan of my life is arranged with reference to its best guidance, and patient instruction, and ultimate evangelization. I teach on a plan. I am to do in ten ~~years~~ twenty years, a certain work in my parish, and my system is based on a knowledge of their wants, prejudices, and affections. Nothing can persuade me that it is pusillanimity, time-serving, the love of money, or place, that restrains me from shocking, angering, and dispersing them by statements on any subject wholly beyond their sympathies. It is the love of their souls, it is a sense of what is wise, kind, Christian, that induces me to study how to commend their duties to them; how to lead them gently into all truth. As the father of a family chooses his own times and seasons to win his children's hearts to duty, so a true pastor does by his flock. Taking this course, I feel that I have gradually planted my own sentiments on the subject of Slavery in the hearts of, perhaps, the majority of my own congregation; and I hope, with prudence, to win more and more of them to a right feeling. All the action of a more direct sort in behalf of the Anti-Slavery Cause, which my more binding duties as a pastor allow, I avail myself of just as fast as prudence justifies it—and beyond that justification, I shall neither be tempted nor driven.

I do not feel that prudence would justify me in taking my place on your Platform on an occasion when what I regard as intemperate opinions, and others regard as blasphemous and treasonable sentiments, are not unlikely to be spoken. If I had committed myself to your Cause, as to *the* great thing to be done, as to the prime object of my life, (and I can easily see how a man might do it, nay, how I might do it myself,) then I would work with anybody, and set all other things at naught, except faithfulness to this one cause—the Slave's Freedom. As a Christian minister, I will work with any and all Christian ministers, and count all difference of creed as naught. But, as a pastor, I cannot put all considerations of ministerial prudence aside for the Anti-Slavery Cause, or any other cause; for that is *first* in my affections and on my conscience.

I hold that *prophets* and *pastors* have quite different functions. Prophets address communities; *pastors*, flocks; prophets cry aloud and spare not; *pastors* give milk to babes, and meat to strong men; prophets obey a divine madness; *pastors* follow the rule of common sense and sober discretion. Every age has need of both; this age, in an especial manner; and I rejoice that prophets have been raised up to testify against the sin of Slavery—who have forgotten everything but their clear office to blow the trumpet against the walls of the doomed city. But I do not belong to their ranks. It is

only when the pastor's and the prophet's duties run together that I can temporarily occupy the prophet's place, and then only haltingly and in second-rate style — as a *minor* prophet indeed.

I hope this explanation of my views, and this account of the grounds on which I decline your invitation, may seem consistent with the views I have always expressed, and the course I have hitherto taken. I cannot expect the prophets of the Anti-Slavery Cause to think very highly of the pastors, or their vows of duty; but that is of less concern than that the pastors should be faithful to their vows and their Master.

With great respect and cordiality,

Yours truly,

HENRY W. BELLOWS.

On motion of A. K. FOSTER, *Voted*, That this Meeting recommend to the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the adoption of measures for a vigorous and thorough circulation of our Tracts, and that, for that purpose, a system of colportage be adopted.

Mr. MAY read a statement respecting the preparation and issue of the Tracts, during the last past five months. The substance of his statement was, that about two thousand dollars had been contributed for the publishing of the Tracts, that thirteen different Tracts had been issued, that others were in preparation, and that about a million and three quarters of pages of Tracts had been printed and distributed.

On motion, the Society then adjourned at three o'clock, P. M.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *President*.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., *Secretary, pro. tem.*

### *Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Scotland against Slavery.*

AMERICANS: You acknowledge the Brotherhood of Nations. You avow the doctrines that the nations of the earth constitute one great family, and that, as such, they are bound to each other by common interests and common ties; and in avowing this, you grant the right of any one member of that brotherhood to lift up a calm and truthful testimony, before any other member, on behalf of humanity, justice, and freedom, when these are assailed or outraged.

We are as one with you in the maintenance of this principle; and it is because we look to you as brethren, bound to us by the most endeared associations, that we now address you.

