

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

"The inviolability of Individual Rights, is the only security of public Liberty."

Edited by the Executive Committee.

ANN ARBOR, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1841.

Volume I. Number 24.

THE SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

Will be published every Wednesday morning in Ann Arbor, Washtenaw county, Michigan, by the Executive Committee, for the Michigan State Anti-Slavery Society.

N. SULLIVAN, PRINTER.

TERMS.—\$2.00 per annum, in advance. \$2.50 in six months. \$3.00, if payment be delayed to the close of the year. A strict adherence to the above terms will be observed in every case.

ADVERTISEMENTS thankfully received and inserted at the usual prices in this vicinity. Any friend of humanity desiring to aid the cause of Liberty, is authorized to act as Agent.

All REMITTANCES and all communications designed for publication or in any manner relating to the "Signal of Liberty," will be hereafter addressed (post paid) to "SIGNAL OF LIBERTY, Ann Arbor, Mich."

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

Wednesday, October 6, 1841.

MR. BIRNEY'S LECTURE ON SLAVERY.

We shall be able to give only a mere sketch of the tenor of his remarks from a few brief notes we took at the time.

Mr. B. commenced by some observations upon the great importance of the subject of slavery, affecting as it does our civil, political and moral welfare, and being intimately and extensively connected with our mechanical, commercial, and agricultural prosperity. It would be impossible in one evening, to go over a field so extensive in itself, and presenting so many topics of inquiry and investigation, and he should be obliged to confine himself within narrow limits, and should endeavor to answer the objection made to the proceedings of the Northern people on the subject, that they know nothing of slavery. He asked how it happened that the North was so ignorant of slavery. The mysteries of the institution were not concealed. Northern men had visited the South from time to time during the entire existence of our nation, and had made their observations on the system and its results, and had communicated them to their friends and to the public, and yet during a few years past, the claim is set up at the South, that we at the north know nothing of slavery. When an intelligent man visits Russia, or the Mahomedan countries, or the African nations, and gives an account of the slavery or servitude that exists among those nations, and its effects on the character, interests and prosperity of the people, we believe the general statements made on these points, especially where the facts related came within the immediate knowledge of the traveller.—Why then should we not believe the statements made to us by great numbers of intelligent and candid individuals who have visited the South, and have personally observed the working of its institutions, and the condition of the population.

But suppose we do not know how many lashes the slave receives for each separate offence—how many or what kind of garments he wears, or how much food he receives, still if we know nothing of slavery except this one thing, that immortal beings are held by their fellow men as property, we should know enough to excite and call forth the liveliest feelings and sympathies of our nature. Holding men as property always implies unlimited power, and where has unlimited power, been conferred on man and not been abused? "The heart of man is deceitful and desperately wicked." We always associate the idea of unlimited power with the abuses which we suppose spring from it. When we hear of the absolute authority of the Emperor of Russia, we always expect, whatever may be the character of him who possesses it, that abuse, in more or less instances, will be sure to accompany its exercise. Unlimited power is prevalent to a far greater extent, and involves the happiness of a far greater portion of the population at the South than under the despotism of Russia. The latter affects chiefly the destinies of a few distinguished families and individuals, while the great mass of the laboring population, are secured by their poverty and obscurity, from the more immediate effects of arbitrary power; while at the South the case is reversed, and the laboring population, in all their social and domestic relations, are continually subjected to the capricious will of their masters.

The truth is, the South is blinded in relation to the actual character and results of its institutions. Among the heathen nations all kinds of vice, and crime, and licentiousness, general stupidity of intellectual powers and deadness of moral feelings, prevail through the land. Yet you cannot convince them of this fact. You can look upon this state of society with all its hatefulness

and deformity, but the eye of the heathen does not see the degradation of his country—his heart does not feel its defilement. It is so with the South in reference to slavery. They too are blinded. They see not its hatefulness and injustice: they watch continually for its safety and prosperity, and are keenly sensitive in reference to every attempt which may be made for its final extinction. We, who are free from the prejudices which they have adopted, and from the feverish and exciting influences which prevail among them, are therefore better qualified to judge of the nature and tendency of the system. But there are some things concerning slavery which are known or may be known at the North.

