

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 3.—NO. 9.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1847.

WHOLE NO. 113.

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$1.75 (invariably required) if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing.

No subscription received for less than six months.

Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents;—one square \$1.

American Slavery Defended.

On Friday night last, the Rev. Alexander Campbell, of Virginia, U. S., explained at some length his views on the much agitated question of American slavery. He fell it necessary to do so, in consequence of the streets of Edinburgh being pleased with announcements styling him the defender and ally of American slaveholders. The reverend gentleman explained his views at considerable length, and with great calmness and clearness. After denying that there was any ground whatever for calling him the friend of slaveholders, he read a correspondence which had been conducted between himself and the Rev. James Robertson with view to a public discussion of the question. The Rev. Mr. Campbell, however, would only give his consent to a discussion through the medium of the press, as affording the greatest amount of satisfaction, and giving to the inhabitants of both the New and the Old World an opportunity of reading the views of the respective parties leisurely, and balancing calmly the arguments on both sides. Mr. Campbell contended that the confederated States of America had as little power to remove slavery as the State of Great Britain—that the removal depended solely upon each of the slave States itself, and the final removal could only be effected by one slave State following another in the abolition. Virginia was the most respectable of the slave States—(great disapprobation and laughter)—and he knew that there was a majority of the entire white population of that State who would willingly vote for the abolition of slavery. Mr. Campbell went on to argue that the New Testament sanctioned the connection between slaves and their masters, under certain conditions. The Bible did not sanction man-stealing, neither did it encourage the keeping of those in bondage who were born free. (Great disapprobation.) At this juncture the large assemblage got somewhat uproarious. Questions were rapidly put to Mr. Campbell, such as, 'Are all men not born free?' 'Are there any men born slaves?' &c. He repudiated the statements which had been made abroad, that he would not sit at the table with a colored man; and in answer to a question as to whether the negroes were allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper with their masters, Mr. Campbell went into an explanation, which did not seem to give much satisfaction. He stated that, especially in hot weather, the odor which was emitted from the bodies of the negroes was almost intolerable, and was more than many could submit to, to sit down at the same table with them. In cold weather there was less objection, because the odor was much less. He could even go into a dark room, and tell whether there was a negro in it, just from the smell. He then asserted that there was the greatest cordiality subsisting between the slaves and their masters, and there was greater desire to attend to each other's interests than amongst us. He then quoted some passages of Scripture, which seemed to justify slaveholding. (Great disapprobation prevailed throughout the meeting, and the Rev. James Robertson having no opportunity to reply, intimated that he would appeal to the press. The meeting then separated.)—Edinburgh Weekly Express.

From the (Glasgow) Christian News.

Cold Love for the Slave.

Mr. A. Campbell, the friend of the slaveholder, finds it difficult work to right himself with the British public, so contradictory are his sentiments. We would counsel Mr. C. to set about an entire 'reformation' on the subject. The following document has just been sent us for insertion, which our readers will peruse with painful interest:

To the Editor of the Edinburgh Weekly Journal:

Sir—Having seen in your paper of the 25th inst., the following statements in a letter signed, A. Campbell, Bethany College, Virginia, viz. 'I never approved nor defended in word or writing any system of slavery, Grecian, Roman, Anglian or American. I have always regarded and represented them as sanctioned by law, and displayed in their statute books, as impolitic, immoral, and irreligious.' I have never said that I would not eat the Lord's Supper, nor a common meal, with an African slave, on either political, moral or religious grounds. These are falsehoods, circulate them who may. I have never defended, as most falsely affirmed in an Anti-Slavery Meeting in Edinburgh, the negro-pew system. Indeed, I never saw it practised in my knowledge. Our African brethren, in all churches known to me, eat the Lord's Supper, at the same Lord's table with their masters. They may or may not in all cases sit in the same pew, but, if they do not, it is for other reasons than mere color or mere relation. And whereas we, the undersigned, consider that these statements are not in accordance with fact, or, at all events, are likely to mislead the public, we deem it incumbent upon us, for the sake of our brethren in slavery, and in vindication of our own characters (we have previously stated what we now publish) to lay before the public the following simple statement of facts:

At an interview which we had with Mr. Campbell, on the morning of the 11th inst., we learned from that gentleman—

1st. That he is in religious fellowship with slaveholders, some of whom are members of his own church, and that in admitting such into communion, it is not inquired whether they keep their slaves by force, or by the free will or consent of the slaves themselves.

