A CONTEMPLATED NEGRO INSURRECTION AT COLUMBUS, TEXAS.

The *Galveston News* of the 11th inst., has a letter giving the particulars of an intended insurrection of the slaves in Texas. Colorado county, where the letter was written, is on a river of the same name adjoining Austin which is the Capital of the State:

COLUMBUS, Colorado County, September 9, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: The object of this communication is to state to you all the facts of any importance connected with a recent intended insurrection.

Our suspicions were aroused about two weeks ago, when a meeting of the citizens of the County was called, and a Committee of investigation appointed to ferret out the whole matter, and lay the facts before the people of the Country for their consideration. The Committee entered upon their duties, and in a short time they were in full possession of the facts of a well-organised and systematized plan for the murder of our entire white population, with the exception of the young ladies, who were to be taken captives and made the wives of the diabolical murderers of their parents and friends. The committee found in their possession a number of pistols, bowie-knives, guns and ammunition. Their passwords of organization were adopted, and their motto, "Leave not a shadow behind."

Last Saturday, the 6th inst., was the time agreed upon for the execution of their damning designs. At a late hour at night all were to make one simultaneous desperate effort, with from two to ten apportioned to nearly every house in the county, kill all the whites, save the above exception, plunder their homes, take their horses and arms, and fight their way to a "free State" (Mexico).

Notwithstanding the intense excitement which moved every member of our community, and the desperate measures to which men are liable to be led on by such impending danger to which we had been exposed by our indulgence and lenity to our slaves, we must say the people acted with more caution and deliberation than ever before characterized the action of any people under similar circumstances.

More than two hundred negroes had violated the law, the penalty of which is death. But by unanimous consent the law was witheld and their lives spared, with the exception of three of the ringleaders, who were on last Friday, the 5th inst. at two o'clock, P. M., hung in compliance with the unanimous voice of the citizens of the county.

Without exception, every Mexican in the county was implicated. They were arrested and ordered to leave the County within five days, and never again to return under the penalty of death. There is one, however, by the name of Frank, who is proven to be one of the prime movers of the affair, that was not arrested, but we hope that he may yet be, and have meted out to him such reward as his black deed demands.

We are satisfied that the lower class of the Mexican population are incendiaries in any country where slaves are held, and should be dealt with accordingly. And, for the benefit of the Mexican population, we would here state that a resolution was passed by the unanimous voice of the County, forever forbidding any Mexican from coming within the limts of the county.

Peace, quiet and good order are again restored, and by the watchful care of our Vigilance Committee, a well organized patrol, and good discipline among our planters, we are persuaded that there will never again occur the necessity of a communication of the character of this.

Yours, respectfully,
JOHN H. ROBSON,
H. A. TATUM,
J. H. HICKS,
Corresponding Committee.

The Galveston News of the 4th instant has the following paragraph. We shall hear probably of many similar acts as whipping the of these slaves to death:

"We learn, from the Columbia Planter of the 9th, that two of the negroes engaged in the insurrection at Columbus were whipped to death; three more were hung last Friday, and the Mexicans who were implicated were ordered to leave the country. There was no proof against these last beyond surmises. The band had a deposit of arms and ammunition in the bottom. They had quite a number of guns, and a large lot of knives, manufactured by one of their number. It was their intention to fight their way to Mexico."

The intelligence is thus confirmed by another paper. The True Issue of the 5th.

"We noticed last week the rumour that a large number of slaves of Colorado County had combined and armed themselves for the purpose of fighting their way into Mexico. Developments have since been made of a much more serious nature than our information then indicated. It is ascertained that a secret combination had been found, embracing most of the negroes of the County, for the purpose of not only fleeing to Mexico, but of murdering the inhabitants, men, women and children promiscuously. To carry out their hellish purposes, they had organized into companies of various sizes, had adopted secret signs and pass-words, sworn never to divulge the plot under the penalty of death, and had elected capcains and subordinate officers to command the respective companies. They had provided themselves with some fire arms and home-made bowie-knives, and had appointed the time for a simultaneous movement. Some two hundred, we learn, have been severely punished under the lash, and several are now in jail awaiting the more serious punishment of death, which is to be inflicted to day. One of the principal instigators of the movement is a free negro or one who had been permitted to control his own time as a free man.

LETTER FROM MR. NUTE.

The Boston Evening Transcript, of Wednesday lays before its readers the following letter from the Rev Mr. Nute, which has just been recieved by the Rev. Dr. Miles, Secretary of the American Unitarian Association. It will be read with painful and thrilling interest.

LAWRENCE, Kansas, Sep. 11, 1856.