It is in no spirit of pride or fancied superiority that we make our appeal, but rather in a spirit of self-humiliation, calling to mind that we, also, were once partakers in this iniquity. And we hope that the fact of our having done what we could to wipe out our reproach as a nation, once implicated in upholding Slavery, will induce you to give the more willing and earnest heed to our remonstrance.

Americans: We plead with you on behalf of three millions of immortal beings, whom you hold in bondage. We plead for the removal of the curse from their brow, the gall from their earthly cup, the chain from their limbs, the iron from their souls. We plead for the immediate, unqualified, and entire abolition of Slavery throughout your land.

It is not necessary that we enter on any lengthened proof of the evils of this system. It carries its condemnation with it. That condemnation is heard in groans of anguish, and written in tears of blood. It has been inscribed, as with letters of fire, on the desolated hearts and homes of millions. The voice of the Eternal proclaims it. A system which subjects three millions of human beings to the condition of mere "chattels personal" in the eye of the law — which deprives them of all their rights and privileges as intelligent and accountable creatures — which disallows or breaks asunder the most sacred ties of life — which virtually annuls the "higher law" of God, and substitutes in its stead the absolute will of a sinful man as a rule of obedience — which robs its victims of the fruits of their toil, and denies to them the means and opportunities of cultivating their deathless faculties — a system which sanctions atrocities like these must be essentially wrong and unutterably shameful, and cannot be mentioned in the same breath with truth, righteousness, and freedom.

Americans: We appeal to you, on the ground of our common humanity, to abolish this system. We assert the manhood of the enslaved. These three millions who are in bondage are men and women like ourselves; gifted with like thoughts, like feelings, like aspirations; and, like us, too, destined for immortality. Why, then, treat them as if they belonged not to human kind? That there are humane men among the upholders of the Slave system, and Slaves who receive humane treatment, we readily acknowledge; and yet we are compelled to say, the inevitable tendency of such a system must be to subject the enslaved to treatment that is anything but humane. Where is the humanity of treating men and women as if they were brute beasts or creeping things? of trampling in the dust the most sacred relationships of life? of rearing Slaves, like cattle, for the market? of subjecting them to the lash and to numerous indignities and immoralities? and this according to the caprice or passion of an irresponsible owner. Is there even the semblance of humanity here? We plead with you to treat the Slave as a man.

We appeal to you on the ground of Justice. Where is the justice that is dealt out to the Slave? Where is there anything meriting the name? The system takes from the Slave all that he has, all that he gains, from life's commencement even to its close. It strips him of money, house, wife, children. It deprives him of education, civil rights, liberty of conscience, the Bible. It condemns him without a hearing, and subjects him, without a trial, to bonds, imprisonment, and even death. In vain does he look for justice at the hand of his oppressor. There is no tribunal of righteousness to which he can appeal. In the preamble to your noble Constitution, it is affirmed that it was framed "to establish justice," and yet there are three millions of human beings, at this hour, within the bounds of your Republic, who may be treated with every indignity and cruelty, while the justice of your land extends no shield over their helpless heads.

We appeal to you on the ground of consistency. And is not this the fundamental principle set forth in your glorious Declaration of Independence — that "all men are born free and equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" What means this language? Does it not mean that the man of color, as well as the white, is a man? That the black man is born free as well as the white? That God has given to the black man, as well as the white, those inalienable rights? Where, then, is the consistency between your profession and your practice as a people?

Again, in your past history, you have shown that you are ever ready to sympathize with the victims of despotism in other lands in their struggles for Freedom. In this you do well. We mingle our sympathy with yours. But where is the consistency of having overflowing sympathies for the enslaved afar off, and bondage and oppression for millions in the bosom of your own land?

