

would not scruple to murder our mother for a meal of victuals—or to scatter the desecrated remains of a dead sister, or father, or wife, to manure our cucumber vines! We thank God that instinct is stronger than reasoning, and conscience more powerful than argument. We do most sincerely believe, and we deliberately weigh what we say, that all the books and papers which have been written to prove slavery a divine institution, have never convinced a single man or woman that it was right—no not one! We have not read the argument above referred to—life is too short for a man to read a discourse to prove that a man may not murder his father, or sell his country for gold, or enslave his fellow man! If then we will not and cannot read the argument of our able friend, 'A Virginian,' in defence of the right, what shall we say of the God defying defender of the wrong? We promised to give the 'Alabama Preacher' and his class a round, when we got our: we now postpone it forever; for until this miserable and dying being of ours becomes yet most deserving of all the ills that flesh is heir to, we never can associate in our mind Religion and Slavery without the most unqualified loathing and hot indignation!—C. M. Clay's True American.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

In the Bugle of the 19th inst., is an article written by my friend B. B. Davis, which seems to demand some reply from me; and which I hasten to notice, believing that a candid interchange of views relative to the subject of his communication, cannot but be beneficial to all parties concerned.

In the communication to Salem Monthly Meeting, published in your paper of the 12th inst., and to which my friend B. B. Davis seems to have some objections, it is stated that "the Society of Friends professes to be a Christian body—that it professes to keep itself such, by dealing with those of its members who are guilty of immoral or unchristian conduct."—In regard to this matter I suppose there can be no difference of opinion among those who know anything directly of the professions of the Society, whatever conclusions may be drawn by those who judge of these professions by its practices merely.

In the Discipline of the Society of Friends of Ohio, as revised and printed by direction of the Yearly Meeting in 1842, it is declared that the great head of the church has been pleased to gather Friends as a people to himself, and to inspire them with a degree of the same universal love and good will by which was ushered in the dispensation of the Gospel. Declarations of the same nature abound throughout the discipline, and so far as that instrument is to be received as an exposition of the principles professed by the Society, (and I know not where else we are to look for such exposition) the Society makes the very highest pretensions to Christianity.—Furthermore, if any member acts in a manner unworthy of this profession, it is declared to be "the indispensable duty" of the Society to treat with him without delay, and if he fails to give evidence of repentance, to disown him. But it is useless to multiply words here. No one who has read the discipline of the Society or other writings approved by Friends, or listened to the testimony of their recommended ministers, can be in doubt for a moment relative to this matter.

My friend B. B. D. calls himself a member of Society. He stands committed in favor of these principles and regulations before Friends, and the world. In his own heart he either does, or does not adopt them. He either does or does not believe it right for the Society to make these high professions and its "indispensable duty" to carry them out, by disowning delinquent members and in other particulars. If he believes it the duty of the church to act upon these principles and if the church refuses to act thus, it must according to his own argument be his "indispensable duty" to disown the church; as every argument used in the discipline, or which can be used to justify the Society for the disownment of delinquent members will go as far, and I believe farther to justify individuals who are true to principle, in disowning a delinquent church.

If on the other hand he rejects these principles of the Society, as being incorrect, he appears to the world what he is not—deceives the Society, and stands condemned by the discipline; which declares that there is imposition "on the part of those who (as is sometimes the case) insist on being retained as members while at variance with Friends either in principle or practice!" There seems, then, no course for my friend to pursue, but to join himself to what he pleasantly terms the "new Comeouter Society," unless he is prepared to take the position and maintain it, that the Society of Friends does act in a manner worthy of its high Christian professions. This position he will not attempt to establish, for two reasons. The one is that he is well acquainted with the position occupied by the Society for several years past, towards questions of reform. The other is that he is an honest man.

My friend is well aware that most of the meeting houses belonging to Friends have been closed against Anti-Slavery and Temperance meetings—that thousands of its members support slavery, by voting for slaveholders, upholding a pro-slavery Government and in other particulars—that many, perhaps a majority of the recommended ministers of the Society, as well as many of its other members are using their whole influence against the Anti-Slavery movement, and yet retain their standing in the Church; and that members have from time to time been disowned, wholly on account of their consistent Anti-Slavery character and action. Could such things be, if the Society carried out in practice its Christian professions! Can that be justly considered a Christian Society, which, while it professes to recommend none to the ministry, except such as are divinely appointed, and speak by immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, yet retains in the ministry persons who are active and bitter in their opposition to the cause of the slave, and declares in its Quarterly and Yearly meetings, that it believes such are "careful in the exercise of their gifts to wait for divine ability?"

