

# The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

MARIUS H. ROBINSON, Editor.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, Publishing Agent.

VOL. 9.—NO. 2.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 27, 1853.

WHOLE NO. 412.

## THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, OHIO.

TERMS—\$1.00 per annum, if paid in advance. \$2.00 per annum, if not paid in advance.

It is occasionally sent to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth, with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to MARIUS H. ROBINSON, Editor. All others to ANN PEARSON, Publishing Agent.

J. HUDSON, Printer.

## ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

For the Bugle.

ADDRESSED TO A CERTAIN CLASS OF PATRIOTS.

Of your vain, wild, discordant cries,  
My soul is sick, O thoughtless crowd!  
No longer vex the wearied skies  
With shouts of triumph long and loud.  
For long have ye made this your boast  
"Our Fathers were the dauntless few,  
Who fearless of a bannered host,  
Defied old England's robber crew."  
Though their life blood like water ran,  
Think not the mighty work is done—  
Up every woman every man,  
Another battle must be won.

O wherefore think to warn ye still  
By those once bright, now fading fires  
That beam on every classic hill  
Kindled by your departed sire?

Lol! while ye watch beside those graves  
Where sleep in death that honored band  
Oppression's dark and turbid waves  
Come sweeping o'er your devoted land!

And while for heroes passed away  
Ye shout your heartless praises vain  
For the brave heroes of to-day  
Ye build the dungeon, forge the chain!

Weak children of heroic sires  
Awake to freedom's rallying cry!  
Kindle again those warning fires  
And gain another victory.

But not with bayonets be it won  
Let your mild censure be the dove,  
Then shall the war in blood begun,  
Be closed in peace, and trust, and love.  
Monroe, July 4th 1853. C. E. M.

## FRIENDS IN MICHIGAN.

Ypsilanti, Mich., 8th mo., 6th, 1853.

FRIEND MARIUS: Although personally a stranger to thee, yet being somewhat acquainted with the little trumpet of which thou hast charge, I take the freedom to send a few lines for thy disposal.—Thou hast already published to thy readers an account of the doors of the Friends' Meeting House at Adrian, being barred against me last winter, by direction of some of the leaders, when I wished to meet with them and discuss the subject of slavery; although there was not the first dissenting voice raised against it in the meeting where the request was made. And they have since barred their hearts against me in an organized capacity, on the anti-slavery question.

A few weeks since I attended our quarterly meeting, held in the same house. On the second day of the meeting, in the discharge of what I felt and humbly trust was my duty, I spoke, I suppose twenty or thirty minutes, mostly on the high professions of the popular christian churches of the land, and showed their awful apostasy from what they professed, even to the buying and selling and making merchandise of the image of God, in the presence of his children, in bartering away their own church members, and often their own children, for money, and with that money buying Bibles to send to the heathen abroad; &c. I then came to our own society, with its high professions, even higher than the others; and when I put the query, How do we stand, when contrasting our practice with our profession? there seemed to be some uneasiness among those who are stationed as watchmen for the organization; and when I began to bring the acts of the yearly meeting into account, the uneasiness was not any the less manifest. But when I referred to a document issued by our yearly meeting of last year, purporting to be an anti-slavery address to the professors of christianity in the United States, in which it is said, "It is true that slavery is confined to a section of the country, and is not under the control of the national government," there was a disposition manifest among those occupying the high seats, that showed they would much rather I should take my seat. Nor is this to be wondered at; for who is there among us that likes to have faults exposed; and it was surely trying for me to have to do it, feeling as I did so incompetent for the task, and reluctant to do the feelings of my friends, many of whom in that meeting were very near and dear to me.

But duty requires that I should be plain, so as to be understood. So when I began to contrast the language of our leaders with the actual state of things, showing that there was not a foot of ground over which the flag of the nation waved, that was not dedicated to the slave system, and that this accursed system is guarded and protected by the national power, and therefore it could not be true, that the national government had no control over it; David Steer, (the friend who so strongly opposed my former meeting,) in an apparently very friendly way, informed me that this was not an anti-slavery meeting, and they did not want an abolition lecture there. I told him I would be there in a few minutes. But he persisted, contrary to our written rule, to interrupt me by telling me to take my seat. At this point other members joined him in opposing me, and interrupting the order of the meeting, which till now had been quite attentive and solemn.