2nd. That though he believed slaveholding to be impolitic, he did not consider it unlawful, nor immoral, nor unscriptural; he affirmed that it was an appointment of Heaven, that it is recognized in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; that it is not in opposition to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, and that Jesus Christ and his Apostles sanctioned the practice of man holding property in man, which opinions and assertions

he endeavored to defend and support, by arguing at some length from the Bible.

3rd. That in his church the blacks and whites do not sit promiscuously together; that the former sit by themselves in the gallery, and that in some of the churches in his connection, a curtain or screen, is put up to separate them from the white portion of the congregation.

4th. That he could not sit at meat with a black person, because of his smell, which he alleged was so offensive that he could tell in the dark whether one of them was in the room. He added, however, that if his back was to him, so that he could not see him, he might take his meat, although a black was near.

For the reasons already assigned, we hope you will give the above a place in your paper of Wednesday first, and oblige, Yours respectfully,

JOHN CARRILL, ROBERT HERRIOT, ROBERT LOCKHART, Kirkcaldy, 20th August, 1847.

From the Glasgow Christian News.

Mr. Campbell and Slavery.

Feeling deeply interested in the cause of the slave, we are not a little delighted to call the attention of our readers to the decided stand taken by the citizens of Edinburgh in the case of Mr. Campbell from Virginia, U. S. An abridged report of the various public proceedings in this case, will be found in another part of our columns. It was well that this somewhat celebrated American preacher should commence to enlighten Scotland, by attempting first to instruct the citizens of its metropolis—well that, previous to any consideration of his doctrine, they should ascertain what effect that doctrine produced on his own heart and life. It was well, too, that the very first point determined, (seeing he is from Virginia,) should be whether he stood implicated in the horrid sin of American oppression. It was also well that the Secretary of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society should be the first to put him to the test on this point, that Mr. Campbell should have the opportunity of defending (if possible) his conduct as the apostle of slaveholding, and one who declares his refusal ever to sit at meat with a colored man. All this was well; but it is better than all, that there should have been excited such a spirit of abhorrence of the intolerable crime of slavery, that as its defender, he should find it impossible to hold up his head in Edinburgh. The Anti-Slavery Society, and more especially their secretary, merit the warmest gratitude of their fellow-citizens for the stand they have taken. We confidently trust that, if not now, at least ere long, American preachers will understand that before they can be listened to in Scotland as 'preachers of righteousness,' they must wash their hands clean from the accursed crime of man-stealing. Never let that day come on when the free hearts of Christian Scotchmen shall fall to burn with irrepresible indignation when their ears are saluted by the voice of him who preaches the gospel in one sermon, and declares in the next, that in one man may rightfully hold property in man.

Rev. Alexander Campbell in Scotland.

