

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE U. S.  
JAMES BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania.  
FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,  
J. C. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky.

ELECTORS  
FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.

For the State at Large:  
HENRY M. SHAW, of Currituck,  
SAMUEL P. HILL, of Caswell.

Districts:  
1st District, WM. F. MARTIN, of Pasquotank,  
2d " WM. J. BLOW, of Pitt,  
3d " M. B. SMITH, of New Hanover,  
4th " GASTON H. WILDER, of Wake,  
5th " S. E. WILLIAMS, of Alamance,  
6th " THOS. SETTLE, Jr., of Rockingham,  
7th " W. W. LARING, of Mecklenburg,  
8th " W. W. AVERY, of Burke.

**Electional Appointments.**  
M. B. SMITH, Esq., Democratic Elector, and O. P. MYERS, Esq., " American" Elector, for this District, (3d.) will address their fellow-citizens at the following times and places:  
Rockingham, Richmond Co., Monday, Sept. 15th, Court w/k. Laurel Hill;  
Lamberton, Robeson Co., Monday, Sept. 22nd, Alfordville;  
Elizabethton, Bladen Co., Monday, Sept. 22nd, Elizabethton.  
Further appointments will be announced hereafter.

**Onslow County.**  
L. W. Humphrey, Esq., Democratic Sub-Elector for the County of Onslow, requests us to state that he will address his fellow-citizens of said County, at the following times and places:  
At Lower South West, Friday, 20th September.  
At Golden Place, Saturday, 27th September.

**The Discussion on Tuesday.**  
Tuesday afternoon Messrs. Smith and Meares, the electors for this district, spoke in the Court-house. It is not our intention to give a lengthened report of the discussion, but merely to touch upon some of the prominent points. Mr. Meares opened at 3 o'clock—the discussion closed about half-past 6. At the time when Mr. Meares commenced speaking the attendance was comparatively small, but the Court-house soon filled up and presented quite a respectable assemblage until it began to get dark.

Mr. Meares commenced by alluding to the crisis at present existing—the strength and determination of Northern fanaticism, etc.—Said that when Mr. Fillmore left the presidential chair all was peace and harmony. In 1852 the conventions of both parties had endorsed the compromise. Pierce went into the Presidency by the support of all sorts of people—Union men like Cass—Southern fire-eaters like Davis, and Free-Soilers like Van Buren. Alluded to appointments in New York. Spoke of the Kansas and Nebraska bill—charged upon "Squatter Sovereignty"—also upon Judge Douglas as a free soiler. Said that under the system of the Kansas bill no more territory could come into the Union as slave States. Denounced the repeal of the Missouri compromise as "reckless and unwise." Denied to either Congress or the people of the Territories the right to legislate on slavery. These territories must at any rate become Free States, because there were an hundred men hanging loose upon Northern society for one at the South, and so they would be filled up with an anti-slavery population. Spoke of the Utah bill signed by Mr. Fillmore, and denied that it was the same with the Kansas bill. The Utah bill confined suffrage to actual settlers, whereas the Kansas and Nebraska bill gave the right to those who had only declared their intention. [NOTE.—Either we could not get things straight, or the speakers did not. Our understanding is, and has been, that the Utah bill signed by Mr. Fillmore in effect repealed the Missouri compromise, because it nullified and disregarded the provisions of that compromise. The Washington Territorial bill signed by Mr. Fillmore, on the last day of his term of office, contained the same clause in regard to suffrage that has been embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill.—Ed. Journal.]

Mr. Meares charged that the repeal of the Missouri compromise was the cause of the present excitement. Said his competitor would talk of dark lanterns &c., after every body knew secrecy was abolished. He then turned his attention to "Americanism" and Catholicism. Large increase of foreigners since Washington's time. Didn't propose to proscribe. Would not pass ex post facto laws, but would prevent those coming from voting and exclude all from office. He and Fillmore agree, both are willing for them to come. Foreigners opposed to slavery. Germans going for Fremont. Germans all opposed to slavery. None think God come South. Dangerous in connection with Squatter Sovereignty. Germans are Red Republicans, Infidels, &c.—their secret societies show it. He said the "American" party did not propose to wage a religious war. It is a warm advocate of Religious Freedom—would fight for it. Platform of 1856 don't say anything about Catholics. Louisiana Catholics not excluded. Catholics divided into Gallicans and ultra montanes. Brownson and the Freeman's Journal ultra-montanes and in favour of the temporal power of the Pope. Opposed to the Pope, Brownson and all such. Pope never had the power, but he interferred in temporal affairs. Consequent corruption. Spoke of Spain, Rome, Napoleon and the English Elizabeth and the Henrys. Brownson and his crowd the only party who mix religion with politics.

