

The Liberator.

No Union with Slaveholders!
BOSTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 1860.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Delinquent subscribers for the past year—that is, from January 1, 1859, to January 1, 1860—are respectfully requested to remember our **STANDING RULE**, by which their papers will be discontinued after February 1, 1861, unless payment for the same be previously sent in. We shall be extremely sorry to lose a single subscriber in this manner, especially at this crisis in our national affairs; but, as our printed terms of procedure, and who had nothing to do with it directly.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held at the TREMONT TEMPLE, in Boston, on THURSDAY and FRIDAY, January 24th and 25th, commencing at half past 10 o'clock, A. M.

The members and friends of the Society are urgently requested to make the attendance on their part larger than ever before seen since its formation. In view of the position of the Anti-Slavery cause, and of the state of the nation, it will be the most important anniversary the Society has ever held. Troublesome as the aspect of things is, it is a sure indication that the cause of impartial freedom is moving onward with irresistible power, and that the day of jubilee is rapidly approaching, to be succeeded by universal joy, peace and prosperity. For nothing disturbs the repose, deranges the business, assails the interest, dishonors the character, and imperils the existence of the republic, but SLAVERY. Freedom, and the love of it, and the advocacy of it, and the uncompromising support of it, without regard to color or race, can never work ill to whatever is just, honest, noble, humane, and Christ-like. It is not the Abolitionists, who simply espouse the cause of God's poor and needy and oppressed, that it may go well with our land, but the Southern slaveholders and slave-breeder, who traffic in human flesh and enslave every man, woman, and child, and who have every thing that savors of liberty, who have brought the nation into its present distracted and distressful condition; for theirs is the spirit which chooses "rather to reign in hell than serve in heaven."

Come, then, friends of freedom, to the Anniversary, strong in the righteousness of your cause, serene and undaunted in spirit, and resolute in your purpose to seek the speedy removal of the cause of all our national suffering and danger!

Able and eloquent speakers will be present as usual. (The list will be given hereafter.)

In behalf of the Society,
FRANCIS JACKSON, President.
ROBERT F. WALLACE, Secretary.

THIRTY YEARS COMPLETED.

We have completed thirty years of editorial life connected with the Liberator. We commence a new decade with the same confidence in the principles we espouse, the same assurance of success in the cause we advocate, that we felt at the commencement of our labors,—only greatly strengthened by the experience gained, and the progress made toward the goal of final victory. It has been a long, desperate, and (humanly speaking) most unequal struggle with the organized religious sentiment, the political power, and the combined wealth, the recognized respectability, the popular feeling, the business selfishness, the staid malignity, and the universal brutality and ruffianism of the country; but, from the hour the bugle of freedom first sounded its notes in favor of immediate and universal emancipation, the movement has advanced with slow but irresistible power, under Divine guidance, confounding the wisdom of the wise, contending the might of the strong, taking the cunning in their own craftiness, unmasking the hypocritical, swallowing up all the rods of the magicians, breaking seats and parties into fragments, vanquishing all opponents, and putting more than a match for all the wealth of the land, its conscience outwitting Church and State, its spirit sublime and unconquerable, its truths self-evident, and its results glorious in the annals of historic achievement;—and still.

"Against the wind, against the tide,
It stands with upright keel!"

outstripping all competition, and with the haven of righteousness and peace full in view.

For thirty years, we have been the target of popular scorn and violence, for imploring the nation to "undo the heavy burdens, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free!"

For thirty years, we have been ignominiously branded as heretic and infidel, disorganizer and fanatic, because we have declared chattel slavery to be diametrically at war with the spirit and teachings of Christianity, and that into the true Church enter neither the enslavers nor despisers of their fellow-men!

For thirty years, we have subjected ourselves to outlawry in all the slaveholding States, and have had no common country to recognize our rights and accord to us equal privileges, because we have maintained that liberty ought to be "proclaimed throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof!"

For thirty years, we have been held up to public abhorrence as a monster of iniquity, and represented as quite unfit to live, because we have "remembered those in bonds as bound with them," refusing to compromise their cause, and carrying out in their behalf the Golden Rule!