This interruption was all done in the face of our written discipline; but it was an elder that spoke, and he must be obeyed, let discipline go as it may. Well, there I was, and according to law and gospel, had a right to proceed; but I saw it would lead to more outbreaks of disorder from the high seats, and I closed by saying that I would leave the mat-

ter (for the present of course,) with the consciences and the God of them that heard me. Toward the close of the meeting, I was impressed to repeat the language of the prophet Isaiah, as applicable to our society at the present time: "The leaders of my people cause them to err, and those that are led of them are destroyed." It happened that I staid over night with one of our recommended ministers, who told me I should not have spoken one word more, after D. Steer told me to desist, and that the last time in particular, when using the language of the prophet, I was entirely out of order, throwing out a hard sentence on the heads of society—that I must remain dumb before the elders—they were the heads of society: (and of course I must be somewhere near the tail)—they were possessed of the true spirit of judging, but I was in possession of the spirit of the devil. I here tried to slip in a word or two, but he forbade and told me again I must remain dumb, that it was my place to listen when an elder spoke, and obey without beginning to reason, that he was not going to reason with me; that I never saw, emphasizing the words strongly, real anti-slavery books and papers; and much more of like character. I sat and heard him through, and the moment he was done he left the room, but soon returned to perform his family devotions by reading a chapter from the testament. It may well be supposed that I was perfectly disgusted with his hypocrisy and ignorance.

It appears to be the intention of the organization that the elders shall rule; and they do rule, and the people love to have it so. If they in an official manner say, ye, the members must say Amen, whether the saying recommends itself to the conscience as truth or not. The heads in a yearly meeting capacity say, "It is true that slavery is confined to a section of our country, and is not under the control of the national government," which is nothing short of lying hypocrisy; or downright ignorance, when the leaders know that the whole country is hunting ground for the slave system, and that the national government pays for the chain, they know that the arms of the nation, are all pledged to the South, to enable them to keep their slaves in their chains, and to carry on their inhuman traffic in human flesh, separating husbands from wives, parents from children, and even the tender babe from the arms of its distracted mother. They know that the national government allows, yes more, authorizes the slave system to poll three votes for every five slaves. Thus the national government is, and ever has been offering a premium on slavery. And yet in view of all these connections of the national government with slavery, together with more than sixty years of pro-slavery legislation, a yearly meeting of orthodox Friends, held in New York in 1852, can boldly say, that the national government has no control over the system of slavery. And when a member in unity with that society, disents from this falsehood, and feels called upon by a higher power to expose it in a public meeting, he is ordered to take his seat, with the taunting assertion that it was not an anti-slavery meeting, and they did not want to hear an abolition lecture. I had supposed that if a society was anti-slavery enough to issue a document purporting to be anti-slavery, it ought to be willing to have it commented upon by its members in collective capacity. But it seems I was mistaken, for the elders say it is my place to be dumb.—Whether I obey the latest, time will disclose.

Thine for pure religion and true humanity,  
SAMUEL D. MOORE.

## RELIGION VERSUS HUMANITY.

DEAR MARIUS: Though not much in the habit of writing for newspapers, I thought it not amiss to report a few facts which have presented themselves to me in a recent visit to western Indiana. Facts touching the important issue that is searching the foundations of governments and institutions in America. I mean the issue between religion and humanity—the church and the reformers.

No one who has freely examined the position of the American church, will charge us with exaggeration, when we state that it, with a few exceptions, has labored hard to prove that war, slavery, the gallows, and other monsters of iniquity, are christian institutions.

The church demands entire supervision over the souls of men, holding that it embraces the entire means to save us from sin, and fit us for heaven.—The clergy deny us Sabbath evening even, to investigate the institutions of war, slavery, intemperance and other wrongs. But how stand the facts in Indiana.

In eastern Ind., there is less religion and more humanity. In western Ind., more religion and less humanity. Take the counties of Jay, Grant, Randolph, Henry, Wayne, Union and Hamilton, and they embrace nearly all of the reform sentiment of the state. And in those counties there is much liberality of sentiment on religious subjects.