Why, asked Mr. Meares, was not Peirce nominated. The Northern men had crammed Buchanan down the throats of the South. Said that the Democratic party was divided on the Internal Improvement issue. The President vetoes bills of this kind and the Congress passes them over his veto. Buchanan for Pacific Rail Road—said so at a dinner party given to President Pierce in Philadelphia. Said that Mr. Buchanan had been a Federalist in 1815, and as late as 1823. It is true he had gone for Texas in 1844, but had assigned reasons for it that deprived him of all claim upon Southern gratitude. He admitted that Fillmore had been wrong too, that he had not approved his course previous to his Presidential services, but in that he had been tried and found true.

Mr. Smith remarked, that he could not but feel proud of being a Democrat, proud of being an advocate of the Democratic cause, whenever he compared that great party with the ephemeral things of a day brought up to oppose it. The Democratic party, unlike that advocated by his opponent, had not arisen yesterday, or to-day, or two or three years ago.—It dated from the origin of the Republic. It was inspired by the maxims of a Jefferson, a Madison, and a Jackson. Its measures of public policy were the laws of the land, Convention after Convention of the party had re-affirmed and re-enforced the identical platform of principles laid down by its predecessors—these principles were the principles of the Constitution, and must endure as long as that instrument. It did not shift and turn and change every year, and almost every day, as did its opponents. His competitor had devoted a long time to what he called Squatter Sovereignty, to this he had no objection and little to say, as Squatter Sovereignty was no doctrine of the Democratic party, as a party—in firing at these and other fancied issues, his competitor was like the company of soldiers in one of the Mexican Wars, who, being so placed, as to have nothing before them, were ordered to fire—Fire at what? Why this

is the crisis of the battle and you must fire, and they loaded up and fired at the crisis—his competitor was simply firing at the crisis. But he would proceed to show that the Democratic party was entitled to the gratitude and support of the people of the South. He would show from the record, that in every real issue it had been the party to sustain the rights of the South, and ensure the safety of the Union. In 1844, when Texas was annexed, so far did this go, that it was a party measure, and the Democrats North and South went for it, and the whole Whig party with its great leader, Henry Clay, went against it. Who will now say that the Democrats were not right. He turned to the votes on the Wilmot Proviso. A majority of Northern Democrats went against that odious proviso. A majority of the Whig party North and South, went for it—every Northern Whig went for it. Again on the Fugitive Slave Law, a majority of Northern Democrats went for it. Every Northern Whig but three went against it. So on the Utah Bill. Mr. Fillmore's friends from New York, all went against it. The Democrats for it.

Much credit had been claimed for Mr. Fillmore on account of the compromise measures. What had Mr. Fillmore done to entitle him to all these eulogiums? He defied any man to show where, in any message or other communication to Congress, he had recommended a single measure favourable to the South. The only measure he had recommended was the admission of California with a constitution prohibiting slavery. But, say his friends, he had signed the Fugitive Slave Law.—It certainly required no great zeal or ability for a man to write his name. Mr. Fillmore was pledged not to veto any measure, unless clearly unconstitutional, and in accordance with this pledge and the opinion of the law officer of the government, he had no alternative. He had since, in his Newbury letter, said that he regretted the necessity of so doing. Fillmore, at the request of Charles Sumner, had pardoned out Drayton and Sayres, convicted of stealing seventy-three slaves from the District of Columbia.