For thirty years, the Abolitionists have been mobbed in city, town and village—misunderstood, misrepresented, calumniated, caricatured, ostracized—injured in business, and cut off from all preferment—because they have endorsed the language of JOHN WESLEY, that "Slavery is the sum of all villany," and believed with THOMAS JEFFERSON, in regard to the enslaved at the South, that "one hour of their bondage is fraught with more misery than ages of that which we rose in rebellion to oppose"—and trembled with him, when they "reflected that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever!"

The "head and front of our offending," and of theirs, "hath this extent—no more."

So stands the record of impartial history.

But the Anti-Slavery cause being of heaven, not of men, and guarded and defended by the arm of Omnipotence, no weapon formed against it has been able to prosper. In vain have been, and will be, all compromises between the North and South. The "irrepressible conflict" sweeps every thing before it, and the fulminations of priestcraft, and

All Union-saving

the enemy with

Carolina, for

tion is

enemies

years as who

assur-

bring-

and!

LETTER FROM DR. A. BROOKE.

MARLBORO', Ohio, Dec. 14th, 1860.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—Your remarks upon the late mob in Boston, in the Liberator of the 7th, include the following passage:—

"It was our impression that the Convention would prove comparatively a failure, as the Call did not emanate from a source calculated to carry any personal weight, and as no conference or consultation whatever was had with the long-tried advocates of the anti-slavery cause, who, if they had been consulted, would have suggested a very different mode of procedure, and who had nothing to do with it directly."

Inasmuch as you acknowledge "the right of the young men," alluded to, "to call the meeting in their own way," is there not something needlessly ungracious, to say the least, in such a remark, under the circumstances? While perilling much in a struggle for free speech for all, and smarting under undeserved violence, was it wise towards our cause to enter a disclaimer of any part of their course, which could not be condemned as a moral delinquency? Is there not reason to feel encouraged by, and to encourage every evidence of uncompromising hostility to slavery, whether the actors in it pronounce our shillibolee, or ask our opinion of the "how to do it," or no?

Yours, with true regard, A. BROOKE.

REPLY. We deem it neither unfair nor improper to "let every tub stand upon its own bottom," or to state facts truly as they exist. The reason why we used the explanatory language, referred to by Dr. Brooke, was, that the meeting at the Temple was falsely represented by the press and telegraph to have been a "Garrisonian" convention, and especially under the guidance of Mr. Phillips and Mr. Garrison, who were tainted with cowardice (!) by the Courier for not having been present. While we shrink from no responsibility of our own, we are not willing to have that of others thrust upon us against our consent. We fully vindicated the right of those who called the meeting at the Temple to do so, against all disorderly interruption, and have ever since been assiduously endeavoring to deepen the infamy of those who riotously broke it up, by recording our own views, and the sentiments of various many journals in different parts of the country. We still think, however, that it would have been not only courteous, but judicious, on the part of the young men who signed the call, to have conferred directly with those older in the struggle, as to the best mode of procedure upon an anniversary calculated to arouse the demon-spirt of slavery, far and wide. There can be no good objection to "personal weight," or to the presentation of the most influential names, when these can be obtained in the cause of ostracized liberty. Nevertheless, it is for each and all to labor as they may. Our only aim was, to make a simple explanation in order to correct a wide-spread misrepresentation. What would have been a comparative failure, has resulted in a meeting for the whole country, commanding millions of hearers, owing to the efforts of Messrs. Fay, Howe, and their mobocratic associates. So kind Heaven—

"From seeming evil, still educe good."

FAMINE IN KANSAS.

With all the relief that has yet been extended, the famine in Kansas continues to be sorely felt, and thousands are in a state of destitution closely bordering upon starvation. The number is estimated at thirty or forty thousand. This is truly appalling; for they can realize nothing for themselves until another harvest. On our last page, we give a highly interesting letter from Mr. [Name], dated "Atchison, Kansas, Dec. 20, 1860," in which some painful and heart-moving facts are communicated respecting this terrible visitation, and a strong appeal made to Eastern benevolence, which we are sure will not be made in vain. The most reliable arrangements have been made in the Territory to secretly and judiciously distribute the charities given, according to the necessities of the parties presenting themselves for relief; so that there need be no apprehension on that point. Think of a bare-footed population in the inclemency of winter, to say nothing of rags instead of clothing for a covering!