We learn from a number of the (Glasgow) Christian News, of September 21, received by the Britannia, that our faithful and efficient coadjutors, the Anti-Slavery societies of Scotland, have given to the Rev. Alexander Campbell, the leader and founder of the sect known by his name in this country, such a reception, as, we trust, may always meet pro-slavery clergymen who present themselves as Christian ministers to the people of Great Britain and Ireland. 'We have for a long time,' says the News, 'had serious doubts about the genuineness of the religion of slave-owners, and we are now fully persuaded that the churches of America are the grand bulwarks of Slavery in that country.' We shall rejoice with exceeding joy when this shall become the prevailing sentiment of the friends of the slave on the other side of the Atlantic. The Coxes and Deweys of the American Churches, however much they may affect to despise the rebukes of the Abolitionists at home, where to be pro-slavery is to be respectable, are exceedingly sensitive as to the reputation which they may have abroad. In America, they oppose every form of Anti-Slavery agitation, because, till quite recently, the popular will has demanded that the subject should not be meddled with. But in Great Britain, their hearts are full of sympathy for the slaves. There is nothing they so much long for there as the redemption of their countrymen from bondage. They do not so much oppose the Abolitionists as keep aloof from them, because they doubt the wisdom of our measures. They are not only ready to adopt any plan for a successful and speedy termination of the 'felon system,' but it is a chief object of their prayers and thoughts, to discover such an one. We are glad to be assured by the reception which is now given to almost every pro-slavery divine who crosses the Atlantic and presents himself before the Christians of Great Britain and Ireland, that their professions are understood, and accepted for what they are worth. It is time that these lights in the American Church were taught to respect the Anti-Slavery movement in this country; and if its intrinsic worth as a great Christian movement, does not command their reverence, let the people of Great Britain show them by the estimation which they put upon their characters that no man has a right to call himself a Christian who is forgetful of the claims of a cause, which it is emphatically the mission of our age and country to conduct to a successful termination. And we be to this people if they turn aside from the work which the Lord has given them to do. No man can hold himself excused upon any plea of the recklessness, the want of wisdom, or the fanaticism of others. If the Abolitionists have been wrong in everything else, they

have been right in one thing, namely—that there can be no plainer Christian duty than that which every free man and woman in this country owes to his humble and oppressed neighbor, the Southern slave. He should not be excused, who sits all the day idle.

On the 10th of August last, on the arrival of Mr. Campbell at Edinburgh, he was waited upon by a deputation of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society, to ascertain whether his views on the subject of Slavery were the same as those published by him in the Millennial Harbinger, in April and May, 1845.—The News gives from that publication the following extracts. They probably are familiar to many of our readers, but will bear repeating. In April 1845, he says:

'It is the simple relation of master and slave necessarily and essentially immoral and unchristian—as that, for example, of the adulterer and the adulteress! We are clearly and satisfactorily convinced it is not. It would be, in our most calm and deliberate judgment, a sin against every dispensation of religion—patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian—to suppose that the relationship of master and slave was, in its very nature and being, a sin against both God and man.'

In May, of the same year, he declares further—

'There is not one verse in the Bible inhibiting it, but many regulating it. It is not, then, we conclude, immoral.' 'The discipline of the Church is the only discipline under which Christian slaves can be placed by Christian masters. If they will not faithfully serve their Christian masters, who partake of the benefits of their labor, then are they, after proper instruction and admonition, to be separated from the Church, and to be put under whatever other discipline a Christian master, under the existing laws of the State, may inflict.' 'To preserve unity of spirit among Christians of the South and of the North is my grand object, and for that purpose I am endeavoring to show that the New Testament does not authorize any interference of legislation upon the relation of master and slave, nor does it, either in letter or spirit, authorize Christians to make it a term of communion. While it describes the duty of both parties, masters and slaves, it sanctions the relation, and only requires that those duties be faithfully discharged by the parties; making it the duty of all Christian churches to enforce these duties, and to exact them under all the pains of Christian discipline, both from the master and from the slave—leaving it to the Lord to judge, correct, and avenge those that are without.'

Here certainly was reason enough why Abolitionists of Edinburgh should ask of Mr. Campbell whether his views remained unchanged. He presented himself to them as a Christian teacher, and they very naturally wished to know if he still held opinions so eminently unchristian. They were satisfied that he did, and a caveat was accordingly forthwith issued, cautioning the citizens of Edinburgh, to beware of the leaven of pro-slavery imported from Virginia, in the person of Mr. Alexander Campbell. The Anti-Slavery spirit of the people was aroused, and the Secretary of the Society challenged the reverend gentleman to a public discussion to vindicate himself, if possible, before an Edinburgh audience. This he declined to do, but offered to discuss the subject in the public prints. He afterward, however, set forth his views in a lecture on Slavery on the 13th ultimo. This lecture, the News says, has been industriously circulated by his friends. It gives two extracts, and first that "he himself teaches"—

'For myself, I greatly prefer the condition and the prospects of the free to the slave States, especially as respects the white portion of the population. MUCH AS I MAY SYMPATHIZE WITH A BLACK MAN I LOVE THE WHITE MAN MORE. As a political economist, and as a philanthropist, I have many reasons for preferring the prospects and condition of the free to the slave States; but especially as a Christian, I sympathize more with the owners of slaves, their heirs and successors, than with the slaves which they possess and bequeath.'