REV. DR. MILES—*Dear Friend*: I am yet alive, to the disappointment of friends and foes, and once more out of the hands of the latter. But I have had a hard time of it. Two weeks of harassing captivity, with wearing exposures, have nearly broken me down in health. A few days will, I hope, set me up again, when I will try to give a full account of that fortnight's experience, and make public some of the facts which I have learned thereby of the plans and doings of the enemies to Freedom and of God.

An account of our capture and treatment for the first 24 hours has probably been given you by those of the party who were bound East, and who were permitted to go down the river.

After that time we endured brutality that will hardly seem credible to those who live among civilized people. I think it will be difficult to find a parallel to this case in all the annals of civil war taking all the circumstances into account—the brutal murder of our brother—the heartless conduct toward the distressed widow—the cool open murder of the young man who attended us—the mockery of proclaiming us free to go to our friends, and the insulting and violent re-arrest on the levee planned so as to leave the widow without any protection—our confinement in a close, crowded, filthy dungeon, after the tenth pay of our imprisonment, when I was too ill to stand up, with other cruel deceits and blood-thirsty threats, so that on three occasions, I had every reason to suppose that my last hour had come. But I have no heart or strength to finish the sentence now, or to give you anything more than a hint of what I have passed through since I last wrote to you. It will be painful for me to go back to the beginning, and give the history of this affair; and it is no mere personal consideration that can move me to undertake the detail.

And what is it all to the whole sum of outrage and barbarity that has been inflicted on my distressed people, and all over this Territory during the past month? Let no one talk of the exaggeration of these outrages any longer. No one can over-rate the distress which has followed them. There is much of it that can never be made public—the butcheries of men of which there were no witnesses but God and the cowardlyly perpetrators—the sleepless terror of defenseless women and children, whose neighbors have been murdered or driven from burning homes, and those yet more unhappy ones whose husbands and fathers have gone out to be heard from no more, or the tidings of whose savage butchery has come back to them.

It is estimated that over sixty families have been turned out of home. Many of them have had their all destroyed or plundered. Of the number killed we have as yet no definite estimate. Six persons with whom I was personally acquainted,—and three of them intimate and dear friends,—have been butchered.

But we have again conquered, though at a terrible cost. If it seal the final victory of our cause, it will be an ample satisfaction to us who have suffered only in our own persons and in the spoiling of our goods, and the best consolation to those who have lost their friends in the contest.

Will it not be a crying shame to the confessors to Freedom and Right in the States, if this work of blood and rapine is not stopped, and that very speedily?

Yours, yet in good hope,
E. NUTE, JR.

P. S. Unless aid is sent out, there must be much distress here during the coming winter.

Warm clothing, blankets and other bedding will be needed by many from whom every thing of the kind has been plundered. E. N.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, OCTOBER 4, 1856.

"THE HENRY CLAY PLATFORM."

In the National Era of the 25th ult., we find the following paragraph. We will not say that Dr. Bailey wrote it, lest we should be found blundering. It is however under the editorial head and leaded:

"We notice that in a resolution passed at a Convention of Garrison Abolitionists at the West, it is said that Dr. Bailey had declared, in the *Era* of August 21st, that "the Republican platform is the Henry Clay platform." Such a declaration was never made by us. It may have appeared from another pen, during our absence from Washington. recently.

We are not in the habit of bolstering up platforms or parties with great names. It is perfectly immaterial whether Henry Clay or Thomas Jefferson would sanction the Republican platform, so long as it is true and sufficient for the exigency.

We presume the "Garrison Convention" referred to is the late Anniversary of the Western Anti-Slavery Society; and the "resolution," the following, adopted at that meeting:

"Whereas, We recognize the truth of Dr. Bailey's assertion in the *National Era*, of August 21st, that "the Republican is a Henry Clay Platform," therefore

"Resolved, That we recommend to all politicians who are in the least tinctured with Anti-Slavery, to peruse the articles written some ten years since by Dr. Bailey and other prominent men in the Liberty party, proving most conclusively that for Abolitionists to support the Henry Clay Platform, would be a practical denial of their principles, and that it would be far better to incur the charge of electing Polk and annexing Texas than to support a platform which the *Era* now declares to be identical with the platform of the Republican party."

