

# ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. I.

SALEM, O., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1845.

NO. 10.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE,  
Published every Friday at  
SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., O.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., General Agent

BENJAMIN S. JONES,  
J. ELIZABETH HITCHCOCK, Editors.

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$2.00 if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing. ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents—one square \$1.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Sam'l Brooke, George Garretson, James Barnaby, Jr, David L. Galbreath, Lot Holmes.

J. H. PAINTER, PRINTER.

ANTI-SLAVERY.

From the Banner of the Covenant.  
A DEFENCE OF POLYGAMY.

It may seem strange, Messrs. Editors, to attempt a defence of polygamy, a practice now wholly disused among civilized nations, and generally considered as a violation of the divine law. Yet there are many things which exist in society from the mere force of habit, and the propriety of which none question, merely because they never think of them as subjects of examination: they are customary, and it is taken for granted they are right. Now, may not this be the case with *Monogamy*, or having but one wife? Would it not be better for society that polygamy should be permitted? Would not the condition of all classes male and female, old and young, be improved? And is not Polygamy authorized and even recommended by the Scriptures?

Many assert this of slavery. We feel confident we may assert it with equal propriety and force of polygamy.

Consider polygamy as a mere social institution. Woman, we all know, is the weaker vessel. She was made to be a help meet to the man, a help meet, to help him in procuring subsistence to make him more comfortable. As an inferior class in the community, she should contribute to the advantage of the superior, just as the degraded descendants of Ham are made only to toil for the gratification and enjoyment of their more enlightened and exalted masters. Woman is not to be alone, for she was made for man. But besides, as weak in body, and feeble in intellect, comparatively devoid of energy and spirit, she can't take care of herself, if alone. Every woman should be under the charge of one of the other sex. Some carping critics may here object that it is inconsistent to say that woman is to provide for man, and then that man must provide for her; but what of this? We may say, in the words of a late *supper* writer, though on another subject, "Well, you are content to make my inconsistency your apology. I am not bound to reconcile the inconsistency of men in this argument. I am explaining and laboring to enforce the claims" of one man to have as many wives as he pleases.

But to return to the subject. We have shown that every woman ought to be married to a man; a conclusion in which we expect to have the general concurrence of our female readers, though they may dissent from the principles on which our argument is founded. Now, as the number of both sexes is nearly equal, it might at first view seem as if there was here an argument against polygamy; but if we notice the fact that many men cannot take care of themselves, and of course could not be expected to take care of wives, it will appear that but a small number of men ought to be married, and hence, there will be a multitude of women for a single man. As, then, all women ought to marry, and all men need not polygamy is sanctioned by the natural state of society. As things now are, we behold the lamentable sight of many females unmarried, and of many unhappy matches. Were polygamy allowed, this might cease. By letting men take more than one wife, all women might be married; and if any man showed he could not take care of his wife, or become tired of keeping her, he might send her off to some person who would take care of her, and was willing to have her.

Here again we are encountered by the sickly sensibility of some sentimental philanthropists. They will talk of the feelings of a wife being torn, and her heart wounded at being treated in this manner,—separated from her husband and children, and traded off like merchandise. We admit that such a thing would be hard, had females the high, noble, and noble sensibilities of the other sex; but they are only females, so that it gives them but little pain. Thus reasons an eminent jurist of South Carolina when defending slavery against a similar objection, and as suitable for our purpose, we apply it to the present case. Where is the heart that does not bleed at contemplating the condition of unmarried females. Pining away in wretchedness and toil, living in the most abject want, without life or spirit, existence

hardly at all desirable. Compare with this the condition of the inmates of a Turkish seraglio. Why, the latter is as preferable to the former, as is the servitude of the negroes of the south compared with the condition of their degraded and miserable brethren in the north.

We might enlarge on many social advantages which would result from polygamy, but we have said enough to convince every unprejudiced person of its propriety.

