THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

DAILY, - - - - - - - - - -	$10 00
TRI-WEEKLY, - - - - - - - -	5 00
WEEKLY, - - - - - - - - -	2 00

For the Southern Press.

To Mademoiselle Jenny Lind.

Although I may not hear thy voice,
Which thrills the hearts of all who hear,
Yet may I note thy generous deeds,
Which glad the heart and drie the tear—

Which poverty doth cause to flow,
So bitterly, down orphans cheeks,
Thy generous bounty to the poor,
A pure and noble soul bespeaks.

Aye, I would love to look upon,
The form where such a soul doth dwell,
I more admire thy feeling heart,
Than e'en thy music's wondrous spell.

Not only is thy treasure given,
But that, which thousands prize much more,
Thy strains divine, are warbled free,
To give a pleasure to the poor.

Fair child of song, sure God designed,
When he endowed thee, at thy birth,
With gifts so rare, that thou should'st be
A perfect creature formed for earth.

The generous deeds thou hast performed,
Doth make me deem thee most divine,
A soother thou of sorrowing hearts,
May anguish never rest on thine.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17, 1850. N. P. L.

DANGERS OF THE REPUBLIC.—On Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 28th, a discourse on the state of the Nation was delivered at the Melodeon, in Boston, by the Rev. THEODORE PARKER, and subsequently published entire in the Chronotype, as phonographically reported for that paper. The following extracts we give as a sample of the whole discourse :—

And now, a word of our DANGERS. There seems no danger from abroad; from any foreign State, unless we begin the quarrel; none from famine. The real danger, in one word, is this, that WE SHALL TRY TO ENACT INJUSTICE INTO A LAW, AND WITH THE FORCE OF THE NATION TO MAKE INIQUITY OBEYED.

See some of the special forms of injustice which threaten us, or are already here. I shall put them into the form of ideas.

1. One, common amongst politicians, is, that the State is for a portion of the people, not the whole. Thus it has been declared that the Constitution of the United States did not recognize the million slaves as citizens, or extend to them any right which it guarantees to other men. It would be a sad thing for the State to declare there was a single child in the whole land to whom it owed no protection. What, then, if it attempts to take three millions from under its shield? In obedience to this false idea, the counsel has been given that we must abstain from all "political agitation" of the most important matter before the people. We must leave that to our masters, for the State is for them—it is not for you and me. They must say whether we shall "agitate" and "discuss" these things or not. The politicians are our masters, and may lay their fingers on our lips when they will.

2. The next false idea is, that government is chiefly for the protection of property. This has long been the idea on which some men legislated; but on the nineteenth of this month, the distinguished Secretary of State, in a speech at New York, uses these words :—"The great object of government is the protection of property at home, and respect and renown abroad." You see what the *policy* must be where the government is for the protection of the hat, and only takes care of the head so far as it serves to wear a hat. Here the man is the accident, and the dollar is the substance for which *the man is to be protected*. I think a notion very much like this prevails extensively in the great cities of America, North and South. I think the chief politicians of the two parties are agreed in this;—that government is for the protection of property, and every thing else is subsidiary. With many persons, politics are but a part of their business; the State House and the Custom House are only valued for their relation to trade. This idea is fatal to a good government.

Think of this, that 'the great object of government is the protection of property.' Tell that to Samuel Adams, and John Hancock, and Washington, and the older Winthrops, and the Bradfords and Carvers! Why! it seems as if the buried majesty of Massachusetts would start out of the ground, and, with its Bible in its hand, say, *this is false!*

3. The third false idea is this: that you are morally bound to obey the law, let it be never so plainly wrong and opposed to your conscience.—This is the most dangerous of all the false ideas yet named. Ambitious men, in an act of passion, make iniquity into a law, and *then demand* that you and I, *in our act of prayer, shall* submit to it, and make *it our daily life*; that we shall not try to repeal and discuss and agitate it. This false idea lies at the basis of every despot's throne, the idea that man can make right wrong, and wrong right. It has become to be taught in New England, to be taught in our churches,—though seldom there, to their honor, be it spoken,—that if wrong is law, you and I must do what it demands, though conscience declares it is treason against man, and treason against God. The worst doctrines of Hobbs and Filmer are thus revived.