Supposing Dr. Bailey to have written the editorial paragraph quoted above, he denies that he ever asserted that "the Republican Platform is a Henry Clay Platform" and seems by his manner of speaking to suggest to his readers a doubt as to whether the *Era* had ever given any occasion for such an assertion. "*It may* have appeared from another pen, during our absence" says the Dr., as though he was in doubt whether it had ever so appeared. This attempt to throw dust in the eyes of his readers is altogether unworthy of Dr. Bailey. He certainly has sufficient regard to his reputation as an editor and to the interests of his party to know *what pen* is employed to write editorials in his absence, and to ascertain what is written after its publication, especially when his attention is called to a specific article. The truth is, the resolution puts the inconsistency of Dr. Bailey's past and present positions in rather too clear a point of light, and a little bewilderment of onlookers is in such cases sometimes the most convenient method of escape.

Dr. Bailey never put forth his energies more wisely, vigorously and successfully for anti-slavery than in opposing the election of Henry Clay when he was a candidate on the very non-extension principle of the Fremont platform. And we most heartily report the recommendation of the resolution published above, "to all politicians who are in the least tinctured with anti-slavery, to peruse Dr. Bailey's articles" written during the Clay and Polk contest.

But has there anything appeared in the Era to justify the statements of the resolution? Dr. Bailey is the responsible editor of the Era, of course whatever appears in leaded type, under the editorial head of that paper is understood to be from his pen unless some indications be given to the contrary. Such a statement did so appear, and without any indications that the editor was not its author. The writer of the resolution was therefore justified in supposing that Dr. Bailey was its author. None of the readers of the Era had any right to make any other supposition.

In the third editorial column of the Era for August 21st, is the article (in editorial type) headed and commencing as follows:

THE REPUBLICANISM OF HENRY CLAY.

"We defy any man North or South, to read the following extracts from Mr. Clay's speeches, and reconcile them with the ground taken in the Buchanan or Fillmore Platforms; *and we challenge them to point out any disagreement between these views of Mr. Clay and those of the Republican party, as embraced in their platform*, and in the letter of Col. Fremont, accepting the nomination.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM IS A HENRY CLAY PLATFORM. In proof of this proposition we select the following passages from Colton's "Last Seven Year's of the Life of Henry Clay."

Then follows a half column of extracts from Clay's speeches "in proof of this proposition." In justice to this unknown writer of editorials in the Era, we must say that his proof, beyond all controversy, establishes his proposition. But of this our readers can judge for themselves, as we append the whole article as it stands in the Era. This proof is such that Dr. Bailey though denying the authorship of the proposition, does not attempt to deny its truthfulness.

It is therefore still true that the *Era* asserts and proves that the "Republican platform is a Henry Clay platform" and Dr. Bailey is unrelieved from important charge of the resolution, until he disavows the proposition and the whole article proving it. To say he did not write the article, or that it is not in accordance with his taste is but trifling or worse. The question is, is the Republican position on the question of slavery extension substantially the same as that of Henry Clay in 1844. Did the Era oppose the Henry Clay Platform then as altogether below the demands of the anti-slavery cause as insufficient for the exigency, and does it adopt and defend it now as altogether "sufficient?"

But Dr. Bailey says, in a spirit of rare independence, "We are not in the habit of bolstering up platforms and parties with great names."—Perhaps not. But the party cannot say as much; not that we charge this upon it as an offence either against good morals or good policy but simply state it as a fact. The most effective instrumentality which the Republicans use in this canvass, is precisely this which the Era pronounces "immaterial." Even the platform of the Republicans, proposes as its alpha and omega, "to bring the Government back to the principles of Jefferson and Washington." Certainly it cannot "be immaterial" whether "those great names" would sanction the platform or not. On no other topic have the stumpers and campaign papers let themselves out with such vigor and success as in proving to old hunker whigs that Republican abolitionism is nothing but the soul of the old whig party, which having left its decayed habitation now inspires with life the new Republican body—and also in proving to Democrats, that Republican "fanaticism" and "Disunion," is only the embodiment of old democratic Anti-slavery as woven into the resolutions of the Democrats of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. And though Dr. Bailey "is not in the habit of using such arguments," yet the Cincinnati and Pittsburgh Gazettes, the Cleveland Leader, the Boston Telegraph and the New York Post and Tribune, do use them with great zeal and efficiency. With such effect indeed as to convince, and for once to silence the "growling, complaining, fault-finding disunion abolitionists," and force them to acknowledge the truth of this Republican doctrine.

But strange to say, when these "impracticables," acknowledge themselves, for once, convinced, the republicans recieve their acknowledgement and proffered aid with a very ill grace and are almost ready to deny and repudiate this grand truth they have established, rather than be found in such company. These abolitionists they cannot consort with, while their party arms are wide open for the embrace of slaveholders.

The following is the article on authority of which the Resolution of the anti-slavery society was based. What appeared as editorial in the Era we have leaded so that it it appears entire, and in the same form in which it made its original appearance.

From the National Era, Aug. 21.