If we look at polygamy as a political institution, we find it commends itself to our approbation. An eminent judge in one of our southern States, to whom we have just made reference, asserts that slavery is essential to civilization, since no nation has ever become civilized without holding slaves. We assert with equal confidence, that polygamy is essential to civilization, because every nation which has become civilized has practised it. It is true that we find both slavery and polygamy given up by nations as they advance in civilization; but may we not fear that when they commence the abolition of these useful institutions, they are destroying the means of their own progress? We may expect them soon to decline, and again relapse into barbarism. In order that men may cultivate their minds, and learn the art of government, &c. &c., they must have slaves to work for them. If they are themselves engaged in manual labor of any kind, how can they attend to the higher pursuits of science, political economy, &c. &c. Now, would it not be better that they should also be disencumbered of the cares of wives and families; that a few persons should have charge of all the women and children, and the rest be left to attend to other subjects. Can any one say the political state of a community would not be thus improved? If he say it, let him say it.

We consider this matter very important at this particular time. Women are beginning to obtain an influence which may soon become exceedingly dangerous. That they might be kept in due subjection, they should not be permitted to read or write; but we find they have generally acquired both. They have formed societies ostensibly for benevolent purposes, in which they meet together without the presence of any of the other sex, and where they have an opportunity of forming plots against their husbands of the most horrible kind. There is great danger in these societies. Still more, we find some of them writing and publishing books, showing a degree of intelligence and amount of information which might be bestowed to the most destructive purposes. They have even begun to take part in politics, saying themselves on the side of one or other of the prominent political candidates, expressing their preferences in the most decided manner, and exerting a felt influence of our elections. Where is this to end? We fear that soon they may claim the right of suffrage—send a female to Congress or the Legislature, or perhaps make some elderly matron the President of the United States. We are alarmed. The wo is almost fulfilled to us, that women shall rule over us. We need another John Knox, to blow "another blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women."

Now, would not polygamy arrest these threatening evils? Facts show that women could not attain, under such a state of things, such dangerous power. She might be more easily restrained, and kept in due subjection; the higher race could make the laws and govern.

But on this we must not dwell. We leave it to the serious reflection of our readers, whether the welfare of the nation does not require that polygamy be restored, because woman must be kept in subjection, and this is the only way to do it.

In defending polygamy, however, we wish particularly to appeal to the Scriptures. It is true that some enlightened men appear to think that because the Bible is not meant to be a code of laws for social institutions, if there is a civil law which may require the performance of something considered useful, the church is not to take cognizance of such matters. "We should not call on the church to meddle with the laws of the land. As citizens, we have a right to demand just and equal laws; but as a church, we have other and higher duties." This reasoning is used to show that a person should not be excluded from church membership because he holds slaves, since holding slaves is a civil matter, and "it is plain [very plain—to the sciences and slaveholders,] that the church has no responsibility and no right to interfere with respect to the slave laws of the South." We cannot go just so far as it does seem to us that the church is bound to see that her members sanction or submit to no civil law in sanctioning or submitting to which they do what God forbids. We like better that part of the argument which endeavors to show that slavery is not contrary to the Bible. The latter view of the case seems to imply some doubt whether the former were perfectly correct—a doubt which quite surprises us. In defending polygamy we will admit no such wavering; we defend it on Scripture grounds, and say that, if it be not reconcilable with the Bible, the church has something to do in requiring her members to abandon it. We appeal to the Scriptures in defence of polygamy.

We must confess, in doing this we feel some slight hesitation, because it cannot be denied that much can be brought from the Bible against it; but we mean to consider only what may be said in its favor. We would not go to the Scriptures at all, were it not that there is now-a-days a morbid conscientiousness operating in the community, and some well disposed but weak-minded persons seem inclined to abandon all practices which cannot be sanctioned by the Bible. Such a disposition has been on the increase in many parts of our land for some time past; and it is a fine thing to find professors of theology, men of liberalized, enlightened, and benevolent minds, showing that such sacrifices are not required, and enlarging the bounds of christian liberty, and rejecting the restraints which some such foolish persons as we have mentioned are disposed to submit to.

We want to get the Bible on our side at all events, and we are confident we shall, because more difficult things have been done. The Bible has been shown to support slavery, and we think it much easier to show that it supports polygamy. Let us see.