I have sometimes been amazed at the talk of men who call on us to keep the Fugitive slave law, one of the most odious laws in a world of odious laws—a law not fit to be made or kept. I have been amazed that they should dare to tell us the law of God, writ on the heavens and our hearts, never demanded we should disobey the laws of men!—Well, suppose it were so. Then it was old Daniel's duty, at Darius's command, to give up his prayer; but he prayed three times a day, with his windows up. Then it was John's and Peter's duty to forbear to preach of christianity; but they said, 'whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye;' then it was the duty of Amram and Jochebed to take up their new-born Moses and cast him into the Nile, for the law of king Pharoah, commanding it, was 'constitutional,' and 'political agitation' was discountenanced as much in Goshen as in Boston. But Daniel did not obey; John and Peter did not fail to preach christianity; and Amram and Jochebed refused 'passive obedience' to the king's decree!—I think it will take a strong man all this winter to reverse the judgment which the world has passed upon these three cases. But it is 'innocent' to try. However, there is another ancient case mentioned in the Bible, in which the laws commanded one thing, and conscience just the opposite. Here is the record of the law:—'Now, both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment, that if any one knew where he, (Jesus) were, he should show it, that they might take him.' Of course, it became the official and legal business of each disciple who knew where Christ was, to make it known to the authorities. No doubt James and John could leave all and follow him, with others of the people who knew not the law of Moses, and were accursed; nay, the women, Martha and Mary, could minister unto him of their substance, could wash his feet with tears, and wipe them with the hairs of their head. They did it gladly, of their own free will, and took pleasure therein, I make no doubt. There was no merit in that—'any man can perform an agreeable duty.' But there was found one disciple who could perform 'a disagreable duty.' He went, perhaps, 'with alacrity,' and betrayed his Saviour to the marshal of the district of Jerusalem, who was called a centurion. Had he no affection for Jesus? No doubt but *he* could 'conquer his prejudices,' while Mary and John could not.

Judas Iscariot has rather a bad name in the Christian world; he is called the 'son of perdition' in the New Testament, and his conduct is reckoned a 'transgression'; nay, it is said the devil 'entered into him,' to cause this hideous sin. But all this it seems, was a mistake; certainly, if we are to believe our 'republican' lawyers and statesmen, Iscariot only fulfilled his 'constitutional obligations.' It was only on that point, of betraying his Savior, that the constitutional law reqired him to have any thing with Jesus. He took his 'thirty pieces of silver,' about *fifteen* dollars—a Yankee would do it for *ten*, having fewer prejudices to conquer—it was his legal fee, for value received. True, the Christians thought it was the 'wages of iniquity,' and even the Pharisees—who commonly made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions—dared not defile the temple by this 'price of blood'—but it was honest money; it was as honest a fee as any American commissioner or deputy will ever get for a similar service. How mistaken we are! Judas Iscariot is not a traitor; he was a great patriot; he 'conquered his prejudice,' performed a 'disagreeable duty;' as an officer of high morals and high principle;' he kept the 'law,' and the 'constitution,' and did all he could to save the 'Union;' nay, he was a saint, 'not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.'—'The law of God never commands us to disobey the law of man.' *Sancta Iscariote ora pro nobis.*

It is a little strange to hear this talk in Boston, and hear the doctrine of passive obedience to a law which sets christianity at defiance, taught here in the faces of Adams, and Hancock, and Washington! It is amazing to hear this talk, respecting such a law, amongst merchants. Do they keep the usury laws? I never heard of but one *money-lender* who kept them, and he has been a long time dead, and I think he left no kith or kin! The temperance law, is that kept? The fifteen gallon law—were men so 'passive' in their obedience to that, that they could not even 'agitate?' yet it violated no law of God—was not unchristian. When the Government interferes with the rum-seller's property, the law must be trod under foot; but when the law insists that a man shall be made a slave, I must give up conscience in my act of prayer, and stoop to the vile law men have made in their act of passion!

It is curious to hear men talk of law and order in Boston, when the other day one or two hundred smooth-faced boys and youths, beardless as girls, could disturb a meeting of three or four thousand men, for two hours long, and the chief of the police, and the mayor of the city stood and looked on, when a single word from their lips might have stilled the tumult, and given men a hearing.

Talk of keeping the Fugitive slave law! Come, come, we know better. Men in New England know better than this. *We know that we must not keep a wicked law, and that it should not be kept when the law of God forbids!*

But the effect of a law which men cannot keep without violating conscience, is always demoralizing. There are men who know no higher law than the statute of the State. When good men cannot keep a law that is base, some bad ones will say, 'Let us keep no law at all;' then where does the blame lie? On him that enacts the outrageous law.

But the idea that a statute of man frees us from obligation to the law of God, is a dreadful thing. When that becomes the deliberate conviction of the great mass of the people, North or South, then I shall despair of justice, and despair of God. But it will never come.

One of the most awful spectacles I ever saw was this:—A vast multitude attempting, at an orator's suggestion, to howl down the 'higher law,' and when he said, Will you have this man to rule over you? they answered, 'Never!' and treated the 'higher law' to a laugh and a howl. It was done in Faneuil Hall, under the eyes of the three Adamses, Hancock and Washington, and the howl rung round the venerable arches of that hall, and one could but ask, 'Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing, and the rulers of the earth set themselves, and kings take counsel against the Lord and say, Let us break his bands asunder, and cast off his yoke from us'; and I could not but remember that it was written, 'He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. He taketh up the isles as a very little thing, and the inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers before him.' Howl down the law of God at a magistrate's command! Do this in Boston! Let us remember this but with charity.