Can the body which hurls from its connection such persons as I. T. Hopper and his associates, wholly on account of their efforts in behalf of bleeding humanity, be justly looked upon as occupying the high moral and religious station claimed by the Society of Friends! But one answer can be given by any friend of truth to these questions.

I know it is sometimes asserted that Friends of Ohio and other places, have nothing to do with the action of Friends in New York.—This is a mistake. I. T. Hopper was disowned not merely by Rose street Monthly Meeting, nor by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings of that place which sanctioned its proceedings, but by the Society of Friends; not one meeting in unity and correspondence with New York, having ever, so far as I am informed, breathed a whisper in disapproval of this high-handed outrage.

Such then, is the position occupied by the Society from which I have thought it my duty to disconnect myself, and to which friend B. B. D. still adheres. Though I believe that after a careful examination of the subject he will agree with me that he cannot sustain his present relation to this body, without in some measure at least, sanctioning its pro-slavery character—without being, so far as this connection is concerned, the "supporter of Slavery—the enemy of the Slave."

B. B. Davis is of opinion that my principles, if carried out, would require that I should come out from the Anti-Slavery and Temperance Societies as well as that of Friends.—If he succeeds in establishing this view of the subject, it will, it seems to me, have little to do with the matter in question, as it is not at all likely the discovery that I am already involved in guilt, owing to my connection with two Societies, many of whose members are corrupt, would induce me to connect myself with a third, of the same, or a worse character, and thus add to my guilt.—Principle, it seems to me, would require that I should leave the former, rather than join the latter.

But I do not admit nor believe, that the arguments used to show the duty of disclaiming the Society of Friends will apply to the same extent, or to any extent, to the members of the Anti-slavery & Temperance Societies, for the reason that these associations are in several essential particulars different from that Society. Every person who subscribes to the Constitution of the A. A. S. Society is a member of that association.—Individuals of all classes, and of every character and condition, meet together on its platform to labor for the overthrow of slavery. That Society has no power nor does it claim the right, or hold it a duty, to disown any member under any circumstances. All, who wish to do so, meet upon that platform—compare views with each other—unite, so far as they can agree, in the carrying out of measures for the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause, and where differences of opinion arise, or a course of conduct is pursued by some which others disapprove, neither party is responsible for the doings of the other, any more than one individual is chargeable with the wrong done by another, from the fact that both live in the same village or neighborhood. The same may be said of the Temperance organizations. Every one can see at a glance the wide distinction existing between associations of this character, and the Society of Friends and most other religious bodies, which are disciplinary, and profess to shut out from their connection all who do not sustain a Christian character.

It is evident therefore that what my friend says about members of A. S. Societies using the products of slave labor, voting for slaveholders, &c., though it may have an effect to induce these members to examine the ground whereon they stand, cannot by any means be made to prove it the duty of any to come out of those Societies, whose members are before

shown are not responsible for the actions of each other.

I will now very briefly answer, so far as I am able, the several interrogatories at the conclusion of B. B. D's communication.

The first question I answer in the affirmative. To the 2nd I answer, we should use the best means which are strictly moral—3rd there are. 4th. To the first part of this inquiry I reply that I have been a member of an association in which it is in order to agitate all questions, no matter of what character. This association is, however, small. It was established a few months ago in Salem. To the latter part of the query I answer, that I have endeavored to exert an influence upon the members of the Society of Friends, though I have not taken part in the discussions of its meetings.

5th, This depends upon the character of the organization. If it is disciplinary, and adopts as one of its cardinal principles, that it is the "indispensable duty" of the body to disown those of its members who do not act "in a manner becoming their profession," it is the duty of those who are true to principle to disown those who are not, no matter which is the stronger party. If on the other hand the association is similar to the O. A. A. S. Society, then those who are true are not implicated in the guilt of those who are false. 6th, It would not. 7th, No. 8th, This I cannot answer; I think probably it would not continue for any great length of time. 9th, Some members of that Society abstain from the proceeds of slave labor to a great extent. A majority I presume do not; some members who use these proceeds consider themselves inconsistent in doing so, others do not. 10th This I cannot answer. 11th, It is not.—12th, It does. In proof of this I refer my friend to the action of the Society in New York, towards I. T. Hopper and others; and to the action of Indiana Yearly meeting towards the Friends of Green Plain.