1. The colored laboring men of the South, excepting the free negroes, (and the colored people of the South perform nearly all the labor that is performed) are deprived of their wages, and this not temporarily, but systematically—universally—always, the oppression extending through their lives, and reaching their remotest posterity. Withholding the wages of those who labor for us is great injustice—it is uniformly condemned in the scriptures—it is contrary to our natural sense of right, and renders a man contemptible in all good society. It is a mean, degrading act. Let us appeal to our own hearts, and make the case our own.—Suppose that the Legislature of Michigan should make a law that the people should be equally divided into two classes, and that the men and women composing the poorer class should be compelled to labor without wages for the men and women of the richer class. Such an iniquitous enactment would not be submitted to for one year, one day, or one moment. The people of Michigan would not tolerate such monstrous injustice. Yet the same injustice is perpetrated every day, by means of legislative enactments, in thirteen states of this union. As soon as the child is tall enough to reach with his hands the cotton bolls, the robbery of his wages begins, and is continued through the prime of life to extreme old age. They rob the women—the children, and the men. This robbing of wages is not an accidental appendage to the system, but an indispensable part of it. Slavery cannot exist without robbery. Suppose in a neighboring county, one part of community should thus rob the other, and that Christians should adopt the same plan, and rob their fellow members of the same churches of all their wages, and justify the robbery, and avow their determination to continue it always—would you hesitate to dissolve your Christian connection, with them?

But the question arises how are these wages used? They are not expended on those who earned them, but for the comfort of those who robbed the laborer of his reward. They are not used as a fund for the education of the young or the support of the aged. Their wages are taken from them, not by their friends to be expended for their good, but by those who avow themselves to be their enemies; for it is a doctrine promulgated at the South, that in the nature of the case, the black and white races are natural enemies, and one must necessarily subdue and govern the other.

2. We at the North know that the slaveholders exercise over their slaves unlimited power of punishment. Some may object to this that the laws of the Southern States protect the slave from abuse, and excessive corporeal inflictions. It is true that there are such laws in the Statute books, but they have no actual force—they exist only on paper. They are like the sham guns which the Chinese pointed on the great wall which they built to defend them from the incursions of the Tartars, hoping they would have the same efficacy in repelling invasion, as though they were made of iron or brass. In order to test the efficacy of these laws, let us take a single instance. There are laws which prohibit the master from taking the life of his slaves. Slavery has existed at the south more than 200 years. Taking all the circumstances into account—the many kinds of punishments which are used—the violent passions of some masters, and the many facilities their situation gives them to vent their resentment upon the hopeless slave—is it at all unreasonable to suppose that five slaves have suffered death each year from the treatment of their masters? Mr. B. believed the number to be more than double that he had supposed, but assuming that as the truth, we have here one thousand murders, committed directly in the face of the law. And of these thousand murderers, not one was ever executed. An instance never yet was known throughout the slave States, in which the master was executed for killing his slave! Now, if we had a law in Michigan

which had been violated in one thousand instances, and never once executed, would it be saying too much to say it was powerless that it accomplished nothing—that it had no restraining influence on society—no efficacy as a law!

It is well known that at the South no slave or free colored man can be a witness against a white man. All that the slaveholder has to do, who intends to perpetrate any unlawful outrage on a slave, is to order him to a place out of the sight of a white person: or if it be committed in the presence of a thousand slaves, their testimony against the master cannot be admitted. Thus he is secure in any iniquity he may practice upon his slaves of either sex, or of any age.

But consider the case of what is called a well conditioned slave at the South. He is brought up by a kind and indulgent master, and owing to a reverse in his master's circumstances, he is sold to a trader, and disposed of to a man of ferocious and violent passions. The slave feels his helpless situation and is honestly and sincerely disposed to do the best he can. Perhaps also he is a disciple of Jesus Christ, and his moral and religious principles make him more diligent in his endeavors to please his master. But his master is offended at something, and he is beaten. He complains and he is beaten again. He runs away and is retaken, beaten again—sometimes to a jelly, as it is expressed at the South—salted and peppered.—And thus he lives. He is perfectly defenceless, and is disposed to do as well as he can, and yet this is his situation. Mr. B. did not say that all masters treated their slaves in this manner, nor that all slaves were so treated; but he did say that every slave, male or female, was every day liable to be thus treated.

3. We at the North know that the slaveholders exercise unlimited power to sell slaves—where, when, and to whom they please, and that the family relations are thereby often sundered. Husbands have no power to prevent the sale of their wives, or fathers their children—they are defenceless, and at the mercy of the master. Females, whether wives or daughters, are often separated from their friends, and purchased by the trader expressly because their beauty will render them saleable. Suppose a case—and many such exist in reality—where a sober, steady colored man has a large family of children of different ages. His master becomes embarrassed and sells one child out of the family—shortly after he sells another, as his necessities become urgent—and another—until they are all sold away from their parents except one daughter. Their affections centre in her. But the slave trader comes for another victim and thinks her beauty will bring a high price in the Southern market—she is purchased and sent to grace some slaveholder's harem, and if the bereaved desolate parents complain they are whipped. And yet people tell how happy the slaves are. Professor Dew, of William and Mary College, Va. says they are the happiest people in the world.