Men say there is danger of disunion, of our losing fealty for the Constitution. I do not believe it yet! Suppose it be so. The Constitution is the machinery of the national mill; and suppose we agree to take it out and put in new—we might get worse, very true, but we might get better. There have been some modern improvements; we might introduce them to the State as well as the mill. But I do not believe there is this danger. I do not believe the people of Massachusetts believe so. I think they are strongly attached to the Union yet, and if they thought 'the Union was in peril this day,' and every thing the nation prizes was likely to be destroyed, we should not have had a meeting of a few thousands in Faneuil Hall, but the people would have filled up the city of Worcester with a hundred thousand men, if need be; and they would have come with the cartridge-box by their side, and the firelock on their shoulder. That is the way the people of Massachusetts would assemble, if they thought there was real danger.

I do not believe the South will withdraw from the Union, with five million freemen and three million slaves. I think Massachusetts would be no loser, I think the North would be no loser; but I doubt if the North would allow them to go, if so disposed.

But I think I know of one cause which may dissolve the Union—one which ought to dissolve it, if put in action; that is, a serious attempt to execute the Fugitive slave law, here and in all the North. I mean an attempt to recover and take back all the fugitive slaves in the North, and to punish with fine and imprisonment all who aid or conceal them. The South has brow-beat us again and again. She has smitten us on the one cheek with 'protection,' and we have turned the other, kissing the rod; she has smitten that with 'free trade.' She has *imprisoned our citizens*; driven off, with *scorn and loathing*, our officers sent to ask constitutional justice. She has spit upon us. Let her come to take back the fugitives—and, trust me, she will 'wake up the lion.'

In my humble opinion, this law is a wedge—sharp at one end, but wide at the other—put in between the lower planks of our ship of State. If it be driven home, we must go to pieces. But I have no thought that that will be done, quite yet. I believe the great politicians who threaten to drive it through the gaping seams of our argosy, will think twice before they strike again. Nay, that they will soon be very willing to bury the wedge 'where the tide ebbs and flows four times a day.' I do not expect this of their courage, but of their fears; not of their justice—I am too old for that—but of their concern for property, which it is the 'great object of government' to protect.

From the Baltimore Sun.

THE FUGITIVE CASES IN BOSTON.—We have published the statements of Messrs. Knight and Hughes, the agents who went to Boston to arrest the fugitive slaves.

The Boston Advertiser, of Tuesday morning, publishes the subjoined letter from Mr. Curtis, the commissioner, to whom reference was made in Mr. Hughes' letter. We publish it as a "part of the history of the times," and as necessary to a full understanding of the affair. The letter it will be seen, is addressed to Mr. Webster, as Secretary of State :

BOSTON, Nov. 23, 1850.

Hon. Daniel Webster—Dear Sir : In reply to your inquiry I will state such facts as are within my knowledge concerning the proceedings which took place here for the arrest of Wm. Crafts, an alleged fugitive slave. On the 22d October, Mr. Seth J. Thomas, a counsellor of law of this city, called on me at my office, between the hours of one and two o'clock, and desired to know whether, as a commissioner of the United States courts, I would be willing to attend to a case of a Fugitive slave. My reply was that I could not answer an inquiry whether I should be willing to do my duty under the law of the land; that when a case was presented to me it would be for me to decide on the facts whether it was a proper case for a warrant. Mr. Thomas then left the room, and, in a few minutes, returned with two men, one of whom he introduced to me as Mr. Hughes and the other as Mr. Knight.

Mr. Hughes, I was informed, was the agent or attorney of some person in Georgia, who wished to reclaim a fugitive slave supposed to be in Boston, and Mr. Knight was a witness to the identity. I inquired of Mr. Thomas if a complaint had been prepared and sworn to. He answered that this had not been done, and that he did not suppose it to be necessary. I observed that the statute did not in terms require it, but that it was the proper foundation for a warrant of arrest, and that I should require it.—The parties then left my office to prepare a complaint, and were to see me again at 4 o'clock. No earlier hour was requested by them, and no earlier appointment could have been made by me, if they had requested it.

At 4 o'clock I met them again at my office, and understood that a complaint had been prepared and sworn to. I then stated to Mr. Thomas that, in my judgment, the best interests of this community, of the law itself, and of his clients also, required that this warrant should be issued by the circuit court of the United States, then in session at the court-house, which is, as you familiarly know, on the side of the street directly opposite my office. My reasons for this opinion must be obvious to any one who knows the inflammable material which existed at that moment in this city; for it is but too true that there were fanatics and mischievous disposed persons, who had encouraged direct resistance to the law. Such resistance was to be anticipated, and, in my opinion, to be provided for. Under these circumstances, I knew perfectly well that no commissioner could give a proper support to the marshal, and it was therefore perfectly clear to me, that if an arrest was to be made, it ought to be made on a warrant issued under the seal of the court, and the hearing should be in the circuit court, under all the forms of law. I know I need not say to *you* that I could have no other motive for advising an application to the court than a desire for the safe and certain execution of the law, in the first case that was to arise in this community.