Here the Sabbath can be used for man, without Priestly indignation. Here it is not infidelity to preach peace on earth and good will to man. Here a strong voice was given against the 13th Art., Randolph Co. rejecting it. Here the sympathy is for the fugitive, and has been so avowed publicly. But how different is the western part of the state. There nearly every adult belongs to some orthodox church. And there almost every one is in sympathy with the cruel institutions of the state and nation. In this region they voted almost to a man, for the 13th Art. They would turn out on a mass to enforce the Fugitive Law. And in this pure evangelical region, but few houses can be obtained, in which to plead for the slave.

I am here in Greencastle, a town full of School Houses and Churches. (There are five Churches in the place.) Here is Asbury University, a well endowed institution, under the charge of the M. E. Church. Here I found a book entitled "Review of Uncle Tom." A work of 218 pages, written by a prominent member of the Methodist Church in Greencastle. The book of itself, is not worthy of notice. But when viewed as an essential part of the religion of Indiana, together with the fact that it flowed spontaneously from the mist of western

Methodism—was written by a popular Methodist, a member in good standing in one of the Asbury churches—that it has been highly extolled by the Whig, Democratic, and Temperance journals of Greencastle, and connived at by the religious paper, and that it is eagerly read and highly esteemed by the professors in this region. When these facts go out with the book, it renders it worthy of notice. Were it an unnoticed book, simply the product of one reckless and corrupt individual, it might be thrown aside with Bennett's Herald, and kindred trash. But when adopted by that class who claim to be our spiritual leaders, it is proper that the book should be exposed. I did all I could to ascertain the estimation of the book among religionists, and did not succeed in finding one who did not like it. It would be stating a fact, plain to every one who has any knowledge of western Ind., to say that the book is not in the least opposed to its religion. Never have I found any place as thoroughly evangelized as western Ind.—a place so completely under the control, I mean, of orthodox religion as preached by the ministry and believed by the laymen, in this country. And I never have found any place where there was less sympathy for the degraded and sufferings ones of this nation.

From what has been written, it will be necessary to give a glance at the character of the book alluded to. That is hard to do in one communication, especially one that has already grown so longly as this has.

The author roots his "review of Uncle Tom," mainly on personal acquaintance with Mrs. Stowe; taking but little notice of the facts, save to deny them in general terms. He indulges mainly in venting his bitter hate on abolitionists; aiming some of it at the north in general, and especially at New England. He views the south as the paradise of this earth, and her institutions as God ordained and Bible sanctioned. Calls all infidels, who do not bow down to legislative enactments. And quotes lots of scriptures to prove that slavery is a christian institution. Touching obedience to law, he quotes Peter, as follows: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake; whether to the King as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers." He then adds: "How dare abolitionists, professing christianity, fly in the face of the laws of the country, &c. &c."

He holds that the colored race are better off in slavery than free. That "all but knaves and fools know that improvidence, idleness, extravagance and crime, are the fruits of emancipation." That "the white man cannot bear the presence of the black man."

That the "colored man is irrevocably doomed to scorn, contempt and degradation, while in the midst of the white race."

Quotes Judge Blackford and Dr. Miller, to prove that "Free blacks are of no service to us in the north." "If liberated, would be a constant source of corruption."

He says, "We have proof positive that the relation of master and servant is not inconsistent with the word of God." "Among the converts of the apostles, were slaveholders." "Admitted into the church as slaveholders."

Says they were not required to manumit their slaves, and thinks it best that they should hold them as such.

He brings up the case of Onesimus, and asks, "Did Paul say to Onesimus, you are now a christian; your master Philimon is a christian. And one christian has no right under any circumstances to hold another christian in bondage?" And answers, "No! THANK GOD, Paul promulgated no such doctrine!" Adding, that Paul sent him back to Philimon, as a slave; telling him that whatever service he did to Philimon, as a slave, he did for God.

I will quote no farther. You have a sample of the manner in which the author treats the subject. It is a book of falsehood and immorality. What he states as facts are false as those of Elwood Fisher. His Bible arguments you are all familiar with.—His venomous attack on Mrs. Stowe and abolitionists in general, would not pay for the printing.—And his attempt to prove that slavery is a christian institution, and that they are infidels who oppose it, is but another fact showing that the religion of America is no benefit to man—that it does not demand of us pure and honest lives. Hence it must be superseded by tangible movements, which will teach truth, wisdom and purity.