THE REPUBLICANISM OF HENRY CLAY.

"We defy any man, North or South, to read the following extracts from Mr. Clay's speeches, and reconcile them with the ground taken in the Buchanan or Fillmore Platforms; and we challenge them to point out any disagreement between these views of Mr. Clay and those of the Republican Party, as embraced in their Platform, and in the letter of Col. Fremont, accepting the nomination.

"The Republican Platform is a Henry Clay Platform. In proof of this proposition, we select the following passages from Colton's "Last Seven Years of the Life of Henry Clay:"

"Sir," said Mr. Clay, "I have said that I never could vote for it, and I repeat that I never can and never will vote for it; and no earthly power shall ever make me vote to plant Slavery where Slavery does not exist."—*Page* 318.

"And now, sir," said Mr. Clay, on another occasion, "coming from a slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say, that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of Slavery, where it had not before existed, either South or North of that line," (the line of 36° 30′.)—*Page* 355.

"I shall not enlarge," said Mr. Clay, "on the opinion which I have already announced to the Senate as being held by me, (to wit: that Slavery had been abolished in Mexico, and consequently did not exist in the territory acquired from Mexico by the United States.) My opinion of the variety of forms in which legislation can take place—that is to say, by the edict of a Dictator, by the Constitution of the people of Mexico, and by the test of the legislative authority of Mexico—by all these modes of legislation, my opinion is, that Slavery has been abolished there."—*Page* 364. Again: "I cannot agree to an amendment (of the Territorial bill for New Nexico) which, in point of fact, assumes that Slavery has an existence there at this time, and which assumes, in point of law, that under the Constitution of the United States, there is a right to carry slaves there. I cannot vote for either proposition."—*Page* 370. Again: "Why," said Mr. Clay, "these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them there is Slavery, and in fifteen of them Slavery does not exist. Well, how can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carry into the ceded Territory their institution of Slavery, any more than it can be argued, on the other side, that, by the operation of the same Constitution, the fifteen free States carry into the ceded Territory, the principle of Freedom.

"Can you come to any other conclusion than that which I understand to be the conclusion of the public law of the world, of reason, and of justice, that the status of law, as it existed in the moment of conquest or acquisition, remains until it is altered by the conquering or acquiring power?" *Page* 138.

Again: "There are gentlemen," said Mr. Clay, "who maintain that, by virtue of the Constitution the right to carry slaves south of that line (36° 30′) already exists. If I had not heard that opinion avowed, I should have regarded it as one of the most extraordinary assumptions, and the most indefensible position that was ever taken by man. The Constitution neither created nor does it continue Slavery. Slavery existed independent of the Constitution; and it was dependent, not upon the will of Congress, but upon the laws of the respective States. The Constitution is silent and passive upon the subject of the institution of Slavery: or, rather, it deals with the fact as it exists in the States, without having created it, or continued it, or being responsible for it in the slightest degree. * * * If slaves are voluntarily carried into such a jurisdiction, (where Slavery does not exist,) their chains instantly drop off, and they become free, emancipated, liberated from their bondage. * * * If the Constitution possesses the paramount authority attributed to it (that is, to protect Slavery in the Territories,) the laws even of the free States of the Union would yield to that paramount authority. * * * You cannot put your finger on the part of the Constitution which conveys the right or the power to carry slaves from one of the States of the Union to any Territory of the United States."—*Page* 175. Again: "I cannot agree that, under, the Constitution of the United States, there is a right to carry slaves into New Mexico."—*Page* 190. Again: "And now, sir, for the first time after the three great acquisitions of Texas, Florida, and Louisiana, have been made, and have redounded to the benefit of the South—now, for the first time, when three Territories (California, Utah, and New Mexico) are attempted to be introduced without the institution of Slavery I put it to the hearts of my countrymen of the South, if it is right to press matters to the disastrous consequences which have been indicated no longer ago than this very morning—even extending to a dissolution of the Union? Mr. President, I cannot believe it."—*Page* 342.

DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONEERING.—Here is a specimen from the *Patriot* of New Lisbon, Ohio:

"Keep it before the people that JOHN A. BINGHAM thinks a nigger as good as a white man, and will try to promote their equality by legislation."

We hope the Patriot speaks the truth this time. If it does, Mr. Bingham only proves that he remembers the lessons taught by Jefferson, Franklin and others who have sent down to us their Declaration of Independence.

FRANCIS P. BLAIR.