Mr. Thomas concurred in all these suggestions, and added that he should much prefer to have the warrant issued by the court, but that an application had already been made to the judges privately, and that they could not grant a warrant, which might involve a summary hearing of several hours, on account of the pendency of an importan Patent cause then on trial before a jury, which had lasted several days, and was likely to continue for several days longer. To this, I replied, that in my opinion this matter ought to be presented to the judges, and, if necessary, to the counsel and parties engaged in that trial, in a light in which they probably had not viewed it—that it was of great public importance, that the first hearing under this new law should be so conducted here, as to prevent the dangers of a rescue, and that, in order to this, the ordinary business of the court ought to give way for a sufficient length of time to enable the judges to receive this application and to hear the case, if an arrest should be made. I then stated to the parties my determination to assemble the commissioners of the court and to have an interview with the judges, and to lay before them the public reasons why this warrant should issue from the circuit court. Mr. Thomas assented to this course, on my assurance that if a warrant could not be obtained from the court at or before nine o'clock the next morning, I would grant it myself.

I then proceeded immediately to get the other Commissioners together, and we (being four in number, viz: Mr. Edward G. Loring, Mr. B. F. Hallett, Mr. C. L. Woodbury and myself,) repaired to the Circuit Court. On a private intimation to the presiding judge, of our desire to confer with him, the jury were dismissed at an earlier hour than usual, (half-past five) and every person present, except one of the marshal's deputies, left the room, and the doors were closed. We then stated to Mr. Justice Woodbury that a warrant was necessary to be granted, and our reasons for thinking it of the highest public expediency that it should be granted by the court. After hearing our views, the learned judge said that he had already conferred privately with the counsels engaged in the cause on trial, and had so far obtained their consent as to enable him to say that he could give some hours to this hearing, if an arrest should be made, and that he would attend at the Court-house, at half-past eight o'clock the next morning, to grant the warrant, out of the Circuit Court, if we would obtain the attendance of his associate, the district judge, at that hour. We did obtain his attendance, and the warrant was issued out of the court and under its seal.

An absurd statement has been made, that the fact that Wm. Crafts was about to be arrested, became public, or, as it was phrased "leaked out," at this interview between the commissioners and the circuit judge. Not one of the gentlemen present, except myself, knew the name of the alleged fugitive, and it was mentioned by me in the course of the conversation.

My knowledge of the occurrences which took place after the warrant was issued, is confined chiefly to the circumstances under which the marshal took an opinion of counsel as to his duties and powers, and the reasons why he did so. A process was placed in the hands of the marshal, which he was to execute under very heavy responsibilities, and in the execution of which he might be called upon to break open dwelling houses, and perhaps to take life, by quelling resistance, actual or threatened. It was a process of a novel character, and there is no sound lawyer in this country who will not tell you that it required deliberation and careful inquiry, to ascertain what degree of force the marshal might lawfully use in its execution. If it was to be considered as a civil process, issued in the mere interest of a private individual, the marshal's powers and duties might be in some respects different from what they would be, if it should be considered as a public process, in the execution of which the United States had a direct interest. Clearly, therefore, it was the marshal's right and duty to be advised upon these points.

The marshal applied for such advice to my brother, Mr. B. R. Curtis, and stated in writing two questions, relating to the degree of force which he might lawfully use in the service of this process. Mr. Curtis happened to be the senior counsel on one side of the cause then on trial in the circuit court, and could not give immediate personal attention to the marshal's application. At his request, however, I devoted at once a good deal of time to the necessary investigation of the subject, and as soon as he was released from the court-house, and on the same evening we conferred together about it. In the course of that conference, my brother suggested that, although the present warrant had been issued out of the circuit court, yet, as a case would be very likely to arise of a warrant issued by a commissioner, and as the marshal had determined to take an opinion, it would be well that he should be advised of the validity of a commissioner's warrant, which would open the question of the constitutionality of the law. This was the more important, as great pains had been taken in this neighborhood to make people believe that the law was unconstitutional, so far as it gave jurisdiction to the commissioners. This suggestion I communicated to the marshal, and he thereupon added to his former questions to the counsel, a question concerning the validity of a commissioner's warrant.

Mr. Curtis' opinion was prepared, and it was an elaborate opinion on all the questions submitted to him by the marshal, defining his powers and duties in the execution of the process which had *actually* been issued, and also sustaining the validity of a Commissioner's warrant, which *might* be placed in his hands for service.