J. BARNABY, JR.

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

In looking over the Bugle a few days ago, I was very forcibly struck with an article from the pen of John B. Wolf, taken, I think, from the "Western Christian Advocate," and it occurs to me just now, that a word in relation to some things contained in it, might not be out of place; and I also wish, to call attention to some further developments of his real character, that from them, the people may see, what this class of persons (the Priests) are, and what they are doing; but, I would observe here, that from all I can learn of the man, I conclude that he is a tool in the hands of Elisha Bates; comes at his call, and barks at his bidding—and I will further add, that no other than a Priest, or the willing tool of a Priest, could be guilty of placing before the public an article so notoriously false, and slanderous, in its character, as the one alluded to. In the first place he professes to have a perfect knowledge of the motives, which impel our friends to pursue the course they are taking, and tells us that it is the establishment of the principles of Infidelity. Merely calling the reader's attention to this, is sufficient; all will see the Priestly assumption at a glance. He says "he asked some questions when at the Convention at this place," but he says nothing of the manner of doing it, or of the professions he made to the audience. Those questions were asked out of pure regard for the cause in which we were engaged (so he said) "and much depends on the answer you give to them. It is for the benefit of the audience, of the speakers, and of the cause, that I, ask them, there is a great deal behind them" &c. And yet, he denied in the same meeting the correctness of the foundation principle of the Anti-Slavery enterprise; that is, that it is wrong under all circumstances to hold Slaves; hence, he must be viewed as an advocate of Slavery; an advocate of man holding his fellow man as property. This also, only requires to have the attention directed to it in order to exhibit the baseness and hypocrisy of the man. But I must not dwell longer on this, I wish as I said in the commencement, to call attention to other developments of the real character of this Priest, John B. Wolf.

On the evening of the 14th of last month, a meeting was held some three or four miles west of Mt. Pleasant, to examine the propriety of holding temperance meetings on the Sabbath day. At an early hour, the house was well filled, and among the number present was John B. Wolf. The ordinary formalities of organizing were over when I arrived. But I very shortly discovered that something more was to be done. Arrangements were being made to select speakers. This last, was evidently the work of friend Wolf, as after movements clearly proved. I took occasion to suggest that any person present wishing to speak on the question under consideration be left at liberty to do so. At this friend W. arose and said "he would oppose any movement of the kind, the audience had come there to hear men of influence and

intelligence speak, and must not be disappointed. "The proposition" he said, "involved the discussion of another question, that of the natural rights of man, altogether extraneous to the one we came to discuss." There was something more said, not now recollected, he, however, took upon himself the entire control of the meeting. Eight persons were named who might, if they wished, have privilege of speaking, but all others were prohibited. One who dared to think only as his Priest dictated, asserted in his remarks, that the real question lay back of the one proposed here for discussion. "It is" says he "Is the Sabbath a Christian institution?" He attempted to show it to be such a one, and as none appeared to be dissatisfied with it being made the question, he demanded that we should come to it. I arose and inquired of the audience which one of the questions I should discuss, as it had been said that the one of holding temperance meetings on the Sabbath was not the one we came to examine; some one made answer—both. I then proceeded to show the necessity of doing good on all days, and from that, and the fact that the sabbath is not a Christian institution; that the introduction of the Christian dispensation abrogated the Jewish Sabbath and did not establish any other—that Christ, his Apostles, nor yet the early Christians ever observed any particular day as the Priests of the present day would have us do. It was said by another that the Church and State were the only institutions recognized in the Bible, and we had no right to form others.

In reply, it was shown that if this doctrine was adhered to, no reformation could ever be accomplished in either, for the Church would excommunicate, and the State put to death those of their members who attempt to reform them. The utterance of these facts, was more than the pious Priest could bear; (and by the way, all that was said by myself in relation to the Sabbath was proven from their own authority, the Old and New Testaments and the standard Church histories.) He imposed himself in the meeting for nearly half an hour, for the purpose of abusing myself and others: said we belonged to a Society whose object was to destroy the Marriage relation, bring about Agrarianism, that we had introduced our Community principles there by proposing that all be at liberty to speak who desired &c. He also stated that I had left the question and taken up another, the Christian Sabbath—and when asked who it was that first introduced it, replied emphatically "did't I tell you what the question was, and what right had you to pay any attention to what they said!" thus, again, placing himself in the position of the whole meeting, or rather assuming to be the meeting.

It would occupy too much space to give all the particulars, but from those given all who are not blind must see the necessity of ceasing to sustain a lying and tyrannical Priesthood. They are always in the way of every reform that is started. The Rev. John B. Wolf could charge others whom he knew were laboring to reform the drunkard and break the chain of the Slave, with striving to destroy the marriage relation, while he himself represents a body, that has already abrogated that sacred institution in the case of one sixth of the American people. If abolitionists do not get the Priests converted to truth, and righteousness, they had as well give over striving for the relief of the Slave from his chains.

