The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, EDITOR. "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS." ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 12.---NO. 28. SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1857. WHOLE NO. 594.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

GOOD REASONS.

The editor of the *Practical Christian* gives the following satisfactory reasons for moral opposition to the slaveholding Union:

If asked by the encomiasts of the Federal Union, on what grounds of moral protest I denounce it, I briefly answer:—

1. I hold that man-stealing is a capital crime against God and humanity, more heinous, all things considered, than murder; that slaveholding is man-stealing deliberately perpetuated; that the system of slavery generates in its natural workings all the sins forbidden in the law and gospel; and that from this system proceeds all manner of evil continually.

2. I know that the Federal Constitution, which is the prescriptive basis and bond of the Federal Union, expresses no condemnation of slaveholding, but regards it as innocent and laudable—investing slaveholders with extra political power in the government proportionate to the number of their slaves, and binding the rest of the nation to facilitate the reclamation of their fugitives.

3. I see that the actual administration of government under the Federal Constitution, though declaring the foreign slave trade to be piracy punishable with death, has nevertheless favored slaveholders, and extended and fostered their peculiar institution as a perfectly righteous, honorable and meritorious one, until now slaveholders claim for themselves of right the lion's share in all the advantages of the Union, making it summary death or banishment in fifteen States for any man to use his Constitutional freedom of speech and the press against slavery.

I take these to be undeniable truths. When therefore, as a man, a philanthropist and a Christian, I contemplate the whole case in this light, with the slave population increased from little over half a million to four millions, all free discussion of the evil completely closed by a *reign of terror* in half of the States, and all parties agreeing that the Union affords to slaveholders their greatest security, it is impossible for me not to abominate both slavery and the Union together. Slavery rises to view as a complex and gigantic embodyment, not only of capital crimes *per se*, but of all possible sins against God and humanity. And the Union stands forth the deliberate pledge of the nation to tolerate, uphold and defend this conglomeration of wickedness to the last extremity. If slavery is what I hold it to be, the Union which endorses, upholds, promotes and defends it must be correspondingly abhorrent to every true moralist. I therefore declare my uncompromising moral protest against the Federal Union as a huge national crime, working in deliberate aid and abetment of slaveholding.

Granting my premises, the logic by which I proceed to my conclusions is inexorable. And from that conclusion there is no escape, but by denying the primary premiss. Accordingly most of the compromisers with slavery, whether in politics or ethics, contrive to persuade themselves, either that slaveholding is per se *no sin* at all, or that it is only one of those *venial sins* which by common consent mankind pass over in each other as excusable. Even Charles Francis Adams in his letter to the Worcester Convention lowers his Anti-Slavery to this flat key-note. He says,—"I do not mean to charge upon slaveholders, as a class, that they are irredeemably wicked, any more than I should upon bankers, or brokers, or hotel-keepers, or liquor-sellers, or horse-dealers, or any sort of traders!" He then goes on to argue, that in this imperfect world we must mix with and tolerate common sinners, ourselves being in the same category; and then adds:—"On this basis, I am willing to continue indefinitely to live with slaveholders, even though some of them should trench a little on my rights!" Now, if I viewed slaveholding in this light, it would be unjust and absurd for me to object to the Federal Union on account of it, or to denounce slavery as a great crime, or a very deplorable evil in any sense. It would be no such thing. I could condemn and disfellowship only its grosser abuses. To be consistent, all politicians and religionists, who are in union with slaveholders, should take substantially this position of Mr. Adams. And then they should be very whist against the evil of slavery; since it can be no very bad thing after all. For a political lecturer to work up the moral indignation of his auditors, by making out slavery to be the most devilish sort of thing in the universe, and then wind up with solemn protestations of his devotion to the Union &c., is blowing hot and cold with the same pair of lungs most ludicrously, not to say contemptibly; since if the thing is half as bad as he paints it, no decent man ought to be in Union with it.

From the National Era.

SECURITY OF SLAVE SOCIETY.

The following editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, of January 8th, is quite suggestive.—Recolect—a few months ago, solid preparation of Virginia for a state of war was vaunted loudyly by that paper and by Gov. Wise, in manifestoes without number. Virginia was a match for a world in arms. A very little thing was the Union to Virginia. Virginia held the Federal Government to be lighter than chaff—at twenty-four hours notice, could put one hundred thousand armed men in the field, thoroughly disciplined, amply provisioned, ready at a moment's warning to capture the United States forts and arsenals, march upon Washington, and take possession of the President, Cabinet, Archives, and Congress to boot!