At the request of those who had a right to request it, the latter part of Mr. Curtis's opinion, in which he discussed the constitutionality of the law, was published; but for obvious reasons the marshal did not see fit to publish to the world that part of the opinion which defines his powers, rights, and duties in the actual execution of a warrant to arrest a fugitive slave. In consequence of the publication of a part of the opinion only, the marshal's position and motives have been entirely misunderstood. He never raised any question as to the constitutionality of the law, but that question of necessity had to be considered and discussed, in order to answer the marshal's question, whether his powers, rights, and duties would be in any respect different under a warrant issued by a *Commissioner* to what they were when issued by a *Court*. No lawyer, and no layman who understands the point, will doubt that it was proper for the marshal to be advised on this question.

I cannot close this letter without saying that, for a long course of years, I have been familiar with the administration of the laws of the United States, and the working of the judicial department of the Federal Government; and that, in my opinion, there is a great deal of legislation needed to make the General Government independent of State control, and independent of the power of mobs, whenever and wherever its measures chance to be unpopular. The United States have no jails, and the law of this commonwealth forbids the use of its jails for the purpose of holding fugitive slaves. Even to detain ordinary criminals, or witnesses obliged to be incarcerated, the United States is entirely dependent on the courtesy of the States, and may have the use of the State jails taken from them at any time when it suits the caprice of a State to withdraw it. In my opinion, too, the office of the United States marshal is by no means organized and fortified by legislation as it should be to encounter popular disturbance. The whole subject ought to be revised by the best jurists and the best statesmen in the country.

Very respectfully, your ob't. serv't.,
GEORGE T. CURTIS,
One of the commissioners of the Circuit Court of the United States for Massachusetts district.

From the St. Louis Times.

The following facts are certified to us from the office of the Secretary of State. The popular vote, as indicated by the Congressional ticket, which is the fairest test, because the freest from local and personal influences, gives the following as the result:

For the Whigs - - - -	31,403
For Mr. Benton - - - -	19,963
For the Democrats - - -	25,200

Adding the two sections of the Democracy together, the vote gives a majority over the Whigs of 13,760—about the usual majority of the party. Adding the Whig and Democratic vote together, the vote gives a majority of 36,640 against Benton. Subtract the vote given for the Benton candidates from that given for the regular Democratic candidates, and it will leave a majority of 5,237 votes of our own party against Mr. Benton. If it be suggested that there was no Benton candidate in the second district, and therefore his strength there, having voted for the Whigs, is not counted in this estimate, we answer that the majority of Bay, in that district heretofore, was about 1,500. The Whig majority there in August last was 1,011.

Now, suppose that this whole majority was given to the Whigs by Benton men, and that in addition to that they gave 750 votes more, which, deducted from the Whig, and added to the Democratic vote, would make 1,500, the usual Democratic majority of the district—their whole vote there would be 1,761. Deduct this from 5,237, the majority of the party already found against him; and a balance will be left against him of 3,467 in the whole State. This is surely the best calculation that can be made for him. Besides, his friends here deny that all his friends in that district voted for the Whigs. If so, the balance against him is yet larger.

There are five districts in the State. In the fifth one, the foregoing estimate gives all the votes cast for Phelps and Gilpin both, to Benton, although there can be no doubt that many anti-Benton men voted for Gilpin.

From the Free Presbyterian.

PUBLIC MEETING.—A meeting of the citizens of Frankfort and vicinity was held on Friday evening, the 15th of November 1850, in the Presbyterian Church in that village, for the purpose of hearing a lecture on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. The meeting was organized by appointing WM. CAROTHERS, Prest. and *Warren S. Dungan*, Sec'y.

Mr. ——— Urquhart being present by appointment, was called upon and addressed the meeting at considerable length in opposition to the law.

Quite a respectable number of the citizens of the village and vicinity being present, there was a desire manifested to have an expression of opinion by the meeting, on the Fugitive law.

On motion, a committee was appointed, consisting of Warren S. Dungan, Robert Dungan and J. S. Campbell, to prepare resolutions for the action of the meeting.—The committee reported the following resolutions, which were adopted, as a whole, without discussion :—

1. *Resolved*, That while we fully recognize the obligation to obey the civil authority, yet the measure of that obedience, we hold, must be determined by a reference to the principles of morality and justice; and that no statute contravening these principles, carries with it the force of law, or binds the conscience of the citizen.

2d. That inasmuch as the late Fugitive slave law passed by Congress is, in many of its provisions, violative of the principles of eternal right—commanding what the law of God forbids; and forbidding what the law of God requires—violative of the Constitution, in suspending the writ of *habeas corpus*, and denying its right of trial by jury—unjust in its operations, in admitting the testimony of one party, and rejecting that of the other—inconceivably *mean*, in offering a bribe, in the shape of a double fee to the acting officer, for finding against the weaker party—we are impelled to the conclusion, that said statute is unworthy the regard of the citizen, and that to acquit our conscience to God, we must disobey this enactment.

3. That while we thus take our stand in opposition to this statute, we hereby pledge ourselves to use all honorable means to effect its repeal.

On motion, Warren S. Dungan, Caleb McClung and J. S. Campbell, were appointed a committee to circulate, receive, and forward petitions, asking Congress to repeal the Fugitive slave law.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published.