Yours for the right,
CARVER TOMLINSON.

Mt. Pleasant, Dec. 10th, 1845.

Thanks to the friend who furnished us with a copy of the following letter: it will doubtless be read with much interest.—[Eds.]
"New Lyme, Asht. Co., O.,
16th Nov. 1845."

Dear Brother,

You know the Free Will Baptists of this place, were set all on fire because Mr. Foster and Miss Kelley, slandered them so, in proving them to be pro-slavery.

They even went so far as to ex-communicate some of their worthy members. (who, they were sure, would leave them) for the same reason that they "gnashed their teeth" no Mr. F. & Miss K.

Might not one, reasonably expect such thorough-going Abolitionists, as these Free Will Baptists, would sit most patiently, under an Anti-Slavery lecture, though it were delivered in a house devoted to Religious Worship!

Well, last Sunday evening, I gave them an opportunity of proving, that they had been slandered, by those Anti-Slavery Lecturers and those ex-communicated church-members, and that it was not without reason they were so exasperated against them.

After listening to a sermon from Elder Yates, in which he endeavored to prove that the body as well as the soul, would go to Heaven;—that the judgment day was the day for which all others was made—that the Saints would smile and triumph over the last con-

flagration, when the Earth, and with it, its wicked inhabitants should be consumed in the flames, &c., &c.—I say, after listening to a sermon which ran after this sort, I took advantage of "opportunity given for any one to speak;" but had said but few words—barely informed them that I "proposed to call their attention to another subject, their duty to God their Father and man their brother, in which they had a more immediate interest than the one to which they had been giving their attention"—when the Elder with a commanding voice, said; "Sit down!" "Sit down!!!" "Sit down!!!" "It's my meeting."

I remarked that I chose not to relinquish the opportunity given and proceeded.

Thereupon the Elder commenced singing "praises to God" in order to drown my voice and thus break me down. His pious Anti-Slavery brethren joined in with him and sang ("in the Spirit" no doubt) until they were tired of it.

Meantime, I continued speaking—spoke slow and loud so as to enable those not engaged in Religious Worship, to hear. I made use of this circumstance, the spirit manifested towards me, to convince them that these professed Christians were "of the Devil."

Well they soon became weary of "making melody unto the Lord" and so changed the order of worship. Two of their leading, most devoted brethren made towards me with firm step, (Courageous men!! What Christian fortitude!!!) and with hearts all filled to overflowing with the spirit of their Master, laid violent hands on me and thrust me out into the street.

As soon as freed from their grasp I returned to the "House of God" and again commenced speaking—was dragged out the second time by the same pious Christians—the second time returned and remained unmolested.

The elder thought it best not longer to continue the "unequal combat, and so unceremoniously left the house without singing, prayer, or the benediction.

The sisters and most of the brethren followed, leaving me to close the meeting in my own way.

You would naturally suppose such a bustle as was produced by this "drag out" would seriously alarm the female portion of the assembly, but so far from it, some of them were a good deal elated, as they evinced by their indelicate grins as they passed me on their way out.

They probably had seen the like before, for they believe in fighting for what they call their "religious rights."

I will just say, in justice to some of their members, who disapprove of branching the subject of Slavery in a religious meeting, that they disapproved of the "drag out" on the ground that it would make talk and give them a bad name abroad.

One of the sisters too, wife of the leader in the attack upon my person, "Wouldn't have had it done for Ten Dollars;" for the reason as her husband said in reply, "O you'r afraid it'll hurt my business, that's all you care for it!"

I did intend giving you before now an account of the manner Mr. Foster used up Elder Dunn—that "Angel" as some of his F. W. Baptist sisters call him, but I've waited so long I'll defer it till I see you, which I hope will be soon.

Yours truly,
HENRY H. HATCH.

A. M. HATCH.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM DECEMBER, 23, 1845.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

MARRIED.

In New Brighton, Pa. on the 21st. inst. at the house of Miss A. Townsend, Stephen S. Foster of New Hampshire, to Abby Kelley of Massachusetts.

TO OUR FRIENDS ON THE RESERVE.

Stephen S. and Abby Kelley Foster, after visiting a few towns in Western Pa. design holding a series of meetings on the Western Reserve. Those persons of the latter place who desire meetings in their respective neighborhoods, and can procure suitable places, and accommodations, will please send information (post paid) to the Editors of this paper. It is desirable to hear from the friends as soon as possible, so that such arrangements may be made as time will allow, and the interests of the cause seem to demand.

Carver Tomlinson is hereby informed that we can supply him with the books for which he wrote. We have been waiting for an opportunity to forward them, but none has offered.