But some objector says "It does not seem to me possible that such things can be done, or at least, the cases must be extremely rare. I have seen many ladies and gentlemen from the South, and they appear so pleasant, kind, amiable, and generous that I cannot believe that such things are of frequent occurrence." In answer to this objection, Mr. B. adduced a great variety of facts showing the extent of the domestic slave trade. Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri and Maryland all raise slaves for sale, while the other States consume them in the same sense in which they consume horses or mules.—A Virginia editor estimated that during the height of the speculations, 40,000 slaves were sold out of Virginia, in twelve months, which at \$600 each brought into the State \$24,000,000, and he thought one half of the amount might be invested in banking. It is to be borne in mind also, that the traders usually purchase slaves of both sexes when they are from 10 to 25 years of age, because such are the most saleable—a period of life when the moral susceptibilities are most keenly sensitive, and the ties of nature bind the heart most closely to kindred and friends. Yet all these things are going on in the public highways of this great nation—in the land of ministers, and Bibles, and tracts, and churches, before all Israel and the sun, and we sit here unmoved—indifferent—as though it was no concern of ours. Ought these things so to be!

4. We at the North know that slaves are not allowed to marry. It is true that the slaves live together, and this they call "taking up," but marriage is entirely unknown among them. It is a fact well

known at the South that a slave country is a great scene of pollution and licentiousness. Henry Clay, in remarking upon the subject, observed, that the evil was not the greatest upon the colored people, but upon the whites. Mr. B. here made some remarks on the folly of a statesman, (if he could be called one) who would legislate to put down the free colored people in the free States, because they were a degraded class. Suppose that to be a fact, every thinking man knows that a body of corrupt and degraded people will corrupt and demoralize all with whom they come in contact. What then is the true policy of a statesman to pursue—to degrade and sink them lower by oppressive legislative enactments, and thereby render them a still greater nuisance to the rest of community, or was it not rather the part of a statesman to elevate their condition, increase their facilities for intelligence, and remove their disabilities, and thereby bring them up to a level with the surrounding population? He who would take an opposite course he called a sham statesman.

Mr. B. said his remarks thus far had referred chiefly to the physical hardships of the slave. But the slave was a man, and he possessed the higher part of man's nature—the intellect. Through all the slave States, with one or two exceptions, a slave cannot even learn to read the Bible. God from Heaven has commanded all his reasonable creatures to search the scriptures—the slave attempts to comply with the requisition, but the slaveholder steps in and says "You shall not!" The slaveholder thus opposes himself against the commands of God, and assumes towards the slave the same relation that God assumes towards all the rational creatures he has made.

Man is so constituted that the increase of knowledge, of whatever nature it may be, scientific, literary, or religious, gives enjoyment and pleasure. Now the slaveholder attempts to defeat this provision of God's government. He says that slavery must be maintained at every hazard—and intelligence and slavery are incompatible. He therefore deprives him as far as possible of all facilities for intellectual cultivation, and improvement. If it were possible to hold him as a slave, and yet grant him facilities for reading Milton, Bacon, Locke, or Malebranche, he would willingly do so. But he is perfectly well aware, that when the slave becomes a man of knowledge he will be a slave no longer.

But slavery lays its hand on the moral nature of man—on those immortal capacities for serving God and his fellow beings, which God has bestowed on the slave, and which he has made capable of endless progression and improvement. God has associated together the body, intellect and spirit. The body acts on the intellect and that in turn on the moral feelings. The intellect must perceive and understand the character of God, before the soul can enjoy and delight in the excellencies and glorious perfections of his nature. So that by shutting out in this life the knowledge of his Creator which the slave might have attained, the slaveholder renders his victim morally incapable of that happiness which he might have attained in a future state, in the adoration and service of God.

Here then, said Mr. B. we see that slavery involves the entire destruction of man—of his soul, body, and intellect—continually—during his residence on earth, and in the state beyond the grave. Yet slaveholders comes forward and say, "you know nothing about slavery!" If we know these things which have been brought to view concerning the abominations of the system, and these facts comprise the total destruction of all that is valuable in man, and yet they are accounted as nothing in the view of the slaveholder, as being so small a part of the system as not to be worthy of notice, what must slavery itself be? If these things are a mere item in the account, what must be the horrors of the institution, when spread out in all their length and breadth? He spoke at some length of the state of public feeling at the North, which prohibits ministers of the Gospel from mentioning it in their discourses, or praying publicly for its removal,

and, which also precludes the petitions of the friends of universal Liberty from being received by our National and State Legislatures, or gives them a sullen and ignominious reception.