And then his view of what the Bible teaches—

'From all these views and convictions, from my understanding of the Bible, Old Testament and New, from the whole genius and spirit of Christianity, as indicated by its Founder and by the apostles, I am constrained to take the position I now occupy, and, therefore, I affirm the deep and solemn conviction, that any Christian man who exacts more from master and slave than the duties enjoined upon each toward the other, as these duties are developed and defined in the Holy Scriptures, as a term of communion in the Christian Church, does that which neither Jesus Christ nor any of his apostles has authorized him to do, and makes himself a transgressor of the law of Christ.'

Upon this the News says:

Overlooking the dangerous doctrine taught in this passage, it is a piece of sophistry from beginning to end; an entire begging of the question. The duties enjoined upon masters and slaves, each towards the other, as these duties are developed and defined in the Holy Scriptures, is the very point upon which we disagree. We would say, that if the master were to obey the rule of Scripture, in rendering unto his slave that which is 'just and equal,' he would immediately emancipate him. Mr. Campbell says, that in no case is the master commanded to emancipate his slave. Here, then, Mr. C. and we are entirely at issue. We affirm that the whole genius and spirit of Christianity, as indicated by its Founder, and by the apostles, instead of sanctioning and sanctifying slaveholding, frowns upon and forbids it under the most terrible responsibilities. What! Christianity approving and baptizing Slavery! Heaven's light shedding its sweet influences upon the lake of perdition! Christ walking in sweet concord and fellowship with Belial! Nay, as soon shall that "spirit accursed" be admitted to tread the golden

streets of the New Jerusalem, and to lave his burning brow in the pure river of the water of life, and to hold sweet converse and fellowship with the spirit of heaven before the throne, as that the spirit of Slavery and the spirit of Christianity, an associate, and co-mingle, and co-exist.

'We have no doubt it will be said,' adds the News, 'by Mr. Campbell's followers, that we are misrepresenting his views upon this great question. We appeal to the lecture now before us, and also to the following quotation from a pamphlet published in Boston, United States, in this present year, entitled, "The Church as it is," by Parker Pillsbury. At page 60, we read as follows:—

'THE CAMPBELLITES OR DISCIPLES. "These are most numerous at the West and South. They are slaveholders and slaves, President Shannon, Hason College, one of the most eminent of this sect, concludes a Bible argument in favor of Slavery thus:— "Thus did Jehovah STEREOTYPE HIS APPROBATION OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY, by incorporating it with the institutions of the Jewish religion, the only religion on earth that had the Divine sanction."

The News, then, to set more fully before its readers the position of Mr. Campbell, quotes the passages that have already been given from the Millennial Harbinger, and closes its article as follows:

'Mr. Campbell says, that from his understanding of the Bible, Old Testament and New, he is constrained to take the position he now occupies. But we cannot forget that Mr. Campbell has studied the Bible amid the baneful influences of Slavery, and therefore we cannot take his interpretation as the mind of the Spirit on this subject. We have some hope, however, that he will see the error of a new light, and that he will carry home with him some of the true Anti-Slavery spirit that animates the heart of dear old Scotland; at least, that he will be able to tell the churches in America, that the Christians of Scotland will have no fellowship with Slaveholders.'