But his competitor had charged that the Kansas and Nebraska Bill had occasioned all the present difficulties. He expected to show that these difficulties sprung from a different cause—from the secret organization to which Mr. Fillmore had attached himself, whose oaths and obligations he had taken. When did that organization arise? Why, exactly at the time when, according to the eulogists of Mr. Fillmore, the Country was in that perfect political paradise in which that gentleman had left it. It commenced at the North some three years ago, just after Mr. Fillmore went out of office. It arose to save the Country—to save the Country from what? from the Fillmore millennium? who believes all that? It arose in secret and darkness to try to stem the onward march of Democracy. All political opposition had failed. The antagonisms of religion and nationality were next to be tried. Sect was to be arrayed against sect, nationality, and the risk run of bathing the country in kindred blood. The Democracy were overwhelmed at the North and the opponents of Democracy at the South raised shouts of triumph over the Know Nothing victories which had brought into power that majority in the House which had elected Banks and had threatened to revolutionize the government. It was to the action and growth of this disorder in the North that all the difficulties were due. Three fourths of those known as the "Black Republicans" of the House were elected by the Know Nothing organization and their election hailed as Know Nothing victories at the South.

What had Catholics done? What was charged to them. Surely their course had not been open to the merited denunciations which all Southern men launched upon the New England Parsons of the denunciations who lanned the flame against them, and at the same time against the South. They had sent no abolition petitions to Congress, and drummed no Sharp's rifles to Kansas. Then why range ourselves against those who, of all denunciations at the North, had least interfered with us. He was no Catholic—no defender of Catholicism, but these were known facts.

What had Foreigners done? The States to which, as his competitor asserted, the main foreign emigration had gone were known to be the soundest of the Northern States on the slavery question. It was asserted that had Washington been alive he would have been a Know Nothing. Washington, who signed the first naturalization law—who never was without a foreigner in his cabinet. He contrasted the record of Fillmore and Buchanan. Fillmore never voting with the South. Buchanan never voting against it. In conclusion paid an eloquent tribute to the Democracy of the North.

The speeches were both creditable to the gentlemen. If, in our opinion Mr. Meares' defence of his cause was not successful, the failure was due to the cause rather than to the advocate, for Mr. Meares delivered a good speech, and one which pleased his friends. Mr. Smith's reply more than came up to the expectations of his friends. He spoke well and ably. The audience was highly attentive and respectful.

**SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY.**—Much credit is claimed for Mr. Fillmore in connection with the compromise measures of 1850. Now, the only one of these measures recommended by Mr. Fillmore was the admission of California with an anti-slavery constitution. This was the most glaring exhibition of Squatter Sovereignty in its most odious aspect. It was totally irregular—no census had been taken—no law had been passed authorizing the holding of a convention to adopt a State Constitution, nor had any law prescribed the qualifications of voters or of delegates, and yet Mr. Fillmore recommended its admission just as it stood, and his defenders who base his claims to the support and confidence of the Southern people upon his course in office, attack Squatter Sovereignty in connection with Kansas. There is nothing in the Kansas bill at all parallel or equal to this—nothing. All is legal and orderly, but the course of the Emigrant Aid Agents. The Senate of the U. States—the Democratic Senate, passed Mr. Toombs' Bill doing away with all that experience had proved to be objectionable or inexpedient in the original Bill, but the Black Republicans of the House, elected mainly under the auspices of the "order," refused even to allow it to be taken up. And yet Squatter Sovereignty is charged upon the Democratic party by the friends of Mr. Fillmore and of the organization to which he belongs. But Mr. Fillmore's Squatter Sovereignty was for the irregular admission of an anti-slave State. The Democrats go for the removal of an abolition restriction.

We repeat, the admission of California, recommended by Mr. Fillmore, and the only compromise measure recommended by him, is the quintessence of Squatter Sovereignty, truly deserving that name in its most odious sense, and no doctrine of that character, or of anything approaching to it, is embodied in any Democratic platform or adopted by any candidate of the party.

**A BIG CIGAR.**—Some weeks ago the papers announced a sale of some two or three hundred pounds of N. C. tobacco, in Lynchburg, Va., at \$2.50 per pound. Yesterday our friend T. H. Williams, Esq., who had recently passed through Lynchburg, presented us with a cigar, manufactured from said tobacco, at least its wrapper was. We puffed it and found it good. Peace to its ashes.