Readers of the Bugle, which is the best, infidel humanity or christian slavery?  
J. P. DAVIS.

Greencastle, Ind., Aug. 4, 1853.

## CAN WE DENY CHRIST WHILE SINCERELY TRYING TO FREE THE SLAVES?

MR. ROBINSON:  
Dear Sir: Having noticed with peculiar interest the fast approaching struggle between Practical Christianity and a mere "Orthodox Christianity," such as the Editor of the "Ch. Press" has given in his late editorial, headed, "Shall we deny Christ in order to free the Slave?" I concluded to give you a short extract from an extensive work I am now writing on "the development of the True Spirit and Church of God, independent of Law applied by human instrumentality." The extract will relate particularly to the question above, the application of which to the above article, I leave the reader to make. The extract was written before I saw the said article, and therefore is not written in the way of an answer to it. But it may apply to all other articles in orthodox periodicals, involving the same idea. My method of writing the above work, is by question and answer, and I will insert it in this way, giving the extract from the answer to the question, "What is the standard of judgment in regard to Christian character in the True Spiritual Church of God?" If this extract will in any way subserve the interest of truth at this peculiar crisis in the church, you are welcome to it.

Yours truly,  
E. HALL.

Extract.—"We are now prepared to notice more definitely the struggle which must come between a mere Orthodox Christianity and a Practical Christianity. Many who are denounced as Infidel, have got hold of the latter, and the so-called 'Orthodox'

Church,' fearing, lest in freely admitting the practical, they will do great dishonor to the theoretical, or what they regard the 'Orthodox,' with pretended holy devotion to the Bible, are without discriminating love or not, which does not bow assent to their creed in regard to the plenary inspiration of the Bible, refusing all co-operation with reformers who are infidel to certain portions of the Bible. This is the severe struggle which must precede the glorious millennium. It is a severe struggle to the professors of the Bible, but it must come. God must turn and overturn, until he whose right it is, shall reign from the rivers to the ends of the earth.—Professed Christians little realize the severity of the struggle, and how it will thoroughly sift the professed church.

"We are now prepared to return to the original question, 'What is the proper standard of judgment in regard to Christian character?' A more important question cannot be proposed than this. It is a question which is shaking society from its centre to its circumference. The professed church generally believe that we should require assent to the Bible as all a supernatural revelation from God. Their conduct affirms, in unequivocal language, that even a believer in the partial inspiration of the Bible, cannot be a Christian. Now what shall we say in regard to such an important assumption? Is it true, or is it false?

"Is a belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible an adequate test of Christian character?—Neither the Bible itself, nor the experience of the professed church, will allow this test as adequate. A perfect creed is an inadequate test of Christian character, for a man may have perfect knowledge, and not practice according to his knowledge. 'He may know his Lord's will and do it not.' A creed is not a correct criterion of Christian character.—Hence, a belief in the Bible cannot be such a criterion, and if this is true, it follows that a disbelief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible cannot be a negative test, or an evidence that a man is not a Christian, for a creed is no test of character one way or the other.

"I am aware that the position which I have given, that a belief in the Bible is not an adequate test of Christian character is somewhat startling in the eyes of the professed church, and the conclusion will at once be drawn by many honest minds, that I am fast tending towards infidelity, and will soon be there. But the position is too obvious for me to be frightened by such suppositions. The falsely called 'Orthodoxy' of the church may force upon me such a position, contrary to their religious instructions, but when practical and not theoretical Christianity is before the mind, all will judge by a different standard. Now, what is that standard?