A similar reception to that in Edinburgh, met Mr. Campbell in Glasgow. Our watchful friends of the Emancipation Society on his arrival there to give a series of lectures on Evangelical Reformation—a subject upon which, one would suppose, he might from personal experience be a most efficient lecturer—had posted a large bill warning the citizens against him, as one who was "the friend of the slaveholder and man-stealer." Before proceeding with his first lecture he endeavored to remove the stigma of pro-slavery which had been fixed upon him both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, and declared that the objection he met with arose, not from any love to the slave, but to prevent the progress of the Evangelical Reformation which he advocated. Adverting to the challenge which had been given him in Edinburgh, he said that it was not given till after it was known that his time was pre-occupied. He challenged any person to meet him now upon that subject, in discussion in the public papers, or in debate. How much sincerity there was in his allegation that a want of time prevented him from meeting his challenger in Edinburgh, we may judge from the fact, that he attached as a proviso to his own challenge in Glasgow, that the debate should take place in Liverpool, between the 24th and 27th of September. As the time he said, he should embark for the United States.

We wish our Scottish friends no equally speedy and happy deliverance from every pro-slavery American divine who shall have the hardihood to visit them for the purpose of enlightening those benighted regions upon the necessity of Evangelical Reformation.—A. S. Standard.

Dr. Hudson, who is now lecturing in New York, relates the following incident in a letter to the A. S. Standard:

Infidelity out of the Church made by Infidelity in the Church.

At Bloomville we were directed to an old man, some three score and ten years of age, as a friend of humanity. We found him at the dinner-table, and when I presented to him my brother Hayden, a slave from Kentucky, the old man's eyes were immediately flooded with tears, and his heart was too big for utterance. He retired to give time free vent. When he returned, having recovered himself, his soul began to kindle up with indignation, and he gave vent to his feeling in cursing the God of slaveholders, their accomplices, and Biblical defenders, the God of bloody human butchers, adulterers, whoremongers, &c. 'If I' said he, 'should see the assassin about to butcher my wife, and did nothing to prevent it, would I not be a murderer! Your God is said to endorse Slavery—he will not pay the tyrant's arm, he heeds not the prayer of the slave, nor yours for him. The Bible is a fiction, got up by bloody-minded human butchers, and slaveholders.' He proceeded to get 'Taylor's Diogenes,' and 'Volney's Ruins' to sustain himself—that Jesus Christ was an idealist, and his history, plagiarism from heathen descriptions of Bacchus, and Prometheus; the former, 'a holy and just God, the latter, Prince of Peace, justly so called.' I replied that my God was a God of love and impartial benevolence, no endorser of slavery, war, whoredom and oppression, that Jesus Christ was his express image; and he, annotated with the spirit of the Lord God, was good news, kindness, mercy, forgiveness, love, and impartial and living benevolence to all men, seeking the best good and happiness of all men, without respect of persons—and call him Bacchus, Prometheus, or an idealist, he was a glorious pattern, to imitate, to live by, and die by. That my God did answer prayer for the slave, through the spirit of truth on the hearts of men who had enslaved their brethren, to lead them to repentance, and by their living agency, destroy the system they had helped to build up. That prayer was the lively desire of the heart. That no other prayer was good for anything,

that mere lip prayer was a mockery, a solemn farce. That brother Hayden, and the emancipation of the thirty thousand fugitives in Canada, the heat of slaves emancipated by their repeating masters, the present general agitation of the subject of slavery throughout our land, was all in answer to the prayer of the slave, and the slave's friends. The old man challenged me to cause a cracker to move across the floor in answer to prayer, and offered a wager of two hundred dollars. I accepted the challenge. He put down the cracker and money. It was the desire of my heart that the cracker should cross the floor, I told him; and as an earnest of that desire, I took hold of the cracker and moved it along. The old man confounded, took his money and put it in the drawer. 'That was the way I prayed God for the abolishing of slavery, and I daily saw my prayer being answered. All other prayers, save living ones, were no better, of no more use than a sounding brass or tinkling cymbal.' When men pray for 'light,' and don't put themselves in the way to get light, when men pray for the overthrow of slavery, and do nothing but oppose the friends of the slave, their prayer is lip-prayer, the hypocrite's prayer.