At a Buchanan meeting lately held in the neighborhood of Mr. Blair in Maryland, special occasion was taken to offer him indignity in consequence of his connection with the Republican party. In reply to this Mr. Blair has addressed a long letter "to his neighbors," from which we make the following extract, which we have no doubt presents him as he is, an enterprising benevolent man, but benighted by his education and connection with Slavery and the government so as on the whole to think it right for him to be a slaveholder and a "sincere opponent of sweeping abolition." We have no doubt but as he says, "his strongest sympathies are with the laboring *white* man," and that he sees and deplores the influence of Slavery upon the white man and is therefore sincerely and heartily enlisted in the Republican movement, to prevent the extension of Slave labor. Nor have we any doubt that he is equally sincere in his declaration that to call the Republican party an abolition party "is an audacious libel" and "that he looks to the action of the Republican party, as a security to the institution in the States where it now exists."

Mr. Blair's character and views are of importance to the community, because more than any other quiet gentleman his hand moves the Republican machinery, and if the party is successful, he will doubtless be one of its leading executives.

We can therefore hope for nothing better from the party in power, than may be warranted by the opinions of this, its distinguished supporter. And in the paragraphs below he presents himself in his most amiable attitude towards the question of universal freedom. His neighbors who know him best, know that his "declarations against sweeping abolition are sincere." They know that he is the owner of slaves and they know also as do others that the party he sustains is resolved to protect him and all others in the Slave States in continuing to hold them. The virtues therefore of Mr. Blair's private character, his invaluable services to his neighborhood; and the sterling virtues of many anti-slavery men out of Maryland cannot save the slaveholding purpose of that party from just condemnation by all thorough, consistent abolitionists.

We have room this week only for the following extract from the close of the letter which as we think presents most correctly as well as "sincerely" the purpose and influence of the Republican organization:

Another pretence for dissolution of the Union urged by Mr. Brooks and his compatriots, is the assumption that the Republican party is an abolition party. *This is an audacious libel.* The Republican party put out its manifesto at its inauguration at Pittsburg. *It abjures the idea of intermeddling with slavery where it exists, or interfering with it in any State which may hereafter establish it.* It insists only on the right of Congress to legislate on the subject in the territories—a right exerted under the confederacy, recognised and established by the constitution, and effectuated by the acts of Congress, from the foundation of the government to the present hour, in the formation of every territory into an embryo state. The partizans in the Senate of that mockery of all law, squatter sovereignty, admitted the principle at the last session, in their pitiful attempt to mitigate the atrocity of Atchison's despotic laws making it felony to question slavery in Kansas.

I was at Pittsburgh—was a member of the committee which embodied in form the principles on which the Republicans of the Union installed their organization. It was designed to oppose the phalanx of nullifiers, wielding the Executive power to overthrow the most solemn compacts made between the states—to destroy the principles of the Constitution, and to found an oligarchy based on slavery in their stead. I CAN SAFELY AFFIRM THAT THERE WAS NOT ONE IN THAT CONVENTION WHO LOOKED TO ITS ACTION AS A MEANS OF ABOLISHING SLAVERY IN THE SLAVE STATES. *On the contrary, they looked to its action, in restoring the pacification which bound the states together,* AS A SECURITY TO THE INSTITUTION IN THE STATES WHERE IT EXISTS. Every man must now see that pacification and the preservation of the Union is its only security. It is well known that civil war, in a nation where slavery exists, liberates the slaves. The civil wars of Marius and Scylla liberated the slaves in Italy. The civil war in Mexico and of the South American republics, abolished it within them. The states invaded by Bolivar offered freedom to all the slaves who would join the ranks to oppose him. Bolivar on his part proclaimed universal emancipation to recruit his ranks. History records the result.

As a member of the Republican Convention, I can say with confidence that, to the prevalent sense of that body, NOTHING COULD BE MORE REVOLTING *than the general manumission of the slaves in the South, and putting them on a level with the white race.*

The liberation of the blacks, under existing circumstances, is known to be impossible—that it would be ruinous to their owners—a great evil to all others of the white race, and fatal to the negroes, who would perish under the intelligence and energy of a superior race, as the Narragansetts, Pequods and Mohicans perished under it in another quarter. Humanity for the incapable race forbids the experiment, and justice to both classes of the superior one requires that they should be saved from the hazards of the struggle it would provoke.

How the question of slavery is, in the tract of time, to be disposed of, depends on the will of the government of the states having it in charge. Nature's code, written in the heart, will, with the progress of Christianity and civilization, work out a happy result. It may gradually go out southward, and an improved race of blacks appear as a colony of our country within the tropics of South America. Amalgamation or equality with our race in the same goverment is impossible.