It is a patriarchal institution. Abraham and Jacob, and others, in patriarchal times, practised polygamy. This none can deny. Then, too it existed, with divine permission, under the Mosaic dispensation. David and Solomon had numerous wives. Will we profess to be wiser or holier than these men? Had we not better go wrong with Solomon, than be right with all the rest of mankind?

Let us go to the New Testament. Now here we find no express command against it, though generally existing in the heathen world, and no doubt, to some degree, among the Jews. Some say polygamy is criminal. We apply to such persons the language used on another subject in the Princeton Review, October, 1844; which, although applied to another, answers our object exactly. Webster but one term.

"How they can avoid feeling condemned out of their own lips, is more than we can understand. The admitted facts of the case are these: 1. That the time of the introduction of Christianity, polygamy in its worst form prevailed extensively over the world. 2. That neither Christ nor his apostles ever denounced polygamy as a crime. 3. That they never urged its abolition as an laudable duty. These are the facts, the inference is irresistible, polygamy cannot be a crime." (p. 568.)

We may also quote from the same source, with a similar alteration, our grand conclusion on this subject.

"It will of course be admitted that what God has at any time sanctioned cannot be evil in its own nature. In that view it can be shown that God did permit his people, under the old dispensation, to be polygamists, polygamy itself cannot be a heinous crime. It will further be admitted, that any thing permitted under the old economy, and which the apostles continued to permit to those whom they received into the church, cannot be a crime justifying exclusion from Christian communion." (p. 554.)

Who now can say that polygamy is wrong—is a crime—should cause the exclusion of those who practice it from the membership of the church. Let not our missionaries among the heathen require those who embrace christianity to abandon it. May not a man be a real Christian and yet have many wives? Let us not oppose polygamy, then, for sin itself, and as far as it is allowed to operate, it is evident that a principle which makes the man who entertains it regard and denounce good men, who really love and serve the Lord Jesus Christ, as heinous criminals, unfit for Christian communion, must pierce the heart, and, where it has full effect, destroy all semblance of religion." (p. 549.) All semblance of religion, to say nothing of any *heart* work. We admit the polygamist may be a christian, but if he be true, those who oppose polygamy have but little right to claim that name.

It is not long since a minister in the Presbyterian church was a good deal for marrying his deceased wife's sister, and the sentence was sanctioned by the highest authority to that body. Had the person been married to two or three, or fifty women, would he, or ought he to have been deposed from the ministry? Certainly he would not have been, if he had held two or three or fifty females as slaves.

We love our country, and we want it to be the glory of all lands. In the progress of decline, we find polygamy banished from every civilized nation, and slavery now finding a refuge in scarcely any one but this. We begin to fear for this patriarchal institution, and we wish, to strengthen it. Polygamy, we feel probably, and certainly kindred with slavery, might help to sustain it. Let us return, then, to those good old times.

From the American Citizen.  
A LATE OCCURRENCE.

"We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of Slavery."—Discipline of M. E. Church, part 2d, Section 10.

"Actions speak louder than words."—Old Proverb.

During the last session of the New-York Annual Conference of the M. E. Church, the recommendation of a certain young man was presented for admission into that body. Several members of the Conference spoke highly in his favor, among whom were Rev. I. Clark, Presiding Elder of New Haven District; Rev. Heman Bangs, of the city of New Haven; Rev. Professor Hilditch, of Middlebury University; Rev. W. K. Stafford, of Hartford; Rev. N. Bangs, D. D.; Rev. S. Martindale and Rev. J. Floyd, of New-York city.

The vote upon the recommendation was about being taken, when the Rev. P. P. Stanford rose and said that he had strong objections to

the admission of the brother whose case was now before them, for he had understood that he was an abolitionist, and in proof of this he would state that a few weeks ago, on a Sabbath evening, the young man had delivered an abolition sermon in the 3d Congregational Church of Guilford, Ct., and Rev. J. A. Edmonds, the M. E. preacher of that village, would bear testimony to the correctness of the statement and as evidence of the ultra-abolition character of the discourse, he had actually made mention of the *Annihilation of Texas!* and had *scarcely* condemned that most democratic usurper! He then called upon Rev. J. A. Edmonds, who rose and said, that "these things were even so."