Again—what paper has so eloquently set forth the manifest blessings of Slavery? O, the failure of free Society! O, the triumph of slave Society How docile, how subordinate how affectionate the slave; how wedded to the master, how productive; how fat, and sosy, and jolly; how free from responsibility and care; how well trained to appreciate his high privileges; how beautifully harmonized the relations of Labor and Capital! At fast, the world is beginning to open its eyes to the sublime truth, the revelation first made to the South, that Slavery is the only refuge on earth from the curses of free society and hireling labor—and the time is coming when the poor, starved, degraded white laborer, convinced by our arguments, will knock at the door of that blissful heaven now vouchsafed alone to the negro.

Bear in mind these charming representations, while reading the following very practical article from the Enquirer."

NECESSITY AND PLAN OF A PERMANENT PATROL.

No doubt, the recent rumors of impending insurrection have excited a sensation of uneasiness and apprehension throughout the community.—It is fortunate, indeed, that we have only to deplore a passing panic, since the developments have revealed so very prevalent a spirit of mutiny; if not a general purpose of revolt, among the slave population. If the affair is to be turned to proper account, we may congratulate ourselves on securing the safety of the community at the trifling inconvenience of a momentary alarm.

There is reason to fear, we know least this happy escape may induce the belief that the cry of danger in the first instance was a false alarm, and people may now be disposed to ridicule their idle apprehensions. In such an event, the negro population will be indulged in a still greater licence of conduct, the rigor of our police will be still further relaxed, and our social system will be more exposed than ever to the peril of a sudden servile revolt. In this way the salutary lesson of these recent disturbances will be perverted to our own insecurity, and we may have to suffer the penalty of a foolish contempt of a providential admonition.

Although no actual outbreak has occurred among the negro population of Virginia, yet nobody can deny that they have very generally discovered an insubordinate impulse, and very generally entertained some indefinite idea of insurrection. Now, this is a fact of the gravest consequence. Shall we make no provision against the danger to which we find ourselves perpetually exposed? All sensible men will acknowledge the pertinency of this inquiry.

In every community on earth, the security of society is protected by adequate arrangements for the prevention and suppression of sedition or revolution. But, in Virginia, a long exemption from any sort of social violence has begotten a sense of security which scorns either police or military protection. Few people understand how utterly destitute this State is of any organized means of defense against a servile revolt. We have no permanent patrol; and it is quite impracticable to provide an efficient system on the spur of a sudden alarm. Besides, that would be to lock the stable after the horse was stolen; for the end and function of a patrol is, to detect the earliest insubordinate movement, and to prevent any combination of malcontent spirits. And not only are we thus exposed to the hazards of an unexpected outbreak, but we are absolutely destitute of the military force for its suppression.

The last report of the Adjutant General of the State discloses a condition of things which should not be suffered to continue for another moment.—To be sure, the Governor's staff is large enough for the Generalissimo of an infinite army, but the entire military force of the State might be garrisoned in a country meeting-house, or paraded on the playground of an old field school. It is questionable if the abolition of the old militia system was a politic measure; it was certainly unwise to supply no substitute, and leave the State without any sort of military establishment. But for the holiday regiment of the gallant Colonel August, and an occasional company in some of the interior towns, the military forces of Virginia would not suffice for a salute on the fourth of July. Yet we have an abundance of raw material, in arms and ammunition, and in the brave spirit of our people.

This statement should convince everybody of the need of some more satisfactory preparation against a possible outbreak among the slave population. Our deficiencies indicate the points to be protected; and we should be careful to secure our social safety by some adequate agency of prevention and suppression. The people are very generally agreed that the Legislature must establish some military system or other, whether on the voluntary principle, or after the good old fashion of our fathers who responded to the call of their country on the day of muster, in shirt sleeves and with walking cane. But less thought seems to be bestowed upon what we regard the more important regulation, viz: the establishment of a permanent patrol in the country.

The existing system, or, rather, no system of patrol, is not only inadequate to its purpose, but is liable to much abuse. Now the plan we propose contemplates the organization of a patrol force in each magisterial district of the State, to be composed of persons of good character, to be supported by a levy on their respective bailiwicks, to be held to a rigid official responsibility, and to be constantly employed in preserving order and quiet among the negro population. Perhaps, by increasing the pay and numbers of the present constabulary, the duties of a patrol might be imposed upon them. The two systems readily admit of such combination.