But it was said that the Bible sanctioned slavery formerly, and if it was ever right to hold property in man, it was right now. In reply, he would ask the objector if slavery was not inconsistent with the Golden Rule of doing to others as we would be done by? He had never found an intelligent, candid man who denied this. This being admitted, he asked further if the Bible was not the offspring of one mind, of infinite wisdom? If it was, it must follow in the nature of the case, that there could be no discrepancies or contradictions in it. If God has established a single rule of action which prohibits slavery, (as the Golden Rule does,) there cannot be any passage in the Bible which sanctions slavery because that would imply two rules whose provisions are directly opposed to each other, both the revelation of one mind of infinite wisdom. If he found two parts of scripture apparently contradictory to each other, he must conclude that he had mistaken the meaning of the one or the other; for in all cases God must be consistent with himself.

But it was said that Paul told slaves or servants (he would not contend about the word) to obey their masters, and thereby recognized slavery. In the time of Paul, every nation under heaven except the Hebrews, held slaves. The Roman Empire extended over every part of the civilized earth, and there was no place to which a slave could escape. It would have been absurd for the Apostle to have advised the slave to escape and regain his liberty, when there was no place where he could remain in freedom. He therefore advised him to bear his lot with patience and consider it an ordination of Divine Providence which the slave might improve for his own sanctification, and perhaps it would be overruled for the ultimate good of his master. But now the circumstances were different. Suppose Paul to be standing in Quebec, in company with a master and a runaway slave, but who was now free by British laws—would Paul tell the slave that it was his religious duty to forsake the land of freedom, and return with his master into slavery, and once more submit himself to the lash, and obey his master in all things, and never more think of becoming free unless his master would voluntarily liberate him? Who can believe that Paul would advise a free man thus to forsake his freedom, and voluntarily become a slave, and teach him that the Bible required him to do so? Again, suppose Paul stood on this side of the St. Lawrence, and a poor hunted fugitive should arrive at the river, and prepare to embark for the opposite shore. He has escaped from a cruel and relentless master, who never had any right to his services, and who has abused and robbed him all his days; and now the slave, without doing the least injury to any one, in a few moments can be released from his misery and become a free man forever. Do you think Paul would tell him "Go back to your master!" He would be the very last man to send back the slave to remain in bonds when liberty was just within his reach.

Mr. B. then spoke of the remedy for slavery, and showed from a variety of facts that emancipation must be immediate, and not gradual, and that it must take place on the soil. Pennsylvania passed an act in 1780, emancipating the slaves gradually. 4000 slaves were emancipated in 25 years being 200 each year. These were liberated without inconvenience, and they found employment among the Quakers and others.—But in Louisiana, where the slave population amounted to 200,000, the case was different. Suppose 10,000 a year should be set free, what should they do? The slaveholders could not employ them and pay them wages, because their slaves would be discontented, and there would be none to hire them, and they would possess no land of their own. Next year ten thousand more would be added to the number of helpless freemen. The consequence would be, that for want of hands the planter must curtail his business and throw out yearly, 1-20th part of his land to briars and thorns. Now look at the other side of the question. Suppose all the slaves in Louisiana to be set free at once. It would be regarded by the slaves as an act not only of justice, but of great mercy and kindness. The masters are superior in intelligence, possess lands and tools, and want laborers, and the slaves want wages. One class is able to earn, the other to pay. Thus master and laborers would be mutually benefited.

But it was said that the blacks of the South would overrun the North. In answer to this Mr. B. observed;

1. That wages would be better at the South.

2. The colored man would have to struggle with more competition at the North—at the South the colored people do nearly all the work.

3. They are ignorant, and would be very poor geographers.

4. The expense of removal to the North would be a hindrance to many.

5. Land is cheaper at the South, and all laborers like to buy land. To obtain a comfortable freehold property, is usually the highest ambition of laboring men every where.

6. The southern climate is usually accounted more congenial to the negro.—Whether this was true, Mr. B. would not pretend to determine.

7. Their connections and their birth-place were at the South.

In case of a general immediate emancipation, effective common schools would be generally instituted throughout the South. The employers would find it to be for their interest to afford all possible facilities to their laborers for the acquisition of knowledge. The great extent of the plantations which has hitherto rendered their common schools to a great extent inefficient, would then be no longer an obstruction. Religious instruction would also be given in connection with intellectual improvement, and the cultivation of the mind and heart would keep pace with each other.