P. P. S. further proceeded to state, as proof of his first assertion, that this brother had also, during the early part of the spring, solicited the use of the M. E. Church in Madison, Ct., for the purpose of delivering an abolition lecture there; and furthermore, that he had on a certain evening, about a month before, accompanied an ultra-abolitionist to a school house in said town of Madison, and taken part in the exercises of the abolition meeting held therein. For proof of these statements he called upon Rev. G. F. Kettell, the M. E. preacher of that place, who rose and gave in his testimony.

While the matter was pending, the Rev. L. Clark came to the young man and thus addressed him: "Perhaps" said he "you are not aware that it is a rule of our Conference, that no member must agitate the subject of slavery, or say a word against it, will you consent, if admitted, to abide by this rule?" The young man could not say.

The advocating of abolition, and the condoning of *annihilation*, created deep offence in the minds of a large number of the members of that numerous Conference, against the admission of the brother, (for there are many strong Democrats *amix Texas men* among them.) The vessel many were resorted to, in order to injure the young man and his family, and the recommendation was laid on the table by a considerable majority.

Can any one who reads these statements exclaim to deny that the New-York Conference of the M. E. Church, *possessively* certain *will* not. Then let every liberty man and woman, every friend of the slave, come out from her speedy and be separate. No longer be ye *partisans of an inquiry that ye receive not of his judges, which shall come like a rushing storm!* For so thundereth, *Eternal Justice* rules our world.

July, 1845. VERITAS.

We copy the following from an eastern paper, "The Practical Christian," for the benefit of those who may have some bias towards Liberty party. At first sight it may appear to be adapted only to certain localities, but on examination it will be seen to be general in its character. The difficulty from which Nathaniel Colver filled to extricate himself, is the same in which many a Liberty party man in Ohio is involved.

LIBERTY PARTY AT UXBIDGE.

The above named Party held a Convention at Uxbridge on the 14th and 20th ult. which I had the privilege of attending, part of the latter day, and of which I purpose to give some notice. When I reached the place of meeting—the Calvinistic Church—I found it well filled, and some efficient speakers present; the chief of whom was Rev. Nathl. Colver, of Boston, and Rev. Mr. Lovejoy of Cambridgeport. There were also two or three clergymen from neighboring towns, who gave to them their countenance and aid. During the half hour that I was present in the morning, the time was chiefly occupied in a discussion upon the righteousness of holding political anti-slavery meetings on the Sabbath. But passing over some interesting discussions, I will notice the manner in which a few plain questions were met, which I proposed to the Convention. In another number, I may give a sketch of other "sayings and doings."

It was plain enough to be seen by all critical observers present, that the *religious* seats to which the speakers of the Convention belonged, were treated in a much more lenient and "brotherly" manner, than were the *political* parties to which they do not belong. On hearing Mr. Colver sneeringly charge the Whigs and Garrisonians with unkind, Herod and Pilot like, in the last election, I ventured to ask him if there were not something of a union between Liberty men and Democrats, whenupon he gave us his views of Whigs and Democrats. The Democrats he said, were better in one respect, at least, than the Whigs—they were *honest in their wickedness*. The Whigs were full of high sounding professions, but all the time *doing the works of the devil*—beautiful without, but within full of dead men's bones and all manner of uncleanness. But the Democrats, they made no profession of goodness—were no hypocrites—were devilish inside and outside; having all the infernal defiance of God, which distinguishes Milton's fallen angel.

I do not pretend to give his precise phraseology, but no one who heard him will say that I exaggerate. S. S. Foster never used harsher epithets; and I am very sure that the people of Uxbridge, generally, think Foster to be quite as serious, quite as sincere, quite as Christian in spirit when he denounces, as Mr. Colver is. Foster never manifests a recklessness of human life—never what appears a delight in violence and blood. But Mr. Colver used no such language as I have attributed to him, in reference to the Church—certainly the most guilty body in the land, especially if guilt is somewhat graduated as Mr. C. thinks by *profession*. Earth as well as heaven knows the Church *professes* enough. But let the *kind* of treatment that Whigs and Democrats received, be remembered, for it will be of service pres-