My neighbors know that my declarations against sweeping abolition are sincere. They know that I own slaves, some inherited and some that have begged their way into my house from the slave-pen; and while they know that my course in submitting to this encumberance is characterized by humanity, they have proof in my conduct, that so far from using it to degrade my own flesh and blood in the persons of those who toil with their hands for a living, and to bring them to the condition which the *democracy*, speaking through the Richmond press, would assign them, that my best efforts have been to counteract this tendency of the system. My strongest sympathies are for the laboring white man. Under this feeling, and believing it the best mode of gradually superceding slavery in the cultivation of the soil, I have employed free labor for the most part in my farming and with the happiest consequences.

Of the neighbors whom I employed to assist me in opening and in the cultivation and improvement of my farm, ten, who held no land, now possess little farms and comfortable homesteads of their own in fee simple. If instead of free labor, I had purchased and employed negroes in my cultivation, I might have added from the profits, all those homesteads to my own domain and exhibited a wide-spread scene of wasting African agriculture. Now the whole neighborhood is dotted with neat and thriving farms and cottages, and the land which sold for ten, fifteen and twenty dollars an acre when I began to open my farm thirteen years ago, now sells from sixty to one hundred and some times more. I do not mention this to assert my claims on my neighbors. They have done more for me than I for them. I state facts to recommend a system. The general benefit every one admits. One of the orators who came from the city to denounce me under the crown of Old Buck's horns, set up to overlook my precincts, complimented my neighbors on the great improvement of the scene around him, but said, fixing his eyes on my home, that his heart sunk within him, when he reflected that it belong to "an arch traitor," and then it was that he summoned the lightning to blast me.

The system of small tenements and free labor can alone confer beauty and strength on an impoverished region. Even the rich soil of Kentucky, the beautiful luxuriance of which it is almost impossible to destroy, cannot prevent the comparative weakness that awaits a state which turns away free labor, and sends it to build up rival free states in the West. Example will illustrate. I have three relatives in Kentucky, honest, benevolent, most estimable men, who, when I left the state, were farmers on a limited scale. Within twenty years one has bought up ten of the farms around him, another twelve, another fifteen, in the heart of Woodford and Fayette. Handsome edifices, once the homes of families numbering a multitude, scattered over the country, are now occupied as graneries, a small one here and there inhabited by an overseer. The population is gone, the school houses are deserted, the churches have no congregations, and yet the country is beautiful, clothed with grass, covered with herds of the finest cattle, mules, and horses in the world. The corn fields for the support of this quadruped population in the winter, are worked by slaves. The rain and sunshine that makes the grass grow, provides for them in summer as it does in the pampas of South America that create the living wealth of those solitudes. The white population banished by this species of engrossing cultivation have a right to the territories reserved by the compact for free labor. And are not the people further south, who have no hold on the soil there also to be secure of a home somewhere? On a multitude of the great plantations in the South free-labor is entirely dispensed with. They have not only their blacksmith, but their black carpenter, wheelwright, plasterer and painter; and where are all the white mechanics to go? and where are the white laborers who are already driven to the hills to live by hunting, fishing and robbing—as Gov. Hammond, of South Carolina, tells us—where are they to go if slavery in the new territories is to pursue them with the same fate? I hope my neighbors will pardon me when I proclaim it, that my feelings and judgement alike actuate me to fight the battle for the rights of the white cultivator of the soil and the white mechanic, against all who would pursue him into the new territories with the institution which drives them out from those "little communities," at the head of which reigns a master, who, with his fellows, the organs of democracy in the South tell us constitute the state. Your fellow-citizen,

SILVER SPRING, Sept. 17. F. P. BLAIR.

The following from the Canton Repository we give with corrections:

DISUNION MEETING AT ALLIANCE.

Mr. Editor:—As the Slave Democracy are attempting with might and main, to fasten the charge of Disunionism upon the Republican party, and persistently assert, that the Garrisonian Disunionists are an important part of the supporters of Fremont and Dayton, I think the following will set the whole matter right, and show the utter groundlessness of such assertions:

On Wednesday afternoon and evening last, Parker Pillsbury, M. R. Robinson and James Barnaby, all leading Garrisonian Abolitionists, held a meeting at Alliance, and the burden of their song was unmitigated denunciation of Fremont and Dayton and the entire Republican party: 1 Because they are the most substantial friends of the Union. 2 Declaring that no good Abolitionist can consistently vote for them. They expressed a preference for the success of Buchanan. 3 because they think it will soon produce what they desire, viz. A Dissolution of the Union. They said that the Republican Party was the only real *National Union Party*. 4 They denounced Gov. Chase, because in a speech, a short time since, at Salem, he glorified the Union, and expressed a strong desire that it should be preserved—and finally, that it was a disgrace for any Abolitionist to vote for Fremont.