Below is a private note from our esteemed friend, Col. Whiting of Concord, Mass., characteristic of his spirit, which we publish in this connection as an incentive for others to "go and do likewise." Blessings on the heads of the juvenile benefactors in Concord of the suffering people in Kansas!

CONCORD, Dec. 16, 1860.

DEAR FRIEND,—Reading in the Liberator of the 7th inst. an affecting account of the sufferings of the people at Neosho Falls, Woodson County, Kansas, I thought it would be well to read it to our Sunday School, which I accordingly did. We then and there voted to take up a collection on the 16th inst. It amounts to \$10.62. It would have done your heart good to see the bright eyes of the dear little children sparkle when the amount collected was announced to them, because it is so much more blessed to (be able to) give than to (be obliged to) receive.

May God in mercy grant that every one who has the means may be kind and generous to the poor sufferers, not only in Kansas, but wherever they may be!

Yours, truly, WM. WHITING.

FUGITIVE SLAVES AND THE LIBERTY ACT.

NUMBER I.

There will, undoubtedly, be an attempt made, in this State and the other States, to repeal the so-called Liberty Act, with a view of reconciling the South, and preventing its secession. It has been stated in the newspapers, recently, by high legal authority, that the Liberty Act of this State is unconstitutional,—as conflicting with the National Constitution,—and for this reason should be immediately repealed. How this may be, I do not know, and I will not undertake to call in question the legal opinions of men so eminent as lawyers, as many of these gentlemen undoubtedly are.

I take, however, an entirely different ground from them, and would prevent the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, whether it is constitutional or not, and whether the Liberty Act of this State is a violation of this provision of the National Constitution or not.

The ground I take—and I think it is an impregnable one—is, that the States had no right to make this provision a part of this Constitution, nor adopt it; and that it is entirely null and void, as such. I will now endeavor to prove the position I thus take. And to do this, I will review the decision of the Supreme Court of this State, in the case of the slave Mend, which came before them more than twenty years since, and which decision was given by Judge Shaw, in his own language. I say, then, that there is an evident inconsistency, in principle, between the law as it was decided by the Court in that case, in reference to slaves brought here voluntarily by their masters, and the law in relation to slaves who are fugitives from other States, under the provision of the National Constitution. In the former case, the Court decided that they are entitled to their liberty immediately, and in the latter case, that they must be returned back again to a state of slavery. To perceive this inconsistency in principle, we must examine the ground upon which they are declared to be free when coming with the consent of their master, and see whether these grounds do not equally apply when they are fugitives from another State. The Court, in giving their opinion in that case, say:—

"Without making inquiry further, it is sufficient for the purpose before us, that by the Constitution, adopted in 1780, slavery was abolished in Massachusetts, on the ground that it is contrary to natural right and the plain principles of justice. The terms of the 1st article of the Declaration of Rights are plain and explicit:—All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential and inalienable rights, among which are the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberty, that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property." It would be difficult to select words more precisely adapted to the abolition of negro slavery."

Now, if these were the grounds upon which slavery

was abolished in this State, and can no longer exist here, why do they not apply as well to fugitive slaves as any other? Why is it not as "contrary to natural right and the plain principles of justice" to hold them in bondage, or return them to bondage, as slaves who have come here by the consent of their masters?

These principles apply to the system of slavery in itself, and not to the mode by which they came into the State. The rights of the slave must be the same in both cases.