ently in illustrating an important point. Seeing that the Convention, as I thought, had one philosophy of reform for political parties, and another and opposite philosophy for religious parties, I thought I would endeavor to ascertain whether I was correct or not by propounding a few questions to its leaders. I thought that if the true doctrine in reference to Whigs and Democrats is *concocted*; it might be the true doctrine in reference to Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists—and that I would try to help the audience see the same. I did not think it quite just that men should have the thunder and lightning of Mr. Colver's indignation poured out upon them, while they were at the polls as men, and had comparative safety by being in the pulpit, and around the communion table as clergymen and Christians. So I put to the Convention the following questions:—Is any one fit to hold an office under the government, who will vote for such a man as Henry Clay or James K. Polk, or any other slaveholder? Rev. Mr. Webster of Hopkinton, having just finished a speech, and being still on the floor, answered the question—and without hesitation—in the negative. He gave me a very emphatic—"No." I then put this question to him:—Is the man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? His reply was—"not any kind of an abolitionist; and the manner in which he replied was sufficiently significant to me, that he regarded such a man as scarcely an abolitionist at all. I then asked:—Is a man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? Is he fit to be received into the Church to sit at the communion table? He answered—"I don't know." But do you hesitate, said I, to decide that a man is not fit for the Church who is not fit for an office in the State, and not an abolitionist? Is your standard of political fellowship higher than your standard of religious fellowship? I do not care to take up the time of the Convention in arguing this matter; I only want the audience to see Liberty Party's position, and would like to have definite answers to my questions, if you are disposed to give them. Here Mr. Colver came to the assistance of Mr. Webster with one of his peculiar sneers against "Garrisonism"—sneering however to get up much of a laugh. "If the brother," said he, "were honest, he would come out plainly and tell us that he is a thorough-going Garrisonian." But it matters not, I replied, whether I am a high churchman, a Garrisonian, or the most confirmed atheist on earth—I suppose I may ask a few simple questions in virtue of my humanity. And as I was proceeding to put out to the audience the inconsistency of receiving men into the Church and at the communion table, who were *not fit for civil office*, he broke in upon me with the question:—And has the brother never known a *plum* golly man, whom he does not think fit for office? Yes, said I, many. But they were not *morally* disqualified. They lacked only the *intellectual* ability. Is this all that you mean when you take the ground that they who vote for slaveholders are not fit to hold office? Is their deficiency a mere *intellectual* disability? If so, why do you denounce the Whigs and Democrats as you do? And they seemed so some—I did not know how many—to be somewhat in doubt to answer. Not, of course, on account of any sentence of my own in propounding the questions, or in dissecting their answers;—my self esteem does not prompt me to think thus. Their difficulty grew out of the *position* they were in.—If they should say that they who vote for slaveholders are only *intellectually* disqualified for office, what would become of their denunciations of the *wickedness* of Whigs and Democrats? But if they should say they were *morally* disqualified, how could they in the face of that great audience say they were fit for a place in the Church and a seat at the communion table? *Morally* unfit for office, but not *morally* unfit to be enrolled among evangelical Christians! They say that would not do. And yet it seemed to me that there was a disposition manifested to make voting for a slaveholder by those out of the Church a *damning* crime, but for those in it a mere *intellectual* blemish—a lack of clearness of vision.

But Mr. Colver said that the disqualification for office of the individuals under consideration might be partly intellectual and partly moral. Did not this look like a desire to screen professed Christians—considering his denunciation of Whigs and Democrats. But let me then, and I put my question in another form. And I asked—Do you believe that an individual who votes for a slaveholder is *morally* unfit for office?—say nothing about his intellectual qualification. And if he answered the question in any other way than by an attempt to be witty about "an axe on a hoe handle," and by saying that if I were not *blinded*, I should see a difference between qualification for office and qualification for Church fellowship, I am sure I do not recollect the answer. If any body else does, I wish they would give it to us in the next Christian. But I told him that whether I was blinded or not, I did not believe that audience was so blinded as not to see that a man who was *morally* unfit for office, must be *morally* unfit for the Church—not so blinded as not to see that the philosophy of concocting is as true a philosophy for religious parties as for political parties—admitting them to be pro-slavery. But he had something to say about its not being a duty to come out of a "divine institution"—what I do not recollect, as he did not argue the point. Yet if government is *divine*, and its officers ministers of God—for which doctrine Mr. C. is a very able and zealous

entirely in illustrating an important point.