On motion, adjourned.

WM. CAROTHERS, *President.*

WARREN S. DUNGAN, *Secretary.*

From the Free Presbyterian.

THE FUGITIVE LAW.—At a meeting held at Kygersville, Gallia county, Ohio, on the 19th November, 1850, to express the sentiments of the community on the Fugitive slave law, passed at the late session of Congress, David Tate was called to the chair, and J. H Pratt appointed secretary. After reading said law and commenting upon the same, and listening to a speech from Mr. J. Bradbury, the following resolutions were passed unanimously :

Resolved 1st. That we, the citizens of Kygersville and vicinity here assembled, are a law-abiding people, and as such will support the Constitution of the United States, and all laws made in conformity therewith; but the infamous Fugitive slave bill, passed by Congress at its last session, is a clear violation both of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and therefore cannot be binding upon us.

2d. That it is the deliberate determination of this meeting not to assist in carrying out the provisions of said law, nor suffer it to be done if in our power to prevent it.

3d. That it would better comport with the usages of this Government to resort to its old practice of employing bloodhounds to hunt down its human prey, than to command all good citizens to perform that service.

4th. That the members of Congress who voted for said law, deserve the scorn and contempt of the civilized world.

5th. That Daniel Webster, Lewis Cass, and Henry Clay, for the part they took in the enactment of said law, have rendered themselves odious and loathsome to a free people; and that the very name of Daniel Webster has become a stench in the nostrils of the free North.

6th. That Millard Fillmore, President of the United States, in signing said law, knowing that it suspended the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* in other cases than of rebellion or invasion, and therefore unconstitutional; and for his cowardly acts in aid of the Southern crusade against American liberty, has shown himself to be a servile Southern tool, unworthy the confidence of that portion of the country to which he belongs, and ought to be indignantly hurled from the high place he now disgraces.

7th. That the spirited resistance to the execution of said law by the people of Boston, merits our warm approbation; and we hereby pledge ourselves to sustain them in the course they have adopted.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the officers, and published in the National Era, Ohio Statesman, Ashtabula Sentinel, and Free Presbyterian.

DANIEL TATE, *Chairman.*

J. H. PRATT, *Secretary.*

From the Boston Liberator.

The Fugitive Slave Bill.

The following preamble and resolutions were passed unanimously, at a very full and spirited meeting of the inhabitants of Manchester, Mass. held Friday evening, October 25, for the consideration of the Fugitive slave law :—

Whereas, the 'Fugitive slave bill, recently passed by Congress, is manifestly cruel, barbarous and inhuman in its provisions towards the entire African race in this country, and oppressive in its provisions and requisitions towards all classes of citizens in the free States, so called; and whereas, this law is repugnant to the genius and spirit of the Constitution of this State and of the United States, as well as to our Declaration of Independence; and whereas, it also directly contravenes the laws of God, which require us, among other things, to 'love our neighbor as we love ourselves; to do good to all men as we have opportunity; to hide the outcast, and betray not him that wandereth, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor' —laws of prior and paramount obligation upon us, above all others; therefore,

Resolved, That as free citizens of the Old Bay State, we cannot but feel mortified and indignant that a statute so barbarous and inhuman as the Fugitive slave bill has been passed by Congress, and made the law of the land; and that any of our statesmen of this commonwealth exerted an influence in procuring its enactment. We cannot but regard it as a monstrous stride backward, in regard to the benevolent and christian enterprises of the age, and justly exposing us to the scorn of the civilized world.

Resolved, That we cannot regard ourselves as under any moral obligation to carry out this law; nor can we persuade ourselves that there is a citizen to be found among us, 'so destitute of love to his country and his race, and so devoid of all justice,' as to aid in returning a fugitive slave under this enactment.

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to the slave, to the colored free man, whose liberty is in peril, to our beloved but dishonored country, and to each other, that we will endeavor to assiduously use all the honorable and lawful means within our power, to procure the speedy repeal of this odious law, and to withdraw the patronage of the Federal Government, in every form, from the institution of slavery.

Resolved, That we believe it has now become the duty of the legislature of this State, at its approaching session, to provide for the appointment of commissioners in each county, whose duty it shall be to extend to all persons claimed as fugitives from slavery, at the expense of the Commonwealth, all the protection, counsel, and comfort, which can lawfully be given, and that we will memorialize the legislature for this purpose.

Voted, That the preamble and resolutions be sent to the Emancipator and Republican, the Salem Register and Liberator, for publication.

JOHN LEE, *Chairman.*

D. L. BRIGHAM, *Secretary.*

From the Boston Liberator.

The Right of the Slave to be Free.

PORTLAND, Jay County, Ind., Nov. 19, 1850.