Mr. B. examined the scheme of Colonization at length showing that the transportation of the slaves to Africa is utterly impracticable, either by a society or by the National government. This enterprise had been highly favored by Doctors of Divinity, Presidents of Colleges, by ministers, and by all denominations of Christians, and donations of money had been made by State Legislatures. With all these encouragements the Colonization society had transported to Africa about 5000 persons in 20 years, being the increase of the whole slave population for one month. The Government could not accomplish this, because in order to send away the slaves, they must be bought.—To purchase the increase of the slave population would cost the government \$20,000,000 at \$400 for each slave, which is the estimate of Henry Clay. Then they must be transported to Africa, and supported one year after their arrival on account of the sickness which prevails there among strangers, and they must be supplied with tools and implements of agriculture. These expenses of purchase and removal and the necessary supplies would amount to twenty-six millions per annum, merely to carry off the increase. It is further to be considered, that when the government becomes a purchaser, the stock will rise, and more be produced for market. The sellers would dispose of their unproductive slaves, while the reproductive ones would be reserved for the last, and every master would rear as many slaves as possible, and thus the annual increase would be largely augmented.

Thus, at an immense expense, the nation would export 50,000 of its most effective laborers, without the possibility of supplying their place by any importation of foreigners. For no German or Irish emigrants can be found who will work on the cotton and sugar plantations of the South, in company with slaves, followed by a driver flourishing the lash.

Mr. B. spoke of the condition of the emancipated slaves in the West Indies—of their industry—their moral and religious improvement, and their peaceable deportment. Not an instance of personal violence from an emancipated laborer towards a white man had yet occurred. Our Southern slaves were more intelligent than those of the West Indies, and their advances would be greater, and were they immediately emancipated, the masters would become perfectly safe and the dread of insurrection would be removed, because the slaves would gain peaceably, without violence, all they desired.

He closed with the remark that the subject must be met and decided. It was emphatically the great question, and the immense agitation which it had excited for some years, demonstrated its importance, for it is utterly impossible to get up a general and permanent excitement on a subject of little consequence. A part of the labor of the nation was performed by freemen, and a part by slaves; and the same system of legislation would not favor both alike. One or the other must have the preference. The subject was now agitated extensively in community, and the question whether all the labor of the nation shall be performed by freemen or by slaves will continue to excite powerfully the public mind, until the decision shall be absolutely and permanently made.

We are happy to say a word for our old friend, HENRY B. STANTON. In a sort of private, "streak" letter, dated Johnston, N. Y., August 25, 1841. He says:—

"I am glad you are at the desk of the Free American again. We are doing what we can in this region for the good cause. My head aches this morning, because I was out last night until half past 12, at an anti-slavery meeting. The temperance and abolition folks contrive to get two or three, and sometimes four or five long speeches a week out of me. We shall run a ticket in this county this fall, heading it, "NO SLAVERY! NO ALCOHOL!" and shall make as good an assault on these twin monsters as they deserve. No, not exactly as they deserve—for they ought to be annihilated—but shall do what our little strength may be equal to.

Free American,

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY

Wednesday, October 6, 1841.

LIBERTY TICKET.

For President,
JAMES G. BIRNEY, of New York.
For Vice President,
THOMAS MORRIS, of Ohio.
For Governor,
JABEZ S. FITCH, of Calhoun Co.
For Lieut. Governor,
NATHAN POWER, of Oakland Co.

"IN ESSENTIALS, UNITY; IN NON-ESSENTIALS,
LIBERTY; IN ALL THINGS, CHARITY."

NATIONAL AND STATE ADDRESSES.

In consequence of the increasing demand...the former supply being exhausted; TWO THOUSAND COPIES of the above Addresses are now being re-printed, and will be ready for delivery next week. Send in your orders immediately. Price \$2.00 per hundred. Address,
N. SULLIVAN, Ann Arbor.

Mobs.

We define a mob to be an assembly of riotous individuals, convened for the purpose of attacking the persons or property of others, contrary to law. It follows, from the definition, that one essential and prominent feeling in the mind of a mobocrat, is a contempt of the law; a want of reverence for it as a rule of action, a disregard of its injunctions and prohibitions, and a defiance of its penalties. A contempt for the authority of law is usually generated by a sluggishness and want of promptitude in its execution. Where the laws are invariably executed upon offenders, they may be disliked, but they cannot be despised, and in such a community, mobs will be scarce.