We appeal to you on the sacred ground of our common Christianity. Shall our appeal here be unheeded? America proclaims itself to be a Christian

land. And is not the very spirit of Christianity one of love? But where is the manifestation of that spirit in the enslavement of three millions of your fellow men? Is not this the teachings of Christianity's Divine Author, "Love thy neighbor as thyself?" And who is thy neighbor? That down-trodden Slave is he. But where is your love, when you even deny him the right to be a man? Does not Christianity teach that God has "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth?" But how can you reconcile this great truth with your conduct in shutting out the poor Slave from the brotherhood of humanity? Is not this the grand law for the regulation of conduct betwixt man and man, as laid down by the Great Teacher himself, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them?" But if that law be honored in the midst of you, does it not follow that you will bid every Slave go free? As you would that men should bind no fetters on your limbs, does not that law demand that ye bind no fetters on theirs? As ye would not be enslaved, Christ bids you enslave none. Have you not Bible and Missionary Societies, and do you not regard them as the glory of your Nation? But why send the Bible to slaves of Sagan in other climes, and deny it to the Slaves in your own land? Why illumine India or China, while you doom to heathen darkness millions in your own Country? Americans, by everything that is sacred or awful in our holy religion, we appeal to you to be consistent here. As you profess to be a Christian people, listen to the Word of the Most High, "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them" — "Proclaim liberty to the captives, and open the prison doors to them that are bound" — "Loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free."

Americans: Shall Slavery continue? Shall the accursed system still live under the shadow of law — still be tolerated, fostered, propagated? Shall the foul blot still remain on your national escutcheon? Will you still forsake the good old paths of your fathers, and act as if you sought to quench the altar fires of liberty which they enkindled? Will you continue to undo the work of patriots, reformers, philanthropists, and to affiliate with tyrants, traitors, usurpers, and men-stealers? Surely, it cannot be! Surely, an indignant nation will say, it shall not be!

Americans: Bear with us in our importunity. We love you as brethren; therefore do we plead with you. We love your magnificent Country, your noble institutions, your spirit of progress; therefore do we plead with you. We love liberty, our dearest birthright and yours, for which our fathers and your fathers shed their blood — liberty, the birthright of all; therefore do we plead with you. We love the three millions who are fettered in the midst of you; therefore do we plead with you. We love Religion, and would see her divine and glorious form making triumphant progress through your land; therefore do we plead with you. We love the image of Jesus, in his disciples of whatever color, and would not see that image in chains; therefore do we plead with you.

Americans: we know that there are difficulties in your way; but these are nothing in comparison with the measureless good to be achieved; your moral influence, your position among the nations, and your glory as a people will be all the more eminent and enduring, if, by one act of magnanimity, you trample these difficulties in the dust. Retrace, then, your steps, we entreat you! Give to the enslaved his inborn, inalienable rights. Give to the toiler the fruits of his toil. Give to the husband the wife of his bosom, and the wife the husband of her youth. Give to the fond mother the child whom God has given to her. Give to immortal minds the priceless blessing of education. Give to the weary, the wretched, and the lost, the light of life, and the hope of eternal repose. Give to man the right to be his own — free amongst his fellows, and accountable to his God. Then shall the Union Flag of Freedom float above a land without a Slave! and the good upon earth will rejoice, and the God of Heaven will bless you.

OFFICERS OF AUXILIARY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES  
FOR 1855.

---

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[*The Office of the Society is at No. 21 Cornhill, Boston.*]

*President.*

FRANCIS JACKSON, Boston.

*Vice Presidents.*

Andrew Robeson, New Bedford.	John T. Hilton, Brighton.
Edmund Quincy, Dedham.	Thomas T. Stone, Bolton.
Adin Ballou, Milford.	Bourne Spooner, Plymouth.
Joshua T. Everett, Princeton.	William Ashby, Newburyport.
Effingham L. Capron, Worcester.	John Bailey, Lynn.
Jefferson Church, Springfield.	James Pussell Lowell, Cambridge.
Oliver Gardner, Nantucket.	Richard Clap, Dorchester.
Henry L. Bowditch, Boston.	William Whiting, Concord.
Josiah Henshaw, West Brookfield.	Ezekiel Thatcher, Barnstable.
Caroline Weston, Weymouth.	David P. Harmon, Haverhill.
Benjamin Snow, Jr., Fitchburg.	Charles Lenox Remond, Salem.
George Miles, Westminster.	John Clement, Townsend.
James N. Buffum, Lynn.	Atkinson Stanwood, Newburyport.
Cyrus Pierce, Newton.	Lewis Ford, Abington.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

Samuel May, Jr., Leicester.