"Will it be a love of Christ as he is revealed to us in the New Testament in his different relations? This will be only another expression of our love to God, or in other words, it is love to God, brought down to our sensual, finite comprehension. It is love to God made flesh, and dwelling among us as a perfect man. In the revelation of Christ was then so much of the Deity revealed, as we, in our sensual state, can comprehend in the form of man, or a man having the nature of God. We should be able to give an intelligent reason why we love Christ, which is this, because we love a perfect human character, or a character endowed with divinity. Such was Christ, and in this sense only do we love God, for I have shown it is impossible to love an Infinite Spirit independent of the human, for in so doing we would rise above the nature with which God has endowed us, which is absurd. While we are men, we must love as men, and not as Gods. We can no more love infinitely than we can conceive of it, and it is self-evident that the latter is impossible, and also, that our love can not go farther than the intelligence. Therefore to love God as an Infinite being is impossible; we must love him as a perfect man, or not at all. This is the intelligent reason why Christ was revealed to us, namely, because we can apprehend God in no other way. Theologians often speak of Christ as possessed of two natures, human and divine. This is true in a certain sense, namely, the divine nature was encased in a human temperament. But the whole of the Deity was not revealed through Christ to man, for this could not be done through a human, finite and sensual body. The Infinite cannot be revealed through the finite.—This is a first truth of reason and cannot be denied. We can love the human in Christ in the sense of personality, but we cannot love the divine in the same sense. We can love so much of the divine, as is revealed in the human, but this is not loving God abstractly, or as an independent person, all spirituality. Loving Christ is nothing more than most rationally loving man. In this sense is Christ the Son of God. He is his offspring or an emanation of the Deity. He is the mediator or medium through which man may know God in a limited and finite sense, or in the only and most appropriate sense in which God may reveal his character to man. Christ and God are equal in the sense of human comprehension, that is, the human mind can comprehend no higher God than a perfect man. What is it then to love Christ? Answer: to love man directly and God indirectly, that is, by loving man. In loving Christ we love God, in loving Christ we love man, and hence enforce our love to God. In the same sense we love the Christ-like in man. What is it to be Christ-like? Answer: to love man as Christ did, to be obedient to those truths which grow out of the relations of man to man as he was. It is in this sense that we conform to Christ, partaking of his spirit, following his example in different respects, or in conforming to different relations. It is doing good to man, thus showing our love to Christ. In this sense Christianity is plain, lovely, and forcible, commending itself to every man's reason and conscience. In this sense our love to Christ is not a mystical love, but purely and strictly human as it must be because of our human natures; and so far as this human love exists, so far do we partake of the divine nature, growing into the image of God, from one degree of glory to another, 'until we come to the stature of perfect men (not gods) in Christ Jesus.'"

"Question. But did not Christ make a belief in him a test of Christian character, that is, a belief in him as the long promised Messiah; and did he not therefore make a creed after all?"

"Answer. He did not regard this a test any more than it is proved to be an adequate test, did not his example prove it, his deeds of charity, whether miraculous or not, in short, his self-sacrifice for the sake of humanity? Did he not go about doing good, healing all manner of diseases, giving sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf,—causing the maimed to walk? Was he not intimate with the poor and the outcast? Did he not sympathize with the afflicted? 'Jesus wept.' He raised the dead of the poor widow. Did he not expose the hypocrisies of the day? Were not his instructions pure and holy by being adapted to the wants of man? In short, did not all his teachings, his miracles, and his whole example, show that his whole life was spent for humanity? How then did he prove that he was the true Messiah? By his philanthropy.—'If ye believe not on me,' said he, 'believe my works, for they testify of me, and prove from whom I came.' A belief in Christ, therefore, was a test of Christian character, just so far as it tasted a love to man and no further. Christ was a perfect exhibition of love, and there was abundant proof of it, which the Jews might have seen, if it had not been for their Jewish orthodoxy, which blinded their minds. Christ only asked to believe in his exhibitions of love, as proof of his divinity, which they could not do without love in their own souls, and being influenced by misanthropy and hate of Christ, because he cut at the root, and exposed their self-love and hypocrisy, they could not see him as the true and lovely Messiah. We may say then that this test was very appropriate and searching. It was the same test, only differently expressed, that Christ presented to Peter.—Simon Barjonah, lovest thou me? Christ was so unpoplar at that time and such was his philanthropic character that no one could believe him without loving him. A man lost his reputation, and endangered his life by avowing such a belief. Therefore, nothing but love could call forth such a belief or confession. It was an overflowing love and attachment in Peter that called forth this expression, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' and how appropriate was the answer, 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but the Spirit of my Father,' which is love.

"It is in this sense that a belief in Christ is a test, not, which is a satisfactory resting upon Christ as a perfect exhibition of love, which cleanseth from all sin.' It is a resting on Christ as a perfect exhibition of philanthropy, and hence an example which the Christian should follow. It is a belief in Christ as a Saviour, love? In this sense, that by partaking of his spirit and following perfectly his example of self-denying love, we are necessarily saved from all sin. How can we believe any thing short of this if we regard him as an adequate Saviour? It is not a theoretical, blind, indefinable, but a rational, practical belief, prompted by love, or in the words of the apostle, it is 'that faith which works by love and purifies the heart.'