We submit these suggestions with the view of directing the public mind to the subject. If any crude idea of our own may be developed into a practible system by some more capable person we shall be very happy to present his plan to the public. All are agreed that the safety of the community is not now sufficiently protected; let every one contribute what he can to supply the deficiency. Our columns are open to correspondents.

"Are not our friends in the free States resting in false security? It such dangers beset that perfect form of social life, called Slavery, how is Free Society to escape? Why is it that no precautionary measures are adopted to prevent the insurrection of hireling labor? Suppose, borrowing a hint from the enquirer, we suggest the plan of a permanent patrol in the free States, to preserve them against the uprising of their industrial classes. Let it embrace the organization of a patrol force in each county, to be composed of gentlemen of good character, to be supported by a levy on all the householders of the county, to be held to a rigid responsibility, whose business it shall be to exercise strict supervision over mechanics, shopkeepers, and workingmen of all classes, see to it that they are not out at a later hour than 9 o'clock at night, on pain of being flogged, that no schools or public meetings be tolerated among them; in every way maintain order and quiet among them!

It is painful, on some accounts, to indulge in mockery on so grave a subject; but those who are familiar with the miserable tirades of the champions of Slavery against free labor and free society will admit that it is fairly provoked."

SUGAR AND SLAVERY.

In the year 1655—6 the government of England, then headed by Oliver Cromwell, arbitrarily transported to Barbadoes, and sold into plantation slavery, upwards of seventy persons. These men were Cavaliers, and had been concerned in a rising against the Cromwellian rule. Among them were preachers of the gospel, gentlemen, old persons, and others. They were sold "for one thousand five hundred and fifty pounds of sugar a-piece, more or less, according to their working faculties." In the memorial which they presented to the first Parliament that met after Cromwell's death, they say that they were then "generally grinding at the mills and attending at the furnaces, or digging in this scorching island, having nought to feed on (notwithstanding their hard labor) but potatoe roots, nor to drink but water with such roots washed in it, besides the bread and tears of their own afflictions; being bought and sold from one planter to another, or attatched as horses and beasts for the debts of their masters, being whipped at the whipping-posts (as rogues) for their masters' pleasure, and sleeping in styes worse than hogs in England; and many other ways made miserable, beyond expression or Christian imagination." It was attempted to be shown that this was "a Cavalier petition," in the hope of exciting political prejudice against the petitioners; but Sir Henry Vane, who was no royalist, but an ardent Republican, said:—"I do not look on this business as a Cavalierish business, but as a matter that concerns the liberty of the free-born people of England." He compared the enslavement of these Cavaliers with the worst acts of the Stuarts, and warned their opponents that if the tables were turned, their best might be treated in the same way. This prediction became frightfully true in after days, when hundreds of the persons who had joined Monmouth were sold into plantation slavery. Indeed, this mode of disposing of political prisoners, taken with arms in their hands was very common with the English of both parties in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was done as late as 1746, after the last open effort of the Stuarts had failed to get back the throne of England. It is curious to observe, that as slavery originated in a mitigation of the horrors of war, by selling captives instead of butchering them, so was this selling of Englishmen into slavery an improvement on the civil wars as they existed only a century or two since. As prisoners taken in civil war, with arms in their hands, they might have all been hanged at once. It was even said in the Parliament of 1659, that the very men who sent in the petition, went to Barbadoes with "remarkable cheerfulness;" but this has been explained to mean that, aware of the penalty they had incurred, they preferred slavery to immediate death, and not that they desired to be transported.