This old man was formerly a prominent member of the Baptist Church, at a time when slavery existed in this State. The Church then, as now, was full of practical abolitionists, saying in their deeds, 'Who is God that should obey him!' It was full of practical infidels, as it is now, who practically deny the brotherhood of mankind. Priests then defended slavery, as they do now, 'divining lies for hire.' It was such atheism, infidelity, and infidelity, that drove the old gentleman out of the Church, and into his present frame of mind.

One of the most exemplary members of the Church, (held and used as a piece of merchandise by another brother,) by the name of Jethro, was compelled to toil six days in the week, and then go to church on Sunday without shoes, though the season was cold and frosty. Jethro felt that he had a right to so much of the avails of his labor as would purchase him a pair of shoes, and accordingly took enough from the crib to purchase a pair. For this he was severely flogged, then led on foot by this Christian chieftain on horseback, with a large lay rope around his neck, to the neighbors, to make confession, and then excommunicated from the Church. The old man, (on whom we called) after protesting in vain against slavery, and such brutality on the part of the slave-owner, and the Church, in its endorsement of such an impious outrage against God and man, fled from such a cage of unclean birds, and has, in consequence of the continued empty and pharisaic of the Church, been made what he is.

And what is he? So far as a man's life is an index of what a man is, he is a saint, compared with those who talk much about 'Orthodoxy,' 'Evangelical religion,' and yet are slaveholders, human butchers, 'abominable, and reprobate to every good work.' 'Thine, truly, for the truth that makes men free, E. D. HUDSON.

The following correspondence sufficiently explains itself:

Boston, June 30, 1847. General.—The remains of the late Captain Lincoln, of the United States Army, who fell at the battle of Buena Vista, will shortly arrive at this port, and afterwards be interred at Worcester with military honors.

General Hobbs, of Worcester, has requested me to take the proper measures to perform such ceremonies here as may be appropriate. I have detailed a company from my regiment to receive and escort the body to Worcester, on the morning of the 1st day of September, and now wish to have the proper measures taken to bring out such officers as may wish to participate in the ceremonies.

If you approve of the idea, I should like to have you invite the officers of the division in your own name.

The ceremonies will be the fourth or fifth day after the arrival of the vessel with the remains. Yours, respectfully, B. F. EDMANDS, Colonel 1st Infantry, 1st Brigade. To General APPELTON HOWE, Commanding 1st Division, M. V. M.

SOUTH WEYMOUTH, July 5, 1847.

DEAR SIR—I have this morning received yours of 30th ultimo, relative to the interment of Captain Lincoln, who fell in the battle of Buena Vista, and feel obliged to say that I do not approve of the object expressed in your letter. It seems to me that the cause in which he fell is one which ought to cover with shame instead of honor, all who are engaged in it. The Mexican war has been pronounced, justly I think, infamous; and I do not know of any reason, which has been assigned in justification of it, which might not be urged with equal truth and propriety, as a reason for making war on the Government of the United States. If the Government of Mexico have been perfidious in regard to treaties, so have ours; if that Government have failed to pay their just debts at the proper time, so have ours; if that Government have trampled on the rights and liberties of individuals who desired to reside within her borders, so have ours. And what adds to the enormity of the whole matter is, the hypocrisy which has been manifested in regard to the causes and progress of this war, in assigning false reasons for its inception, and the most palpable absurdities for its continuance. Who does not know that this war would not have occurred had it not been for the existence of Slavery in our own country, and a desire on the part of the present administration and its abettors to extend it into the Mexican territories! The whole scheme was contrived, as I believe, to extend and perpetuate that system of slavery which now