DEAR GARRISON:—Since I last wrote you, from Richmond, I have held anti-Fugitive-slave-law meetings in different towns in Wayne, Randolph and Jay counties. The one in Winchester, the county town of Randolph, was a great gathering. It was held on the afternoon of what the priests call the Lord's day. The people came in from ten and twelve miles around, to worship God by pledging themselves to resist, at all hazards, the execution of said law in this county. An *Orthodox* Quaker was President, and an *Orthodox* Quaker was Secretary. Four resolutions were discussed, and adopted by a rising vote—several hundreds voting for them, only *three* against them :

Resolved, That it is the right and duty of the slave to escape from slavery.

Resolved, That it is our right and duty to incite and to aid slaves to escape from slavery.

Resolved, That it is our right and duty to resist the execution of all laws and constitutions that require slaves to obey or submit to their masters, or forbid *them* to escape from slavery, or *us* to incite and aid them to escape.

Resolved, That we hereby pledge ourselves to resist the execution of the Fugitive slave law recently passed by Congress, because it makes escape from slavery, and inciting and aiding slaves to escape, *crimes*, to be punished by fines and dungeons.

Thus we worshipped our God, by inciting all slaves to resist the authority and to escape from the cruelties of their masters, by pledging our lives, fortune and honor to aid them in their efforts; and by a declaration of our unceasing hostility to all laws and constitutions that forbid slaves to escape the tyrant's grasp, or us to aid them. Such is the worship which, under present circumstances, can alone be acceptable to God from this nation. I wish some Sunday might be set apart for the whole North unitedly to worship God in this manner, by entering into a 'solemn league and covenant,' in defiance of all laws and constitutions, to incite and aid all slaves to escape from slavery. The people of the North owe it as a sacred duty to themselves, their posterity, and their God, to enter at once into such a 'solemn league and covenant.'

I came to this place, the county town of Jay, by previous appointment, to hold a meeting in the Court-house, to rouse the people to a stern and efficient opposition to the Fugitive law. I arrived, and found the court in session. The judge promptly adjourned the court, to give place to the meeting; and judge, lawyers, constables, clerks and sheriff staid to hear, and to help on the agitation. The above resolutions, in substance, were adopted—but one voting against, and nearly the entire assembly voting for them. Many came ten miles to aid the healthful work. The same resolutions, substantially, have been heartily and almost unanimously adopted in all my meetings.

By the way, Jesse D. Bright, United States Senator from this State, is now busy trying to get a re-election—his term expiring next spring. His own party, the Democratic, is disgusted with him, as having neither talent nor honesty—except to be a tool of slave-breeders and kidnappers. He himself is an actual slave-breeder and slave-hunter. They say he has no chance at all. Good! Let every man who voted for the Fugitive bill be consigned to infamy and oblivion. Other candidates are in the field, who, it is thought, will succeed against him.

The constitutional Convention now assembled at Indianapolis is playing a desperate game. It is made up of lawyers and political hacks, seeking for place and office. They have voted so to alter the constitution as to exclude negroes, mulattoes, and Indians from suffrage, to prevent them from coming into the State, and from bearing witness against a white man! Is not this the land of the free and the home of the *brave?* But the constitution is to be submitted to the people, and whether adopted or not, the discussion and voting on it will do much to open wide their eyes to the nature and encroachments of the slave power. In conjunction with the Fugitive bill, it will go far to show them the alternative that is before them, i. e., the enslavement of the laborers of the North, or the disenfranchisement of the laborers of the South. *Slavery in the North or freedom in the South is the issue.* Slaveholders have decreed slavery to the laborers of the North, and have confederated with Northern capitalists and political demagogues to carry their point. The Fugitive slave law is one link in the chain they are forging for the Northern mechanic and farmer. They think, and think truly, that if this law can be enforced upon the North, the work of making slavery the corner-stone of their republican edifice is done. The slaveholders know that the laborers of the North must be enslaved, or the laborers of the South must be made free. By means of Webster and other Northern allies, they expect to gain their ends; and their hopes will be realized, if the Northern laborers do not take their stand in open, determined hostility to this last act of tyranny under the cloak of republicanism. Now is the day of salvation or perdition to the laborers of the North. Submit to this law, and you show yourselves fit only to be slaves.

There are many fugitives in the log cabins of Indiana. I meet some of them every day. They are determined to meet the enemy here. Their motto is—LIBERTY OR DEATH. They are armed, and will answer the kidnapper's demand, whether he comes as a marshal, deputy marshal, assistant, judge, commissioner, 'claimant, or his or her agent,' with a rifle ball through his heart, and then let the laws of the State deal with them as they may. To die on the gallows for refusing to be slaves, and for defending themselves, their wives and children against kidnappers, is less terrible to them than slavery. I honor their resolution and their object, but I deprecate the means by which they seek to carry out their plans. But can I blame them? I cannot. This nation, in its religion and government, has never taught them any higher or more potent law of life, but has ever infused into their hearts the sentiment, that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God; that he is the true saint and hero who strikes down the oppressor; and that he is the mean, cowardly traitor to humanity who, without resistance unto blood, submits to chains and slavery.