The Stuarts were, as usual, worse than their opponents, even in this business of transporting political prisoners, or convicts; for when Jeffreys sentenced 841 of Monmouth's followers to transportation, "these men, says Macaulay, "more wretched than their associates who suffered death, were distributed into gangs, and bestowed on persons who enjoyed favor at court. The conditions of the gift were that the convicts should be carried beyond sea as slaves, that they should not be emancipated for ten years, and that the place of their banishment should be some West Indian Island. This last article was studiously framed for the purpose of aggravating the misery of the exiles. In New England or New Jersey they would have found a population kindly disposed to them, and a climate not unfavorable to their health and vigor. It was therefore determined that they should be sent to colonies where a Puritan could hope to inspire little sympathy, and where a laborer born in the temperate zone could hope to enjoy little health." They were to be sold to sugar planters. It is not stated whether, like Cromwell's prisoners, they were paid for in sugar, an article that in modern days has had a hideous connection with the foulest forms of human cruelty and injustice. Sugar was a much scarcer article in the seventeenth century than it now is, so that to give fifteen hundred and fifty pounds of it for a man shows that slaves were quite valuable articles in those days. As the trade with Africa was then open, and as negroes were better for slaves than white men, to say nothing of the chances of the latter obtaining their freedom through the occurrence of political changes, we may suppose that Africans were as valuable articles then in the British West Indies as they now are in Virginia. The things that were then done, as of course, and which even had a sort of excuse on merciful grounds, would not now be tolerated in the worst governed country in Christendom. The French government, though it has dared to deport political prisoners to Cayenne, has not dared to sell them into slavery. This change shows how much reason we have to hope that even a greater change will eventually be brought about by the steady progress of opinion; and that, as slavery cannot now be inflicted on men as punishment for political offense, so it will become impossible to keep men in slavery who have committed no offense against any law.—*Boston Telegraph.*

From the Western Presage.

FOSSILS.

In looking over the specimens in the cabinet of an amateur Geologist, we chanced upon a fossil of a pre-adamite reptile, to which science has given the name of trilobite. It was smoothly polished by rough usage from the different elements, and was indeed a very pretty specimen of the former residence of a defunct worm. But the vital beautifying element was gone, and after all, nothing but a smooth bit of stone—a fossilized shell.

The thought immediately occurred to us, that there were fossils outside of Geology; that there were petrified specimens among us of defunct opinions and positions, representatives from the different strata of bygone political struggles.

In the great "drift" of political life, we find many fossils: not of pure minded noble patriots, for the vital element with them burns with a warmer and brighter glow. Their life and vigor are recuperated and intensified, in proportion to the wants and dangers of a distracted country.

But mingled with life we find death. There are among us, in all parties, fossil politicians smooth and slippery from many turnings and tumblings in the different strata of demagogueism, whose life is extinct, and who ought long since to have been collected into a political cabinet and labeled "Fossils of the progressive class."

There is in the Republican party, the beginning of such a collection. This collection, though not scientifically named, has still a name that has attracted public attention to its masterly inactivity; and public contempt has already followed public attention. But the fossils are not *all* collected in this cabinet. There are more in the Republican party, and their weighty inactivity delay shinders, its progress. And there are some, only *half fossilized*, who are, if possible, doing still more damage to the Republican cause. What little life they have left, is that of personal ambition. And this ambition has to some extent, proved a petrifying agent of their former moral activity. Their love of the principles that are the life of the Republican cause, has been petrified by the hope of personal success; and this hope—this personal ambition—which is all the Republicanism they possess—has led them to attempt compromises, in which principle is ignored, and of which individual advancement is the only consideration. During the present session of the illegal body styling itself the "Legislature," has such a compromise been attempted.—For the purpose of placing one of their number in that politico-geological cabinet, the Senate of the United States, they have endeavored to sacrifice principle for the sake of illegal and disgraceful elevation. But the old liners have by their daring disregard of law, principle, or any other obligation, *risen above* compromise, and rejected their overtures, and their petrifaction is now complete.—And a worthless set of "dernies" they are not fit for a cabinet collection, and all that remains for the Republicans to do is to pitch them aside.

If the Republican party would succeed, they must rid themselves of these fossil leaders, who have ago without experience, gray hairs without their accompanying wisdom, and who combine those two essentials of certain defeat—the perception and shrewdness of childhood with inactivity.

IOWA—PROGRESS—AN EXAMPLE.

Reference has been made in our paper to the fact of the repeal by the Iowa Legislature of the clause of her statute book prohibiting negroes, mulatoes, and Indians from testifying against white men in courts of justice. Those who know the political record of that state up to 1856, will be startled, if not edified, by an event so significant. Prior to that date, no "free state"—not even California—was more thoroughly pro-slavery than Iowa. In none did the few sterling anti-slavery men who were before that time to be found within her borders meet with more intolerance and proscription, scarcely falling short, in fact, of mob violence.—Growing up as a Territory, and admitted as a state under the auspices of Calhoun "Democracy," it seemed almost as thoroughly given over to the domination of the slave power as South Carolina itself. Yet, owing chiefly to the influx of a better class of emigrants, behold what a mighty political and moral revolution has taken place in Iowa in two short years? Triumphing in 1854, it has gone with that steady advance march which guaranties the permanent ascendency of the right.