The above facts are well attested: A great many of our best citizens having been present and heard them. Indeed this is precisely the position of Garrison himself. The truth is, the Republican party is the only truly National party now in existence, they being the advocates of Freedom, which is universally conceded to be a National principle, whilst the opposite party are the advocates of the extension of an institution which is conceded by all Northern Democrats to be sectional. How can a party advocating Sectional measures be properly considered a National party? And what effrontery in them to call a party Sectional which advocates principles admitted by their opponents to be truly National? REPUBLICAN.

ALLIANCE, Sept. 22, 1856.

1. The "burden of their song" was denunciation of slavery and slave-holders. Unfortunately, the Republicans have made it necessary to show that they are voluntarily among the number of slave-holders, a work which the speakers did, among other things on this occasion.

2. Not because Republicans are the most substantial friends of the Union, but because they *profess* to be such.

3. We heard no such expression, and for ourself have no such preference. How it may be with the other speakers we do not know.

4. They said that they *claimed* to be such, and they believe that such a claim is disgraceful, while slavery is national under the constitution. If they are so in fact, as this writer claims, it does not help them out of their disgrace. The whole opposition to the party from slave-holders is on the supposition that they are not national in the sense in which they claim to be; but are sectional—that is—against the national support of slavery under the constitution. Any party occupies a disgraceful position which is not sectional in this sense, because any such party is for slavery.

"THEY ASK TO BE LET ALONE."

"The venerable Josiah Randall, of Pennsylvania, who has known all the Presidents," we are told by the Democratic papers, has made a speech in Tammany Hall, and uttered what they call the "eleventh commandment"—that is, to "let the south alone." "All they ask is to be let alone," says the venerable sage. While the south are hesitating at no means to extend the institution of slavery over free territory, "all they ask is to be let alone." When they are marching into free territory, and seizing upon the ballot boxes and driving the free voters from the polls at the point of the bowie knife, and themselves voting instead, without a shadow of right to do do so, "all they ask is to be let alone." When they sack and pillage and burn the houses of quiet, freedom-loving citizens and then murder them, "all they ask is to be let alone." When they beset the highways, and rob and plunder northern emigrants, and send them back whence they came, "all they ask is to be let alone." When, by and by, in fulfillment of a threat often repeated, they attempt to call the roll of their slaves on Bunker Hill, "all they ask is to be let alone."—*Sandusky Register.*

Just so. And to let them alone in the holding of their slaves, while joining with them in the government is just what the *Sandusky Register* and the Republican party proposes to do. Doing this is just what has brought the present outrages of slavery extensionists upon us and such a continual letting alone will continue the evils under which we have labored and degenerated ever since our national Union with slaveholders. The only effectual way of letting them alone is to withhold all governmental and church fellowship from them. A kind of letting alone they do not covet.

SLAVEHOLDING MISSIONARIES.—The Slaveholding Church is now as of old compassing sea and land to make prosselytes, which when made, are "ten fold more the children of Hell than before." We notice that two missionaries one from Kentucky and the other from Tennessee, were recently set apart by the Southern Baptist Church as Missionaries to Africa. Several New York Baptist Doctors of Divinity assisting at the ceremonials with sermon prayer and song, and other demonstrations of Christian fellowship.

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETINGS.

We learn from Mr. and Mrs. Jones, who have just returned from a short lecturing tour with Mr. Pillsbury that they had a large and most interesting meeting at Linesvill, on Saturday and Sunday last. Next Saturday Mr. Pillsbury, with Mr. and Mrs. Griffing, hold a series of meetings in the old Mormon Temple, at Kirtland.

Mr. Jones will furnish an account of their tour for our next paper.

A note from Mrs. Griffing informs us that the meetings held by Mr. and Mrs. Griffing and Mr. Foss, west of the Cuyahoga, were good, beyond their expectations. We extract a paragraph or two from Mrs. G.'s letter.

She says:

"I cannot forbear saying that the idea that it is throwing away labor to hold anti-slavery meetings during the excitement of this political campaign, is a mistake. I think I may say our meetings have been well received, and have shown republicans from their own texts that they were not, as many of them suppose, an anti-slavery party—that the party not only does not propose to abolish slavery, but in fact is "inflexibly" opposed to abolition, if that must endanger the Union. It never was more easy to hold up our standard of "No Union with Slaveholders in Church and State."

"Mr. Foss had occasion to say, at our meeting at Litchfield, that the intelligent men of the Democratic party were *scoundrels*. This was to those of that class present an unbearable application of principle, which produced a spirited discussion.—Our meetings have been well attended, and I much regret that we cannot respond to the demands for many other meetings in the vicinity."