Seeing that the Convention, as I thought, had one philosophy of reform for political parties, and another and opposite philosophy for religious parties, I thought I would endeavor to ascertain whether I was correct or not by propounding a few questions to its leaders. I thought that if the true doctrine in reference to Whigs and Democrats is *concocted*; it might be the true doctrine in reference to Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists—and that I would try to help the audience see the same. I did not think it quite just that men should have the thunder and lightning of Mr. Colver's indignation poured out upon them, while they were at the polls as men, and had comparative safety by being in the pulpit, and around the communion table as clergymen and Christians. So I put to the Convention the following questions:—Is any one fit to hold an office under the government, who will vote for such a man as Henry Clay or James K. Polk, or any other slaveholder? Rev. Mr. Webster of Hopkinton, having just finished a speech, and being still on the floor, answered the question—and without hesitation—in the negative. He gave me a very emphatic—"No." I then put this question to him:—Is the man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? His reply was—"not any kind of an abolitionist; and the manner in which he replied was sufficiently significant to me, that he regarded such a man as scarcely an abolitionist at all. I then asked:—Is a man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? Is he fit to be received into the Church to sit at the communion table? He answered—"I don't know." But do you hesitate, said I, to decide that a man is not fit for the Church who is not fit for an office in the State, and not an abolitionist? Is your standard of political fellowship higher than your standard of religious fellowship? I do not care to take up the time of the Convention in arguing this matter; I only want the audience to see Liberty Party's position, and would like to have definite answers to my questions, if you are disposed to give them. Here Mr. Colver came to the assistance of Mr. Webster with one of his peculiar sneers against "Garrisonism"—sneering however to get up much of a laugh. "If the brother," said he, "were honest, he would come out plainly and tell us that he is a thorough-going Garrisonian." But it matters not, I replied, whether I am a high churchman, a Garrisonian, or the most confirmed atheist on earth—I suppose I may ask a few simple questions in virtue of my humanity. And as I was proceeding to put out to the audience the inconsistency of receiving men into the Church and at the communion table, who were *not fit for civil office*, he broke in upon me with the question:—And has the brother never known a *plum* golly man, whom he does not think fit for office? Yes, said I, many. But they were not *morally* disqualified. They lacked only the *intellectual* ability. Is this all that you mean when you take the ground that they who vote for slaveholders are not fit to hold office? Is their deficiency a mere *intellectual* disability? If so, why do you denounce the Whigs and Democrats as you do? And they seemed so some—I did not know how many—to be somewhat in doubt to answer. Not, of course, on account of any sentence of my own in propounding the questions, or in dissecting their answers;—my self esteem does not prompt me to think thus. Their difficulty grew out of the *position* they were in.—If they should say that they who vote for slaveholders are only *intellectually* disqualified for office, what would become of their denunciations of the *wickedness* of Whigs and Democrats? But if they should say they were *morally* disqualified, how could they in the face of that great audience say they were fit for a place in the Church and a seat at the communion table? *Morally* unfit for office, but not *morally* unfit to be enrolled among evangelical Christians! They say that would not do. And yet it seemed to me that there was a disposition manifested to make voting for a slaveholder by those out of the Church a *damning* crime, but for those in it a mere *intellectual* blemish—a lack of clearness of vision.

But Mr. Colver said that the disqualification for office of the individuals under consideration might be partly intellectual and partly moral. Did not this look like a desire to screen professed Christians—considering his denunciation of Whigs and Democrats. But let me then, and I put my question in another form. And I asked—Do you believe that an individual who votes for a slaveholder is *morally* unfit for office?—say nothing about his intellectual qualification. And if he answered the question in any other way than by an attempt to be witty about "an axe on a hoe handle," and by saying that if I were not *blinded*, I should see a difference between qualification for office and qualification for Church fellowship, I am sure I do not recollect the answer. If any body else does, I wish they would give it to us in the next Christian. But I told him that whether I was blinded or not, I did not believe that audience was so blinded as not to see that a man who was *morally* unfit for office, must be *morally* unfit for the Church—not so blinded as not to see that the philosophy of concocting is as true a philosophy for religious parties as for political parties—admitting them to be pro-slavery. But he had something to say about its not being a duty to come out of a "divine institution"—what I do not recollect, as he did not argue the point. Yet if government is *divine*, and its officers ministers of God—for which doctrine Mr. C. is a very able and zealous

entirely in illustrating an important point.