With such examples before us, let us not despair of Indiana.—*Western Presage.*

From the Western Presage.

"DENATIONALIZING OF SLAVERY."

This phrase meets our eyes frequently. What does it mean? It cannot mean the national abolition of slavery, for it is used by those who do not admit that the nation has any power to abolish the slavery that exists in the nation. It cannot mean the abolition of slavery by any process or under any authority. If it were but abolished, there would be no occasion or opportunity for denationalizing it.

To "denationalize" (according to Noah Webster) is to "divest of national character or rights by transferrence to the service of another nation. A ship built and registered in the United States, is denationalized by being employed in the service of another nation, and bearing its flag.—*French Decrees. Decree of Prince Regent.*

How, then, shall we "denationalize" American Slavery? According to Noah Webster's definition, we must, somehow, "divest" it of national character.' It must no longer pertain to the nation. The character of the nation must recieve no tinge or hue from it. How shall this be done while slavery exists and operates, and acts out itself, *is* the nation—while the nation permits it—and while it is cherished by the controlling citizens throughout one half of the nation.

We must also divest it of national "rights."—How can we do this but by declaring, with the national voice, that it has no "right" to be in the nation? A recognized "right" to be in the nation, is a national right. It involves the right to national protection. Slavery must cease to be *American* slavery before it can be denationalized. It must become the slavery of *some other* country—not the slavery of *this* country—not the slavery of America, in order to its becoming "denationalized." Just as "a ship built and registered in the United States" is "denationalized"—"by transferrence to the service of another nation"—just so slavery, "built and registered in the United States" may be "denationalized" by being "transferred" to some other country. Put the slaves and the slave-holders out of the country, beyond its jurisdiction out from under its flag, and under the jurisdiction of some other nation, and slavery will then be denationalized."

This would involve the denial of national citizenship to slaveholders. It might be effected, perhaps, by ceding the Carolinas, Georgia, &c., to Brazil, or by transferrence" of their "service" and allegiance to some of the barbarous slave-holding princes of Africa. They must no longer be authorized to hoist over their heads the American "flag." They must "bear the flag" of some other nation, or none at all. When all this shall have been effected, then, (by the dictionary of Noah Webster) it may be no violation of good English, to talk of our having "denationalized" slavery.

Seriously, is this what our Free Soil or Free Democracy editors and orators mean when they promise us the "denationalizing of slavery." Do they propose to extind the slave-holders, or the slave-holding states? If so, why do they not fall in, at once, with Mr. Carrison's movement, and "denationalize" slavery by a severance of slavery from the nation to which they hold allegiance?—Will they do or propose any thing of the kind? If not, why do they talk of "denationalizing slavery"?

The truth is, so far from "denationalizing slavery" they are constantly giving to slavery the national sanction of constitutional protection.—They concede its constitutional protection. They concede its constitutional right to exist in the original slave states, which (at the tine of forming the constitution) included all the then existing states except Massachusetts! They promise to "bring back the government to its original position." Is this their undestanding of its original position?—And would this be the denationalizing of slavery"? At the present time slavery exists in and controls nearly one-half the states composing the nation. And it is gravely proposed to denationalize" slavery, while recognizing its constitutional right thus to overrun and crush and despoil half the nation! Nay, while conceding the constitutional right, even of old Massachusetts itself, to become a slave state—for it is not pretended by them that the rights of one of the *original* states differ from those of another.

And thus the broad ægis of the National constitution is virtually thrown over all the slavery that ever has been, or is, or ever shall be maintained in "the original states." And this is called "denationalizing slavery!"

WORK FOR THE NEW SCHOOL GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Several of the Synods of the New School General Assembly, at their last fall meetings passed resolutions called on the General Assembly to instruct the Presbytery of South Lexington, Mississippi, to commence process of discipline against Rev. D. W. Holley, who avowed himself on the floor of the General Assembly "a slaveholder from principle." Mr. Holley died recently, but his mantle has fallen upon others. The Rev. Dr. Newton, of Jackson, Mississippi, writing to the "Christian Observer," says:

"I deem it due to the memory of his good name, his unquestioned piety and eminent services to the church in the salvation of souls, both of the bond and the free, as well as for the respect and affection which we bear toward his bereaved family, that some of us should favorably avouch the character and conduct of our deceased brother, and say to the Synod or General Assembly: 'If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account.'