*Recording Secretary.*

Robert F. Wallcut, Boston.

*Treasurer.*

Samuel Philbrick, Brookline.

*Counsellors.*

William L. Garrison.	Wendell Phillips.
Maria W. Chapman.	John Rogers.
Cornelius Bramhall.	Anne W. Weston.
Eliza Lee Follen.	Charles K. Whipple.
Edmund Quincy.	William I. Bowditch.
John T. Sargent.	Charles F. Hovey.

## PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[The Society's Office is at No. 31 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia.]

*President.*

JAMES MOTT, Philadelphia.

*Vice Presidents.*

Edward M. Davis. Benjamin C. Bacon.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

James Miller McKim.

*Recording Secretary.*

Clinton Gillingham.

*Treasurer.*

Sarah Pugh.

The above, with the following persons, constitute the

*Executive Committee.*

Lucretia Mott.	Robert Purvis.
Mary Grew.	Cyrus M. Burleigh.*
Abby Kimber.	Jacob Peirce.
Margaret Jones.	Howard W. Gilbert.

## WESTERN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[The Society's Office is at Salem, Columbiana County, Ohio.]

*President.*

ABRAHAM BROOKE.

*Vice Presidents.*

Isaac Brooks.	Jacob Millisaek.
Josephine S. Griffing.	William Watson.
Elizabeth Jones.	Christian Donaldson.
George Garretson.	Anson M. Clement.
John Smith.	Lot Holmes.

Joel P. Davis.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

Marius R. Robinson, Salem, Columbiana Co., Ohio.

*Recording Secretary.*

Benjamin S. Jones.

*Treasurer.*

Joel McMillan.

*Counsellors.*

Lydia Irish.	Benjamin Bown.
Lewis Morgan.	Isaac Trescott.
James Barnaby.	John Gordon.

Robert Hillis.

\* Deceased.

## MICHIGAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

*President.*

CYRUS FULLER, Plymouth.

*Vice Presidents.*

Joseph Merritt, Battle Creek. Abraham Power, Farmington.

Maria Dey, Hickory Grove. C. E. Mickley, Fairfield.

J. H. Parker, Rome.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

Jacob Walton, Jr., Adrian.

*Recording Secretary.*

Eliphalet Jones, Adrian.

*Treasurer.*

Samuel Hayball, Adrian.

*Executive Committee.*

Edwin Comstock, Adrian. Ann Hayball, Adrian.

William Ward, " Thomas Chandler, "

Frances S. Mott, Hickory Grove.

## NEW YORK ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[The Society's Office is at No. 138 Nassau Street, New York.]

*President.*

LAUREN WETMORE, New York City.

*Vice Presidents.*

William A. Hall. Dr. Oliver H. Wellington.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

Oliver Johnson.

*Recording Secretary.*

Henrietta W. Johnson, M. D.

*Treasurer.*

Rowland Johnson.

*Executive Committee.*

Lauren Wetmore.	Henrietta W. Johnson.
William A. Hall.	Rowland Johnson.
Oliver Johnson.	Oliver H. Wellington.
Abby H. Gibbons.	John F. Cleveland.
J. Mortimer Hall.	Elias Smith.

Samuel Ross.

The NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, published at No. 138 Nassau Street, New York, is the Organ of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY; Sidney H. Gay and Oliver Johnson, Editors.

Samuel May, Jr. is the Agent for the Tract Publication. Office, at No. 21 Cornhill, Boston.