A second cause of mobs is found in the encouragement and countenance given to them by men of property and standing in the community. These gentlemen lend the weight of their characters and influence against a certain class, by denouncing their real or supposed principles and practices as injurious to the interests of their fellow citizens, or as derogatory to their character and reputation, thereby inciting the mob to deeds of violence against them. When Cincinnati was under the dominion of a mob for several days, during the recent riot, the citizens held a meeting, and after passing a string of resolutions against mobs and illegal violence, they concluded with declaring that they "viewed with abhorrence the proceedings of the Abolitionists," and that every citizen ought by all lawful means to discountenance every man who lends them his assistance.—Such a resolution as this, passed at such a time, by a meeting of the most respectable citizens, over whose deliberations the Mayor presided, was a pretty plain intimation to the mobocrats to attack a particular class of the citizens, and was so understood by them, and doubtless so designed by those who originated it. The mob attacked the houses and property of the abolitionists with greater boldness and courage than before.

Also, the countenance or approval of the leading men in a community, whether openly expressed, or only implied, tend greatly to encourage the violators of law to hope they shall escape its penalties, while they act only with the current of public sentiment. In the ordinary administration of law the guilty often escape, and they feel doubly courageous in risking its penalties, when the influential and dignified, whose opinion and feelings, in a great measure enforce or mitigate the severity of its execution, sympathize with them, and indirectly incite them to violate its provisions. In every place large enough to contain the materials of a mob, there are a few leading individuals, whose influence, if united, could immediately suppress its propensities to violence. Hence we see, that the responsibility of the existence of a mob, lies, in a great measure, with the most respectable and dignified individuals of the place.

The outbreaking of violent and ungovernable passions may be reckoned as a third occasion of mobs. The violence of the passions is augmented or diminished, in all cases, by the early training of the individual, and the habits of the surrounding society. The same child, that under the tuition of some Quaker, or minister, or deacon in New England, would become a peaceable, orderly law-abiding citizen, when educated amid the influences of a high-spirited slaveholding family, might be jealous, quarrelsome and violent in his intercourse with society. Either class of feelings is developed, more or less, in proportion as circumstances call them into action. Whence a slaveholding country, other things being equal, will always be more subject to mobs and the crimes resulting from excited and impetuous feelings, than a community where every citizen is taught, from his earliest years, to regard his neighbor's rights, and in all contests which may arise, to submit his cause, implicitly and finally, to the justice and supre-

macy of the laws, and to seek no redress for his grievances beyond what they will afford. How much more common are mobs and personal violence in the slave States, than amid the steady industrious population of New England!

A fourth and principal cause of mobs is the immense quantity of intoxicating drinks that is supplied to the community through the operation of the license system. Except in the cases last referred to, individuals will seldom commit violence on each other's persons or property when perfectly free from intoxicating drinks; and a great proportion of the cases of assault and battery which occur, take place while one or both of the parties are partially intoxicated. And of the more serious crimes which fill our State Prisons, a considerable share were committed while the criminal was under the actual operation of alcohol. In fact, ardent spirits have often been resorted to by persons intending to commit crimes, for the purpose of bracing their nerves, and drowning the voice of reason and conscience. Their influence is similar on the minds of a mob intent on mischief and destruction. Where has a mob been known in all the country where there was no alcohol? It is an indispensable requisite; and the most disgraceful and bloody mobs in the land have been accompanied by a plentiful supply of liquors. On the other hand, who would not be astonished to hear of a mob composed entirely of tea-totalers?

From this brief recital of the causes of mobs, we may also, in some measure, discover the remedies. A faithful execution of the laws by the magistrates, and a prompt and united concentration of the influence of the principal citizens will go far towards restraining the violence and ferocity of a mob, although they leave untouched the two great fountains of commotion and rebellion against the law—SLAVERY and ALCOHOL.

Against these also we call upon all patriots and lovers of mankind to unite, by beginning at the foundation of the evils which deluge the land, by establishing as a permanent principle, that their influence and their votes, shall never send to our Legislative Halls, those who are in favor of longer cursing our nation and the world by a continuance of these evils. Let the other parties take what course on these great subjects their party interests and prejudices may require, the Liberty party, founded on the principles of equal and exact justice, will ultimately make an end of both, and slavery and the system of licensing drunkenness by law shall be remembered among the things that were, and their existence be recurred to by historians as an astonishing instance of the folly and depravity of the people who so long endured them.

A few days since we heard an invalid clergyman inquiring of a gentleman who had resided at the South, whether it would be safe for him, an avowed abolitionist, to travel to the South for the recovery of his health. He was assured most fully, that it would not be safe—that should his connection with abolition become known while there, he would be in continual danger of being lynched, and perhaps hanged—and that neither his sacred profession, nor his personal respectability, nor his state of health, would be certain of securing him from personal violence. What a story is this to tell of one half of our country! Amid what we consider the tyrannical governments of the old world, the person and property of the American traveller are perfectly safe: and he is at liberty to express his sentiments on any subject without molestation, and should he by any means be exposed to injury or abuse, his character as an American citizen will secure the protection and interference of the government.—Yet the same traveller cannot pass through one half of these free United States, for health, business, or curiosity, without imminent danger to life and liberty from his own countrymen. How much reason abolitionists have to praise our free institutions—our equal rights—our civil liberties!