"Accordingly, I hereby declare that there are today one, two, three—a half a dozen, (and many more) ministers, members of the several Presbyteries constituting the Synod of Mississippi who are slaveholders, as Mr. Holley was; and who will say, as Mr. Holley said, 'We are slaveholders from principle.' That is, as Mr. Holley evidently meant, We are slaveholders conscientiously; we do not condemn ourselves for the deed; we do not deem slaveholding a sin.

"And I hereby notify the Synod of Gennessee and all whom it may concern, that whenever it is desired, I will give the names and the declarations of ministers, with their autograph signatures, occupying precisely the same ground as that professed by Mr. Holley."

Thus is the gauntlet openly and boldly thrown down to the next General Assembly. If the professed anti-slavery men of that body are really in earnest in this matter, they cannot hesitate to take it up. They constitute the large majority of the Assembly. They are openly defied by the slaveholders. Will they have the moral courage to meet the issue? If they do the division of their church is inevitable. The slaveholders will not submit for one moment to the process of discipline; much less will they submit to a decision which shall pronounce them guilty of sin, and call on them to repent and reform. They deny that they are living in sin, in holding slaves 'from principle.' They hold that it is perfectly innocent to buy, sell, own and work their fellow men for gain. The large majority of the New School Presbyterian Church profess to believe this kind of slaveholding a heinous sin and scandal. Their General Assembly has repeatedly declared it to be such. They must then either meet the issue like men, and exercise discipline on the guilty, or they must ingloriously abandon all their anti-slavery professions, and come under the control of a mere handful of slaveholders. Which will they do?—We have our opinion on that point, but reserve the expression of it to another time.—*Free Presbyterian.*

SLAVERY IN THE CHURCHES.

We clip the following from the *Christian Press* Is it not timely, appropriate, sound, forcible, scriptural, what the present crisis demands?—*Wesleyan.*

"The American Church is the bulwark of American Slavery."—J. G. Birney.

"Would the Churches do their duty—American Slavery would not continue a single year."—Albert Barnes.

The connection of religious organizations with slavery has constituted one of the strongest supports of that inhuman system. Political parties, with all their base subserviency to the slave power, have been unable to render any such service, as the church has rendered to slavery. The power of a political party is as inferior to that of a church, as time is to eternity. Important as it is to watch the movements of political parties, it is still of importance to observe well the movements of religious bodies.

It has been truly said that "the key of the slave's dungeon is in the hands of the church." The power to abolish slavery rests with the church. They alone can successfully stamp the system as one of sin, and divest it of the garb of innocence and respectability by which it gets leave to live. The whole system would fall to pieces under the thunders of the pulpit. No earthly arm could save it against the arm of the church—and its destruction is to be despaired of without the aid of the church. Every sign of the coming up to this work, on the part of the church, must be hailed by the friends of freedom with joy and gratitude.

It is in vain to think of banishing the works of the devil from the world, while we admit those who do them to be disciples of Christ. To speak against slaveholding, and yet embrace as a Christian the slaveholder, is practically giving the lie to such preaching. When the church buys, sells, and heathenizes God's children, and blasphemously appeals to the name of Christ as its sanction, no language is strong enough to describe it. Talk of their piety! Though their prayers were longer than the Pharisees, and their prayers were solemn and unceasing, they are all a mockery while they trample on God's image. Judge ye, therefore, what is Christianity, and give not the holy name to that which violates its laws and has none of its spirit.

From the Pittsburgh Gazette.

THE GERMANS IN TEXAS.

Among the many interesting and novel facts presented by the recent book of Mr. Olmsted descriptive of his journey through Texas, we found none that possessed more interest and novelty than those pertaining to the German population of that vast State. They are estimated to have been at the commencement of the current year 35 000 Germans in Texas, of whom about 25,000 are settled in the German and half German counties of the Western portion of that State. In Comal, Gillespie and Medina counties nearly all the inhabitants are from the 'Fatherland.' In Victoria and Colarado counties, Germans constitute about threefourths of the population. In other counties they make a half, a third, or a fourth of the population. In the principal cities and larger towns there is, even in Eastern Texas, a large per cent of this nationality. In the counties containing Galveston, Houston and Harris, there are about 8,500 Germans.—Some authorities worthy of much confidence, set down the whole number in the State as high as 40,400, of which Western Texas has 21,700; Central ditto 10,200; and Eastern 8,500.