KANSAS.

Kansas, as it seems to us, is now subdued. Governor Geary, has dispersed the invading army of Missourians. This he did by persuasion, and by pledging himself to enforce the laws of the Bogus Legislature, to arrest Lane, if he could, and to punish the Free State men, whom the Ruffians charge with murder, robery and all the other crimes they themselves have perpetrated. He satisfied Atchison, Reed, Capt. Pate, and other ruffian leaders that their work would be done, before their followers separated. To carry out his promises, which are doubtless nothing more nor less than his Washington instructions, he has the United States troops at his disposal and his force still further increased by a new organization of the Kansas Militia, under the command of Titus, who also commanded it under Shannon. This militia is made up in part of the disbanded army of Missourians and the whole is under the control of (U. S.) General Smith. And he is further authorized to call if necessary, upon Illinois and Kentucky each, for a regiment to enforce his measures. What can the little handful of starving, harrasses and robbed Free State men do against such odds but to submit, even if disposed to resist the United States authorities, to which they have always declared they would render obedience. Kansas is *Slave Territory*, and slavery is to be secured there by the laws of the fraudulent legislature, enforced by Gov. Geary, Judge Lecompt and General Smith, with the regular troops, the Kansas Militia and the Illinois and Kentucky regiments. Thus "law and order," are to reign in Kansas. When the next Congress meets lookout for a pro-slavery constitution, got up by some Washington and Missouri "hocus pocus," and for the admission of Kansas into the Union as a Slave State, before Fremont gets seated in the Presidential Chair, even if he shall be elected in November. We dont believe the moral force of his election can prevent this, especially since the Republican party in the House of Representatives has so demoralized itself by voting for Dunn's infamous bill. That act of the majority, will give license to a sufficient number in the house, to carry such a measure, in connection with Americans and Democrats. Kansas we believe is destined to be a slave state, let the election go as it may.

A SLANDERED MAN.—The Fillmorites down South are abusing poor Buchanan for an abolitionist. Of course, in the history of a man who has belonged to all the parties which have existed for the last forty years, there is no difficulty in proving anything either for or against him. Just now the Fillmore slaveholders are keen on his track and anathamatize him because in 1829 he voted to *consider the propriety* of abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia; an object in those days only sought by old fashioned Quakers, whose occasional testimony was considered so harmless that even some of the slave-drivers could tolerate it and even eulogize their humanity. It is an unwarrantable and base slander to bring up this old and long-atoned-for act of Buchanan as representative of his present character. But this is not all, nor the worst. For his friends, the Democrats are in our anti-slavery communities giving currency and support to this slander of their opponents, and if we may believe them, Buchanan is one of the most thorough abolitionists, and the Democratic party is the only abolition party in the land—in its martyr devotion to freedom out-doing the very Garrisonians themselves.

FREEDOM IN THE SOUTH.

A Georgia Corrrespondent of the Tribune gives a partial view of the enslaved condition of the people of that state who are in opinion and feeling unable to agree with the mad and brutal tyrants who rule that country, and who are leaving no effort untried to reduce the whole country to the submissive condition of Georgia.

We are under greater surveillance than are the Emperor Jo's subjects in Hungary, and if we return North and dare express our sentiments where they can attract attention, we are politely requested not to return home—vide Underwood and his neighbors of Clarke County, Va. Is this freedom? Tell me, freemen of the North, for you must decide? Nor is it the freedom of opinion alone which enhances our interest in Fremont's election. I am an Alabamian; I look at my State and behold immense water-power unused, coal-beds unworked, mineral lands destitute of smelt works and forges, the rich prairies of the State annually deprived of some portion of their scant supply of vegetable matter, the twenty-years-ago-considered inexhaustable creek and bottom-lands rapidly changing to sand beds, three bales of cotton made to the hand, when six or eight were made fifteen years ago, and already the small planters—the real wealth of the country—selling out to the nabobs of niggerdom, and moving to Texas or new portions of Mississippi, because 'the land is no count.' And why is this so? Niggers! Yes, says Mr. Buchaneer or Fillmoreite, but what's that to do with Fremont's election; he dosen't propose to remove your slaves; he's only for making Kansas free? I'll tell you. Four years ago, there was a Union party of conservative men in the South—I speak particularly of Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi—who outnumbered their opponents; Mr. Pierce was elected, and his strongest support came from them, which he repaid by making Jeff Davis, the hottest fire eater, save Gen. Quitman in the Southern States, Secretary of War and thereby *killed the Union party*, driving the most conservative politicians into retirement, and introducing instead such men as Clay & Co. To-day