☞ Jacob Barker, a lawyer, of eminence in New Orleans, formerly from the North, who has been engaged extensively in suits in behalf of free negroes and colored persons, has been notified by a committee of citizens to quit the State, informing him if he did not comply with the invitation, he would receive a visit from Judge Lynch. In the time of Paul, the Apostle, being a Roman and uncondemned, was a safeguard against violence in a heathen country. In Christian New Orleans, (are we right in coupling the two words together?) being an American citizen unconvicted of crime, will not secure any man from personal violence. Do we not need a liberty party?

☞ The United States Bank, to avoid the numerous suits which were commencing against it, has made an assignment of a very considerable part of its assets for the benefit of its creditors. So the "monster" seems at last to be down.

☞ Benjamin Shaw of Vermont is lecturing in Pennsylvania in favor of Independent Liberty nominations.

American Board of Foreign Missions.

This Society held its thirty-second anniversary at Philadelphia, Sept. 8. The financial affairs of the Board were in a critical and alarming situation. The receipts last year amounted to \$235,000, while the expenditures were \$265,000 and the debt of the society, if the receipts for the ensuing year shall be the same as last year, will amount to \$98,000. Massachusetts paid \$75,000 last year, or nearly one third of the whole amount. The other N. E. States diminished their gifts \$2,300, and the slave States decreased theirs \$7,000. The whole amount received from the slaveholders must be very small, while the abolitionists begin to withhold their accustomed contributions on account of the relation of the Board to Slavery. A memorial was presented by Mr. Green from sixteen ministers of New Hampshire, complaining of "the studied silence" that had been maintained on that subject, and calling on the Board to be explicit in making known their views and feelings "that they may be recognized by all as sympathizing with those Christians who deeply abhor that system of abomination." They also set forth that among the sober and considerate members of their churches, there is a deep feeling of disapprobation in reference to the studied silence of the Board, which must ultimately, and that before long, cause their contributions to be suspended, unless the grievance should be removed.

This memorial was referred to a committee of which Dr. Woods was chairman, who made a very singular report upon it. He took the ground that the one object of the Board was "to propagate the Gospel among the unevangelized nations," and "to do away idolatry, ignorance and wretchedness among the heathen." The committee "think it may fairly be presumed that the funds contributed from time to time to the treasury, are obtained in a proper manner, and are given from proper motives," and they recommended that no expression on the subject of slavery be made. The report was adopted, and the Board once more resolved to maintain fellowship with slavery, and thus show to all the world that they do not consider the act of slaveholding to be a sin or a reproach in a Christian people. The Board has thus fully determined to accept the fruits of robbery for the Lord's treasury, and it is left with those who hate "that system of abomination" to resolve whether they will continue to fellowship it. Concerning the report, the Emancipator remarks:

"The object of Jesus Christ is to save people from their sins, of which slaveholding is one. The Board cannot sympathize fully with the object of Jesus Christ, and is obliged to limit its labors to the removal of one particular sin, idolatry. It cannot properly labor to deliver the people of Africa, India, the Sandwich Islands, or the Cherokee Indians, from the sin of slaveholding, because it allows that among its own members, and holds open fellowship, at home with 'them that do such things.' The report, however, cautiously intimates that slavery is an evil, and that to labor for its abolition is a work of benevolence. On this ground its adoption was earnestly resisted by Doctors Skinner and Bates, and Thomas Bradford, Esq., who declared that it would never do for the Board to affect 'our Southern brethren' with the avowal of such sentiments. Their shameless servility was well rebuked by some southern men, and the Report was adopted without farther objection.—This is a decided advance. It will not relieve the Board, however, nor satisfy those who have a proper abhorrence of the sacrilege of making Christianity the handmaid of slavery."

THE SABBATH IN PHILADELPHIA.—The Courier of July 31, says: Last Sunday we were confidently assured that there were not less than 4 to 6000 persons who left the city and county of Philadelphia, in the various modes of public conveyance, principally in the different steam boats. These steamboats had been advertised a large part of the week to make these excursions. Crowds rushed on board of them—and in one or two instances, were told that not less than two hundred persons were left behind upon the wharves because the boats were too thronged.