The early immigration was of a somewhat humble and promiscuous description, such as is found in most of our cities, men of small means and of industrious habits. Among these, doubtless, was a mixture of those guilty and vicious characters "who left their country for their country's good," but the proportion of this sort was not large, and such as there were found full vent for their evil propensities in the rough and tumble of border life, among Camanches, half-wild Mexicans and those from all the states of the Union who had found the "air of freedom in the presence of the law oppressive to the lungs."

After the events of 1848, the immigration became of a different and more valuable character, and including a large proportion of farmers and persons in moderate circumstances, who sought a hopeful future in the New World. But with these came also that large number of patriots, haters of slavery in all its forms and under whatever name; men who had forfeited their lives in the great battle for Freedom which raged during that eventful year in all the lands from the western confines of France to the Czar's dominions. Many of these were in their own lands men of the largest culture men who had studied all the systems of philosophy and whose theories of government and perchance of religion were built upon the sublime tractates of Plato and the other philosophers who graced the palmy age of Grecian literature. Nor have they all left behind them the tastes which were acquired in academic halls. We are told that there is something extremely striking in the temporary incongruities and bizarre contrasts of the backwoods life of these settlers. "You are welcomed," says Olmsted, "by a figure in a blue flannel shirt and pendent beard, quoting Tacitus, having in one hand a long pipe, in the other a butcher's knife; Madonnas upon log walls; coffee in tin cups upon Dresden saucers; barrels for seats to hear a Beethoven's symphony on the grand piano; a fowling piece that cost $300 and a saddle that cost $5; a book-case, half filled with classics, half with sweet potatoes."

Evidently we are just beginning to learn something about this large and increasing population which is giving tone to the State yet to be formed out of a portion of Western Texas. At the present time the question first asked is, what do these people think and how do they act relative to the matter of slavery? New Braunfels is in Western Texas, situated on a branch of the Rio Guadalupe in latitude 30° North. The population is almost exclusively German and numbers about 3000 souls. The Anglo American population does not exceed twenty. An American living in the town owns a negro girl and one negro girl is hired by one of the Germans as a domestic. There are no other negroes in the town. But how do these German folk cultivate lands upon the border of the torrid zone, where we have been told so often that it is impossible for any white man to labor? The answer is in one fact, to wit: these Germans sent to market last year 800 bales of cotton raised by their own care which at Galveston brought from one to two cents per pound more than that produced by slaves, owing to the more careful handling of white and personally interested labor.—The quantity is a mere drop in the bucket, it is true, but the argument is omnipotent. We thank Mr. Olmsted for this pregnant fact as well as the fair-haired and industrious Germans who have made it a fact.

From the Cincinnati Gazette.

POPULATION OF MISSOURI.

A Census of the State of Missouri, which has just been taken, shows a total of 912,206, divided as follows:—Free whites 819,503, free blacks, 2,652, slaves 89,590. Increase of white population in six years, 224,453 or over 28 per cent. increase of slaves; 1823, or a fraction over two per cent.

Two counties return no slaves, twenty counties report only 1000; the highest reaching only 96, and the lowest having 8.

The extent of Missouri is about 67,000 square miles, and that of Ohio 40,000 square miles, and yet Missouri, with so much larger extent of territory, has less than half the population of Ohio. The only answer that can be given to the question, why this difference? is the existence of slavery in Missouri. The increase of the white population being 28 per cent. in six years, and the increase of slaves being only two per cent, shows the natural adaptedness of the State to a free white population, and its poor adaptation to slavery. We have seen it stated that land in Missouri, within 30 miles of Keokuk, Iowa, is selling at three dollars, while similar land in Iowa, at the same distance from Keokuk, is selling at $30 per acre—a difference of $27 per acre. Now estimating the slaves in Missouri at $500 per head, their whole value would be $45,000,000. The whole number of acres of land in the State is about six millions. A rise of only eight dollars would more than equal the whole value of the slaves, and we believe the abolition of slavery would make more than that difference in the value of land. Were they to give away their negroes, then, they would be the gainers by the gift.

There are 214 insane males in the State, and 184 females, of which number 22 are negroes—total insane, 398.

There are 281 blind persons in the State, of which number 151 are males and 130 females, and 34 of them are negroes.

There are 325 deaf and dumb persons in the State—males 174, females 140, and 21 of them are negroes, and 112 of them have been taught to read and write.

NEGROES.