Seeing that the Convention, as I thought, had one philosophy of reform for political parties, and another and opposite philosophy for religious parties, I thought I would endeavor to ascertain whether I was correct or not by propounding a few questions to its leaders. I thought that if the true doctrine in reference to Whigs and Democrats is *concocted*; it might be the true doctrine in reference to Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists—and that I would try to help the audience see the same. I did not think it quite just that men should have the thunder and lightning of Mr. Colver's indignation poured out upon them, while they were at the polls as men, and had comparative safety by being in the pulpit, and around the communion table as clergymen and Christians. So I put to the Convention the following questions:—Is any one fit to hold an office under the government, who will vote for such a man as Henry Clay or James K. Polk, or any other slaveholder? Rev. Mr. Webster of Hopkinton, having just finished a speech, and being still on the floor, answered the question—and without hesitation—in the negative. He gave me a very emphatic—"No." I then put this question to him:—Is the man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? His reply was—"not any kind of an abolitionist; and the manner in which he replied was sufficiently significant to me, that he regarded such a man as scarcely an abolitionist at all. I then asked:—Is a man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? Is he fit to be received into the Church to sit at the communion table? He answered—"I don't know." But do you hesitate, said I, to decide that a man is not fit for the Church who is not fit for an office in the State, and not an abolitionist? Is your standard of political fellowship higher than your standard of religious fellowship? I do not care to take up the time of the Convention in arguing this matter; I only want the audience to see Liberty Party's position, and would like to have definite answers to my questions, if you are disposed to give them. Here Mr. Colver came to the assistance of Mr. Webster with one of his peculiar sneers against "Garrisonism"—sneering however to get up much of a laugh. "If the brother," said he, "were honest, he would come out plainly and tell us that he is a thorough-going Garrisonian." But it matters not, I replied, whether I am a high churchman, a Garrisonian, or the most confirmed atheist on earth—I suppose I may ask a few simple questions in virtue of my humanity. And as I was proceeding to put out to the audience the inconsistency of receiving men into the Church and at the communion table, who were *not fit for civil office*, he broke in upon me with the question:—And has the brother never known a *plum* golly man, whom he does not think fit for office? Yes, said I, many. But they were not *morally* disqualified. They lacked only the *intellectual* ability. Is this all that you mean when you take the ground that they who vote for slaveholders are not fit to hold office? Is their deficiency a mere *intellectual* disability? If so, why do you denounce the Whigs and Democrats as you do? And they seemed so some—I did not know how many—to be somewhat in doubt to answer. Not, of course, on account of any sentence of my own in propounding the questions, or in dissecting their answers;—my self esteem does not prompt me to think thus. Their difficulty grew out of the *position* they were in.—If they should say that they who vote for slaveholders are only *intellectually* disqualified for office, what would become of their denunciations of the *wickedness* of Whigs and Democrats? But if they should say they were *morally* disqualified, how could they in the face of that great audience say they were fit for a place in the Church and a seat at the communion table? *Morally* unfit for office, but not *morally* unfit to be enrolled among evangelical Christians! They say that would not do. And yet it seemed to me that there was a disposition manifested to make voting for a slaveholder by those out of the Church a *damning* crime, but for those in it a mere *intellectual* blemish—a lack of clearness of vision.