☞ Many of the Whig papers deal in hard epithets against President Tyler. The Detroit Advertiser speaks of his "whiffing treachery,"—"basely treacherous conduct"—"a mercurial prevaricator"—"a contemptible, whiffing demagogue"—and declares that no man who respects himself can take office under him. If the Whigs have elevated such a man as this to the first office in the nation, does it not strongly indicate that the party is corrupt?

☞ There are two great political parties in the nation which are pro-slavery. They must be pro slavery or anti-slavery, for there can be no neutral ground in the present condition of things, and they themselves say they are not anti-slavery. It follows then that the voter who gives his suffrage for the Whig or Democratic parties, according to the standing the parties assume for themselves, votes for slavery, and against liberty. Let this be remembered.

The Southern States and British India.

Hunt's Merchant's Magazine, for September, contains an article on the commerce of the British East Indies, considered in reference to the staple productions of the South. It appears from the statements there made, that the climate is admirably adapted to the production of sugar, cotton, rice, indigo, coffee, tobacco, and various other articles, and that the imports from India to England are rapidly increasing, and India is already beginning to be a formidable rival to the South.

For instance, the exports of sugar from India to England in 1831, were about 60,000 cwts: in 1839, 519,126 cwts. The exports of 1841 are estimated to exceed 1,200,000 cwts.

In 1831, the imports of cotton into England from India, were 75,627 bales; in 1835, 116,153 bales; in 1839, 216,794 bales—being nearly trebled in nine years. The importation in 1830, was 47,233,559 lbs.; in 1841, 76,703,295 lbs.; an increase without a parallel in the history of the article.

The writer adduces a great variety of facts respecting the capabilities of the country, mode of manufacture, soil, and climate, and sums up his conclusions as follows:

"That we have some real grounds for asserting that India is able to compete with us in the cultivation of cotton, and that of all qualities, the writer of this has endeavored to show by a few substantial facts of recent date. It is time for the planters of the South seriously to set about the investigation of the subject; and to ask themselves, whether slave labor at 31 cents a day, (three negroes doing the work of one freeman—a well known fact in slave countries) with all its concomitant evils and vexations, is equal to free labor at twelve cents a day; a large supply of labor, and any quantity of unoccupied land for the purpose; and with a government and wealthy company ready to second them; having only one great impediment in the way—the greater distance of transportation. The people of the United States are alike interested in this subject, and it should by all be one of common interest."

"Now what are the conclusions which are forced upon us by the considerations of these facts? I think it is fully proved by all modern writers on India—1st. That she is amply capable of producing almost any quantity of the very articles which form the principal exports from our southern States. 2d. That she is willing—3d. That there is abundance of tilled and untilled land. And 4th. That labor is plentiful and cheap.

Reflection on these facts and circumstances must bring to our minds the inquiry—Will the planters of the southern States be able to stand the coming woe competition; not only as to quantity, but to quality of material? I think it all resolves itself into one simple answer, that they who sell the cheapest of the same article, of whatever variety of merchandize, and no prohibitions in the way, will get the most custom.

I believe it can be safely asserted, that with the present costly system of labor at the South, they will be unable to compete with the East Indies. If we have been able to produce the same articles better and cheaper with a rich soil and ingenious machinery, it does not stand to reason, that other countries with the same soil and cheaper labor, may not take advantage of our improvements, and backed by a wealthy company, and encouraged by a powerful government, be able to defy our competition. It is not possible—it is against the very nature of our present system."

I hope the planters of our Southern States may not be afraid to ask themselves the question, Can we meet this scarcely to be supposed change: Is it politic, or profitable to continue the present wasteful system of labor any longer? The answer of every candid man who enquires into the subject is, you cannot go on exhausting whole tracts of fertile land by this plan—moving further west every few years, and the original plantations falling back into a fruitless wilderness, (which is the operation at the South,) without ruining yourselves, and the country also.

But perhaps it will be asked by the planters—Suppose we change the system; shall we be able with free labor, and time-saving machinery, to compete with labor in the East at thirteen cents a day? I think this is satisfactorily answered by the fact that we have at present the supply of the two main articles in which the southern states are directly concerned—cotton and tobacco; and that with our ingenuity and skill, free labor at twenty-five cents a day, and a shorter distance, no American can doubt that we should be fully able to compete with India in cheapness of production. Give America full swing and an open market, and England dreads her more than any other competitor. The very reverse of this is the case at present; continuing in our present system, we shall gaze on the conflict, and tremble for the result.

A few words, and this paper will be brought to a close. It may be supposed that if India entirely supplies Britain with the articles that we now do, she (Britain) will impoverish herself by losing so valuable a market as the United States now is. But a glance at the facts of the case will convince us of the error of such an idea. If England loses seventeen millions of customers in America, she gains one hundred