"But such a belief in Christ is not a creed in the common or theological conception of the term, which latter is a belief in the Divinity of Christ, man defining what this expression means. Namely, the love of Christ, for God is love.' The divinity of Christ therefore means, the essence of the Deity which is love revealed through Christ to man. In the 'Orthodox' acceptance it is a theological dogma, to which the intelligence must assent as a mere article of belief, without at all affecting the heart. Now I say boldly, that such a belief is no proper test of Christian Character. A faith which works by love is the only adequate test, not faith in the theoretical or theological Christ, but a faith in love as Christ was love.

"But although such a belief is an adequate test of Christian character, there are many corruptions, 'theological' and 'orthodox,' of this belief, confounding the true belief or Bible meaning, that becomes necessary in the higher and more spiritual development of the true church to reject the term belief and substitute in its place love. When Christ was upon earth, so much Scripture was there in regard to his coming, that no man could believe in the fact of his coming influenced by such evidences as I have given, without loving him, and then a belief was a test of a higher standard of love. A belief was then a test in the same sense that philanthropic acts are a test now of the love of Christ, which is a love of God. Instead of a belief in Christ as the Messiah, God has by his spirit and providence, substituted love to Christ as a pattern of love to man, and through man to God."

From the above extract, the Christian public may understand my views of Christianity. I am aware that the reasoning is somewhat metaphysical, perhaps too much so to suit some minds. But I am convinced that the great question of the age and of the church, what is it to confess Christ, and what is it to deny him? must be met in an analytic and philosophic way. To any intelligent mind the conclusion is evident, from my reasoning that true Bible religion is Philanthropy, that by the exercise of this feeling we rationally love Christ and exercise him, and that by loving Christ, we love God. Do we therefore "deny Christ," by "preaching deliverance to the captive," and the "opening of the prison doors to those who are bound," thus fulfilling the mission of Christ to the world? Can we deny Christ in order to free the slave? In trying to free the slave do we not most rationally confess Christ? How can we love Christ more effectually, than by loving those who are bound, as bound with them? Will the Rev. Mr. Boynton of Cincinnati, and Professor Cowles of Oberlin, please answer these plain and simple questions. They have intimated that Mr. Garrison and others of his views, are denying Christ, and are calling to the churches, to leave of such false teachers "who are coming to us in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." Such is a severe charge and should be well sustained before given. They have not proved that such men "do deny Christ" in their exertions to free the slave. They have not explained what it means to deny Christ. I wish they would be more definite, and first prove the severe charge, before they make it, and if they prove conclusively from the Bible that the charge is well founded, if they will prove that they are not following out the very mission of Christ; but rather a mission of the devil, as their charge intimates, then will they wield a most powerful weapon of truth against such enemies from the official registers. But they must not deal in

mere speculations on such vital points. I desire them to thoroughly sift my reasonings which have brought me to the conclusion that such philanthropy as is exhibited in freeing the slave, instead of denying Christ, is confessing him. I suppose this to be Bible doctrine. What say you my dear brother in the ministry, am I heretical on this point? If I am, then set me right, and thus will you confer a lasting benefit upon the church, for this heretical, philanthropic theology, although not clearly and scientifically developed, is fast spreading and is threatening a storm upon the "Orthodox church," never even faintly realized before in the history of the church. "Come then let us reason together."—Who of us is right in Bible theology, you or I? If I am an Infidel along with the rest, as the Christian brethren, show me my error before it is too late.  
E. HALL.