But Mr. Colver said that the disqualification for office of the individuals under consideration might be partly intellectual and partly moral. Did not this look like a desire to screen professed Christians—considering his denunciation of Whigs and Democrats. But let me then, and I put my question in another form. And I asked—Do you believe that an individual who votes for a slaveholder is *morally* unfit for office?—say nothing about his intellectual qualification. And if he answered the question in any other way than by an attempt to be witty about "an axe on a hoe handle," and by saying that if I were not *blinded*, I should see a difference between qualification for office and qualification for Church fellowship, I am sure I do not recollect the answer. If any body else does, I wish they would give it to us in the next Christian. But I told him that whether I was blinded or not, I did not believe that audience was so blinded as not to see that a man who was *morally* unfit for office, must be *morally* unfit for the Church—not so blinded as not to see that the philosophy of concocting is as true a philosophy for religious parties as for political parties—admitting them to be pro-slavery. But he had something to say about its not being a duty to come out of a "divine institution"—what I do not recollect, as he did not argue the point. Yet if government is *divine*, and its officers ministers of God—for which doctrine Mr. C. is a very able and zealous

entirely in illustrating an important point.

Seeing that the Convention, as I thought, had one philosophy of reform for political parties, and another and opposite philosophy for religious parties, I thought I would endeavor to ascertain whether I was correct or not by propounding a few questions to its leaders. I thought that if the true doctrine in reference to Whigs and Democrats is *concocted*; it might be the true doctrine in reference to Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists—and that I would try to help the audience see the same. I did not think it quite just that men should have the thunder and lightning of Mr. Colver's indignation poured out upon them, while they were at the polls as men, and had comparative safety by being in the pulpit, and around the communion table as clergymen and Christians. So I put to the Convention the following questions:—Is any one fit to hold an office under the government, who will vote for such a man as Henry Clay or James K. Polk, or any other slaveholder? Rev. Mr. Webster of Hopkinton, having just finished a speech, and being still on the floor, answered the question—and without hesitation—in the negative. He gave me a very emphatic—"No." I then put this question to him:—Is the man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? His reply was—"not any kind of an abolitionist; and the manner in which he replied was sufficiently significant to me, that he regarded such a man as scarcely an abolitionist at all. I then asked:—Is a man who will vote for a Slaveholder a *Christian*? Is he fit to be received into the Church to sit at the communion table? He answered—"I don't know." But do you hesitate, said I, to decide that a man is not fit for the Church who is not fit for an office in the State, and not an abolitionist? Is your standard of political fellowship higher than your standard of religious fellowship? I do not care to take up the time of the Convention in arguing this matter; I only want the audience to see Liberty Party's position, and would like to have definite answers to my questions, if you are disposed to give them. Here Mr. Colver came to the assistance of Mr. Webster with one of his peculiar sneers against "Garrisonism"—sneering however to get up much of a laugh. "If the brother," said he, "were honest, he would come out plainly and tell us that he is a thorough-going Garrisonian." But it matters not, I replied, whether I am a high churchman, a Garrisonian, or the most confirmed atheist on earth—I suppose I may ask a few simple questions in virtue of my humanity. And as I was proceeding to put out to the audience the inconsistency of receiving men into the Church and at the communion table, who were *not fit for civil office*, he broke in upon me with the question:—And has the brother never known a *plum* golly man, whom he does not think fit for office? Yes, said I, many. But they were not *morally* disqualified. They lacked only the *intellectual* ability. Is this all that you mean when you take the ground that they who vote for slaveholders are not fit to hold office? Is their deficiency a mere *intellectual* disability? If so, why do you denounce the Whigs and Democrats as you do? And they seemed so some—I did not know how many—to be somewhat in doubt to answer. Not, of course, on account of any sentence of my own in propounding the questions, or in dissecting their answers;—my self esteem does not prompt me to think thus. Their difficulty grew out of the *position* they were in.—If they should say that they who vote for slaveholders are only *intellectually* disqualified for office, what would become of their denunciations of the *wickedness* of Whigs and Democrats? But if they should say they were *morally* disqualified, how could they in the face of that great audience say they were fit for a place in the Church and a seat at the communion table? *Morally* unfit for office, but not *morally* unfit to be enrolled among evangelical Christians! They say that would not do. And yet it seemed to me that there was a disposition manifested to make voting for a slaveholder by those out of the Church a *damning* crime, but for those in it a mere *intellectual* blemish—a lack of clearness of vision.

entirely in illustrating an important point.

\* See "Divine and Human Rights," p. 23.

\* Princeton Review, Oct., 1844—p. 360.

† Ibid.