An election for members of Congress and State officers is held in Maine to-day. There are but two parties in the field—the Democrats on one side and the friends of all sorts and sizes on the other. The Neal Dowites who go for making men temperate by Statute law and domestic inquisition, the Abolitionists who flaunt a banner with sixteen stars, and the Know Nothings who go for runaway negroes from the South and curse white emigration from Europe, all these are arrayed against the Democrats.

This Fall there have been two State elections held at the North and another is progressing to-day. In Iowa and Vermont the Democrats have been beaten. What will be the result in Maine is yet to be seen. But there is one noticeable fact in connection with these elections, which should not be lost sight of by the people of the South when they come to concentrate their forces upon one of the two presidential candidates presented to them,—for we regard Fremont as out of the count so far as the South is concerned. The fact to which we refer is this, that in all of these States, Iowa, Vermont and Maine, the Democrats, the friends of Mr. Buchanan have raised the banner of opposition to Black Republicanism.—They have run candidates, and if in Vermont and Iowa, they have fallen, they have fallen battling manfully for their principles. Where were the Fillmore men—the "National Americans" of Iowa and Vermont, where are the Fillmore men of Maine in this struggle?—No-where! Either the Fillmore party was unable to run a ticket in a single one of these States or it was unwilling. Either it could not or it would not, and yet the South is asked to vote for a candidate that so far has shown himself without any party at all. The Democrats have been beaten in Vermont, where they have always been beaten, and they have also been beaten in Iowa, and the Fillmoreites have not been beaten, either because there were none of them to beat,—not enough to get up a ticket—or because they were merged in the anti-Democratic coalition. We ask the people of the South to mark these facts.

The Democrats of Indiana had a grand rally at Tippecanoe, in that State on the 3d inst., at which 40,000 persons were present. The meeting was addressed by Messrs. Douglas, Breckinridge and others.

By the way, we notice that the Herald of this place, in one of its issues last week, found fault with Mr. Breckinridge, a candidate for the subordinate office of Vice President, because of his addressing a public meeting of Democrats, and in the next day's paper made certain extracts from recent speeches of Mr. Fillmore, its own candidate for the Presidency, the basis of much eulogium!

We farther notice in the Herald of Saturday, something given as proof of the assertion that Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Parker Pillsbury, favour Buchanan's election. Now, before we proceed to examine this so-called evidence, we must refer to the nature and object of the original assertion, being to cast suspicion upon Mr. Buchanan's fidelity to the rights of the South, by associating with his name, the names of these notorious characters, as among his supporters. So far, so good. Now turn to the evidence which the Herald relies upon to "settle the question." It consists of an extract made from the New York Courier and Enquirer, abolitionist, which informs the world that the National Era, also abolitionist, states that Parker Pillsbury and Wendell Phillips, abolitionists of the Garrison School, have declared their preference for James Buchanan, alleging,—now mark this!—alleging that they have still hopes of disunion, and that the election of Buchanan, may effect that object. Why do they allege this? Because they know James Buchanan to be the very antipode of all they shout and howl for—because they dream of raising the fanaticism of their infidel followers to such a pitch as to do away with the constitution that they have denounced as a compact with hell. They favor Buchanan's election on the very same principle that a disunionist per se at the South would prefer that of Fremont, because they might think it would tend to the promotion of their wishes. Garrison and his school are too crazy to be feared. As a specimen of their talking, we give the following from Garrison's Liberator, May 4th, 1855—

"I have carefully looked over my article (see Liberator, Feb. 2.) and I can but find a single expression that begins to compare, in point of 'profanity,' with the above extracts. I said, if God had the power to abolish slavery, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs of the slave, and should refuse to exercise it, is a scoundrel—I should have said, devil. And if there is a man, not a fiend in human shape, who does not regard this sentiment it is because his humanity is swallowed up in his 'theology.' No doubt you would agree with me, that the man who will not do all in his power for the abolition of slavery, has more of the devil than of the divine in his nature; but God may be deaf to the cry of despair, may even command justice to not be ravished, and would not, he was 'a very great coward.' Now, did I recognize the existence of an infinitely holy being, and then should speak of him in such a manner, you might call it profanity; but as I believe in no God, my statement amounts simply to this: Any being whatever, having the power to strike the chains from the limbs