## CONCEDING TOO MUCH.

MR. EDITOR: In your Paper of July 30th, in commenting upon certain remarks of the Oberlin Evangelist, in regard to the co-operation of Anti-Slavery Christians with Infidels, you make concessions I find myself unable to endorse. You express a willingness to refrain from uttering, on certain occasions, your stern convictions, in order to conciliate a certain class of persons, whose help, in a certain direction, you need, and hope thereby to secure. That many, (perhaps most) of the wisest heads, and truest and bravest hearts that are to be found among the noble band of Reformers, whose efforts are fast securing the world's salvation, are willing to make the same concessions, may be true. So completely interwoven are bigotry and intolerance, with almost all with which we have to do, that we habitually, and almost unconsciously, yield them a degree of respect, and look upon their exhibitions as a matter of course. That compromise is as baneful in its effects, as it is fatal in its promises, is, seemingly, the hardest lesson Reformers have to learn. It is only a few of the most efficient and true, who have learned it. And even these, it seems, cherish the idea that the dishonest and ligoted—such as deny to their (so-called) fellow workers, the freedom they claim for themselves—who are "ready to sacrifice the slave to their theological opinions," must be humped and conciliated, for the sake of their help in saving the world. It will not pay. In our effort to save the world, and serve the cause of Truth, we may refrain from uttering truths which those we address are not prepared to appreciate or understand, but we are not to be of any service, must be such as are not to be hurt or frightened by the utterance of any truth,—must be such as are prepared to encounter, calmly, philosophically and heroically, whatever may come in their way.

Show me a man who is afraid to concede to all freedom of speech, and I will show you a man for whom help in the work of Reform, or the world's salvation, I would not give a fig. Let every abolitionist, as he steps upon the anti-slavery platform, fearlessly utter what he deems appropriate to the occasion, and what he believes the interests of the cause of the slave demand; and if the Editors of the Oberlin Evangelist and Christian Press, will not stay upon this platform, let them get off from the platform,—the cause of Truth and the Slave, demands their absence. Reformers will, ere long, fully learn, what they have already begun to learn, that from such the cause of Reform has little to hope. Joseph Barker has well and truly said, that Reform and Infidelity have come to be nearly synonymous terms. It is, that the reforms of every age, have been carried forward by those who have been reckoned infidels, by the religionists of their time. It is also true, that the latter, instead of co-operating with the former, have ever thrown stumbling blocks in their way. Let Reformers take timely notice of this, and govern themselves accordingly; and thus save themselves from the disappointment to which they are otherwise doomed.

FRANCIS BARRY.

SHORTNESS OF LIFE AMONG NEGRO CATCHERS.—A letter from Hon. John Jay, of New York, to the Committee of Investigation at the celebration of the West India Emancipation, at Washington, contains the following impressive paragraph:

In recalling one of those cases, (under the fugitive slave law) that of Henry Long, which was entered for some three weeks—I am solemnly impressed with the realities of life as compared with the shadowy vanities of the passing hour.—Of all those who were so eager to deprive Long of his liberty, how few survive. Mr. Gardner, the Clerk who appointed the pseudo Commissioner who issued the warrant, and was so active in his support; Mr. Western, the counsel for the claimant, who was rewarded for his zeal by a service of plate; Mr. Griffin of the Safety Committee, who assisted to retain Mr. Wood as assistant counsel against my poor client, and Judge Johnson, who surrendered him as a slave, in utter defiance, we believe, of the law and the evidence, and without venturing to allude, in his elaborate decision, to one great point of the defence, that my associate, Mr. White, was forced with such convincing argument, that the Bench and the Bar, as I believe, felt it to be impracticable to resist, after their brief triumph over the helpless negro, have been themselves summoned in turn, by Death, relentless as a Marshall, to the bar of Heaven's chancery, to be judged by that higher law so scoffed at here. Let us hope that they have met—I will not say with more justice—but with more mercy than they showed to Long.

ENFORCING THE BLACK LAWS.—Indiana, like Illinois, has her black laws—a proper name, we think—though they are not of quite so dignified a character as ours. The constitution of that State provides that any person who may employ, or otherwise encourage any negro or mulatto coming into the State, shall be fined, the sum not to be less than ten nor more than five hundred dollars. Under this clause a case has arisen, which not only excites a great deal of interest, but causes the constitution in this particular to be executed throughout the State. It appears that Rev. Calvin W. Ketcher, one of the oldest presiding elders of the Methodist Church, and a man who stands spotless before the world, lately employed a colored preacher from Louisville to preach to his colored brethren in Louisville. This being a clear violation of the constitution and laws of Indiana, it is said the Reverend Elder will be indicted at the next term of the Jefferson Circuit Court, and brought before a jury of his country to answer for this violation of law.—Chicago Tribune.

The difference between those whom the world esteems as good, and those whom it condemns as bad is in many cases that the former have been better sheltered from temptation.