During the past season, a company of kidnappers from Kentucky invaded the town of Newport, Wayne county, at midnight. Many fugitives were there, living in comfort and peace. These, with the Abolitionists, having heard of their approach, were gathered together in the centre of the village. The kidnappers rode up to them, armed with pistols and bowie knives. Many of the people collected were armed with rifles and other deadly weapons. One was pointed out to the kidnappers, by the person who had led them on, as a slave. The leaders of the piratical band rushed on him to secure him. The fugitive—a resolute, determined man—stepped back, drew up and cocked his gun, ready to shoot him down. His hand was stayed from blood, that time might be had for remonstrance. The kidnappers were surrounded by armed men, determined to do or die. They were calmly but firmly assured, that if they shed a drop of blood, or attempted to arrest one man, not one of them would ever leave the place alive. They appealed to the whites, endeavoring to induce them to allow them to capture their slaves, several of whom they saw before them; but the appeal was in vain. The blustering miscreants concluded that discretion was the better part of valor, and wheeled and rode off, empty handed as they came.

Is it the right and duty of the people of the North to invite and assist the slaves of the South to rebel against their masters? It is; and glad am I that the nation, by the recent Fugitive law, has made this distinct issue. To refuse obedience to and to escape from their masters is rebellion on the part of the slaves. Such rebellion, and such alone, I advocate. Then, if the masters attempt to enforce obedience and prevent escape, I would not blame the slaves if they cut their oppressors down. They know no higher, nor holier rule, and can act on none other. Two questions are forced upon the people of the North—

1. The right and duty of the slaves to escape.
2. Our right and duty to incite and assist them to escape.

Thank God, that the recent Fugitive slave bill distinctly forces these two propositions upon the entire North. The Constitution and the law of 1793 did the same, but not so clearly and fully as the law of September, 1850, does. Any law, constitution, book, or decree, of heaven or earth, (none such ever came from nature's God,) that contravenes this right and duty on the part of the slave or his friends, must be wrong, and ought to be disobeyed and resisted.

But more of this. Queer things happen out here, of which I will apprise thee as soon as I have time.

Affectionately thine,
HENRY C. WRIGHT.

P. S. Dear Garrison, I cannot express the deep sadness I feel at not being able to see and greet GEORGE THOMPSON once more. It is my last chance of seeing that great-hearted friend of humanity in this life. His fearless constancy and fidelity to the cause of the American bondman, and of the down-trodden millions of Europe and Hindostan, endear him to every person in whose bosom man finds a higher place than institutions. I believe the name of George Thompson should and will be entered, on the records of this world, as one of earth's brightest and noblest ornaments. He has shown himself to be THE FRIEND OF MAN; and when the names of earth's warriors and statesmen are forgotten, he will be loved and revered as the hero and champion of the human race. Europe, Africa, Asia and America—the four quarters of the globe—will yet do homage to his spirit and his deeds. I have been with him in Boston, in Glasgow, in Edinburgh, in Manchester, and in London, in advocating the cause of humanity. Now he is near me, and for the last time, and I cannot get to him. My duty lies here, and I must stay and do it. He is consecrated in my heart.—May God bless him, and give him the desire of his heart—the redemption of our common nature from the desecrations of slavery, war, and other social wrongs.

It not this the hour, the *set* hour, to call a mass meeting of fugitive slaves in Massachusetts? Inviting all to come together, from all the Northern States, to consider the rights and duties of slaves, and our rights and duties in regard to their escape, and in regard to all laws and constitutions that would brand us as felons for aiding men, women and children to escape from slavery. Let it be done boldly, openly. Let fugitive slaves come together, with their friends, and openly discuss their rights. Let the call go out to all the nation, and let slaveholders and their slaves meet face to face, (if the former will come.) Let that convention send a memorial to Congress. Such a convention, at this time, would shake the nation. Every slave State would be represented there. Invite Webster, Clay, Fillmore and Stuart to come and address them. It would be a scene! Would Massachusetts or Congress attempt to prevent such a meeting? Do try it! Such a meeting would powerfully tend to hasten the final issue—(1) the dissolution of the Union; (2) and then, the abolition of slavery. Do think of this, and get the committee to think of it. Perhaps you have. I don't see the Liberator. I am *starved* for want of it.

H. C. W.

From the Free Presbyterian.

SOUND SENTIMENTS.—The following extracts are from an address delivered at the Wesleyan University, by D. D. Wheelon, Professor in the University of Michigan. They embody great thoughts, tersely spoken :

THE PULPIT AND POLITICS.—Meanwhile the pulpit is proclaiming the Kingdom of God at hand. Hers it is to impregnate the philosophy of the age with spirituality, and thus to complete the formation of a public conscience. Or rather, it is her office to appropriate the philosophy and the civilization of the age and to be herself the public conscience. Christianity has