If one-half the cruelties enacted during the recent insurrection panic at the South, could be disclosed, what an appalling record would they make. But not a tithe of them will ever be known beyond the circles in which they occurred. The South is not communicative in such matters.—During the troubles at Dover, Tenn., a suspected white man was put to death in a most cowardly and cruel manner, and yet the fact has but just came out, in a letter from a daughter of a physician in Tennessee to her friend in New York.—The white man was squeezed to death in a cotton press! His name is not given, and there are no means of ascertaining that there was a particle of evidence against him beyond the suspicions of the barbarous chivalry of Tennessee. Twenty of the negroes at Dover iron works were whipped to death and decapitated, and their heads placed upon poles along the Cumberland river! The following account of the burning at Abbeville, Ala., of the negro Mose, is taken from the Eufaulau Native, and is not of course exagerated:

"It will be recolected that the crime for which Mose was burned, was the murder of his master. A large concourse of people was assembled at Abbeville, numbering from 4000 to 5000. The negro was taken from the jail by the guard; no opposition was offered by the sheriff. The place was arranged before the negro arrived. A green pine stake was set in the ground firmly, and around that, a pile of fat pine wood was arranged in diameter about six feet, and about 4 feet high. He was bound head and feet, to the pole, and before fire was placed to the pole, the wretch made the following confession: "That he had murdered his master, but would not have done it if it had not been for a white man." He made some other confessions, implicating a white man and another negro in the affair. Our informant says, when he left the fire had already consumed his head, legs and feet, and that they were piling on more wood to finish the body.

From such pictures in our own Christian country, we turn for hope to the followers of "the false prophet," and we find this announcement in the latest advices from Turkey:—

"About a year ago a firman was issued forbidding the sale of white slaves in Turkey. This firman was owing entirely to the strong representations made by the foreign ambassadors. Redschid Pasha has now resolved by his own will, and without any pressure from without to forbid the importation and sale of black slaves likewise.—Knowing the ideas which public opinion in Europe attaches to slavery, he makes this concession in spite of the difficulties which he must expect in carrying out a measure which, perhaps, more than the prohibition of the sale of Circassians, must lead to a complete change in the domestic habits of the country.

Richard Arkwright, it would seem, was not a beautiful man—no romance hero with haughty eyes, Appello lip, and gesture like the herald Mercury; a plain, almost gross, bag-cheeked, pot-bellied Lancashire man, with an air of painful reflection, yet also of copious free digestion; a man stationed by the community to shave certain dusty beards, in the northern parts of England, at a half-penny each. To such end, we say, by forethought, oversight, accident, and arrangement, had Richard Arkwright been, by the community of England and his own consent, set apart. Nevertheless, in strapping of razors, in lathering of dusty beards, and the contradictions and confusions attendant thereon, the man had notions in that rough head of his; spindles, shuttles, wheels, and contrivances plying ideally within the same;—rather hopeless looking, which, however, he did at last bring to bear. Not without difficulty! His townsfolk rose in mob round him, for threatening to shorten labor—to shorten wages, so that he had to fly, with broken wash-pots, scattered household, and seek refuge elsewhere. Nay, his wife too, as I learn, rebelled: burned his wooden model of his spinning-wheel, resolute that he should stick to his razors rather—for which, however, he decisively, as thou wilt rejoice to understand, packed her out of doors. Oh reader! what a historical phenomenon is that bag-cheeked, pot-bellied, much-enduring, much-inventing barber! French Revolutions were a-brewing: to resist the same in any measure, imperial Kaisers were impotent without the cotton and cloth of England; and it was this man that had to give England the power of cotton.—*Thomas Carlyle.*

Juvenile Surgeon.—A gentleman of this city who is the father of a pair of young hopefuls of the respective ages of eight months and two years and a half, was alarmed yesterday morning by a tremendous outcry in a neighboring room, which his parental solicitude informed him proceeded from the youngest of his flock. Upon hastening to the spot his eyes were saluted by the spectacle of the youngest stretched upon the floor, and the eldest seated upon it with a jack knife in hand, the blade of which he had inserted in the mouth of the other, and was industriously slashing away, without paying any regard to the screams of the little victim. Of course he was interrupted in his anatomical operations, and the sufferer cared for with anxious solicitude. Upon being questioned as to the reasons for his apparently blood-thirsty inclinations, he replied that he was *cutting teeth!* Having seen the family physician perform the operation upon the baby he embraced the first oportunity to practice upon his young relative in the manner related. The injury inflicted was severe, though it might probably have been much greater if he had not been interrupted just as he was.—*Detroit Free Press.*