disgraces our country—a country, whose voice is loud in the proclamation of liberty, while her hands are busily engaged in the works of despotism. In a cause like this, however cool one may be in danger, however daring in exploits, or however reckless of consequences, I can see no reason which would entitle such an one to any public honor, which would not apply with equal force to the case of a duellist or pirate, who should exhibit equal evidence of bravery. I know it may be said that Captain Lincoln belonged to the regular army, and that his duty was to obey the orders of his superior officers; but I am not aware that the orders commanding him to the Mexican territory were repugnant to his inclinations, or that he made any effort to be excused from the duties assigned him on that station, and in this view he should be placed on a par with the volunteer corps of the army, whose infantry, I hope, may be as lasting as the cause they have espoused. Had Captain Lincoln fallen in a good cause, in the defence of his country, no one would have been more ready than myself to do him honor; but in the invasion of another country, he loses all my sympathy, and all my respect. Such are some of my feelings in regard to the subject matter of your letter, and while I thus plainly and briefly express them in all honesty, and with all due respect to those who may differ from me in opinion, I accord to others the same liberty which I claim for myself, of thinking and expressing their thoughts in accordance with their convictions of duty. I must, therefore, decline taking any part in this matter, and leave it in your hands, or in the hands of those who may feel an interest in the concern.

With sentiments of the highest respect, I remain yours, &c.

APPELTON HOWE, Maj. Gen. 1st Div. M. V. M. Colonel B. F. EDMANDS, 1st Infantry, 1st Division.

An Algerine Satire.

A correspondent of the Liberator, in an account of a great Barnstable Co. Anti-Slavery Convention, says:—

Among the speakers was John Kenrick, of Orleans. He denounced slavery as a curse, which he would be glad to see the country rid of; but how to get rid of it was the question. 'We were all alike implicated in the evil. The South were no more to blame than the North. (A proposition to which we fully agree.) And what were the poor slaveholders to do! Were we prepared to witness such scenes of bloodshed as attended the abolition of slavery in St. Domingo? He considered slavery a foul blot upon our country, of which he had been made especially ashamed. During the war of this nation with Tripoli, and while the frigate Philadelphia was lying before that city, he was detained there for some time; and visiting the theatre one night, he found that the subject for the evening's entertainment to these Mahometan freebooters, was no other than a caricature of American liberty. On the rising of the curtain, the Bashaw rode upon the stage on a richly caparisoned horse, surrounded with his attendants, and was soon followed by an American Sea Captain, who was represented to be himself—accompanied by an African slave. From whence art thou? said the Bashaw, addressing the American. 'I am from America, the glorious land of republican liberty and democratic equality,' replied the Captain. 'And whence art thou?' inquired the Bashaw, turning to the slave. 'I am from Africa, that afflicted country which Christian Americans have robbed of her children,' replied the slave. 'I was stolen from my native land, and sold to this Christian, and am now his slave.' At this stage of the performance, said Mr. Kenrick, I could hardly refrain from rushing upon the stage and rebuking those who were thus ridiculing my country and her institutions. But I remembered that I was alone against a multitude; and that the whole point, and the only point in the performance—that which galled me to the quick—was its truth. In such contempt do even the semi-barbarians of Northern Africa hold the people of this country, solely in consequence of their being a nation of slaveholders. And the scorn and contempt of these semi-barbarians—as we are prepared to call them—is now receiving additional power from the fact that slavery is fast disappearing from northern Africa; Tunis and Egypt have already done the work of abolition.

The Truth was once.—The papers are telling a story, believing, some of them, no doubt, that it was as they call it, an "awkward mistake," while others are laughing in their chairs, at the silly joke they are perpetrating. For our own part, we see neither joke nor mistake about it, but think it as solemn a truth as was ever uttered; and we rejoice with our whole heart that it was told where it was, and has been engraved in stone. May it be blessed to the people of that country. Here it is. We give it as we find it told in the papers;—A. S. Standard.

AWKWARD MISTAKE.—A fine stone church was lately built in Missouri, upon the facade of which a stone cutter was ordered to cut the following as an inscription: "My house shall be called the house of prayer." He was referred for accuracy to the verse of Scripture in which those words occur, but unfortunately he transcribed, to the scandal of the society, the whole verse: "My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

The Editor of the National Watchman, a "colored" paper at Troy, says that one of the thirty-seven Southerners who issued a circular to establish a pro-slavery paper in Washington, to his "certain knowledge has a colored family, consisting of a beautiful woman, a swarthy prototype of Hagar, and five children."