But in reply to this it may be said, that, in the case of fugitive slaves, the State of Massachusetts has, by adopting the National Constitution, bound themselves to recognize slavery in the Southern States, so far as to deliver up fugitive slaves when claimed by their masters, but have not bound themselves to deliver up slaves who come here under other circumstances. But the question recurs again, what right have they to bind themselves by adopting a Constitution containing such a provision "against natural right and the plain principles of justice"? What right have they to assume dominion over the lives and liberty and welfare of a race of men who were not parties to this Constitution, and who had no voice, either in fixing its provisions or making the laws under these provisions—which were not represented in the Convention that framed it, or in Congress who made laws under it? If there is any truth in the assertion made in the Declaration of Independence, "That all just laws proceed from the consent of the governed," they are certainly not bound by these laws, for they never gave their consent to them in any manner, either directly or through their representatives. And I would further ask, what right had the States to bind themselves by an instrument, which, under certain circumstances, requires them to rob a fellow-man of all his rights, personal, domestic and civil, and to reduce him again to the condition of a brute and a chattel? If they have no right by the Constitution and laws of Massachusetts, grounded upon "natural right and the plain principles of justice," to deprive a fellow-being of all his rights, and treat him as a slave, they have no right to become parties to a National Constitution which is intended to produce this effect. This principle will apply to the one as well as the other.

But it is said by the Court, in this case, that the Constitution of the United States partakes of the nature of a treaty between foreign powers, and that it would be perfectly competent for one foreign power to stipulate by a treaty to deliver up the fugitive slaves of another foreign power. This position of the Court I would respectfully dispute. In my judgment, it is never competent for one foreign power to bind themselves by a treaty to do that to another foreign power, which the party stipulating consents will, in its consequences, lead to something "against natural right and the plain principles of justice." If it were competent, it would be competent for a nation to do what is an acknowledged wrong, and a violation of justice.

The plain distinction in the case appears to me to be this: that though a government has no right forcibly to interfere with the laws or institutions of another State, within that State, though such laws or institutions may be unjust and oppressive, yet it ought not, in any way, to cooperate with the other State within its own jurisdiction and territory, in the support of such institutions and laws. It is not bound to reform and purify the laws or institutions of another State of their injustice and evil, except by the exercise of a moral influence; but it is bound in any way to execute these laws, or uphold these institutions, within its own dominions. To do so, would be to make other nations do right, but it is obliged itself not to do wrong.

Again: see the absurdity which follows from considering a man a slave who comes into Massachusetts as a fugitive, and a freeman when brought here by his master. In the former case, he is considered a mere chattel—a movable—personal property attached to his master, which may be reclaimed as a stray horse. In the latter, he is considered a freeman, entitled to all the rights of a freeman. Yes, the same individual, having the same natural rights, which he has never forfeited or transferred, is to depend for the character, in which he shall be treated, whether as a horse or a man, upon the mere mode by which he shall have found his way into the State—a circumstance not at all affecting the fact whether he is a human being, endowed with all the faculties of a human being, and entitled to all the rights of a human being. If such a doctrine is not absurd and destitute of sense, and such as never would have entered into the head of anybody, but those who are wedded to the artificial principles of law, I do not know what would be such.

I have often thought that the habit of studying the law has an effect in obscuring the mind from the perception of the clear principles of common sense and common justice, which are so readily felt and understood by people in other occupations. Lawyers often make artificial distinctions, where no one else would think of making them, and carry the subtleties of special pleading into the great and fundamental principles of justice. A man may make a good lawyer, and a miserable statesman. The one allows his reason to be shackled by the rigid and often arbitrary rules and principles of law, in all the views he takes of great national questions. The other takes a broad and expanded view of these questions, in reference to their influence upon the welfare of society, and the great principles of justice and humanity. No other circumstances will explain the illiberal and irrational views which pervade the speeches of many of our legislators in Congress, and the opinions of many of our distinguished lawyers and judges. There are views expressed, in many of these speeches and these opinions, which are totally abhorrent to all the first principles of justice, and even to the plain principles of common sense. These persons talk with great flippancy about the rights of individuals to hold property in human beings, and the political rights of States to determine their own institutions and laws, while they totally ignore, and treat with the utmost contempt, the doctrine that these human beings have any property in their own bodies and souls, and the same right to make use of their faculties for the acquisition of other kinds of property as they themselves have. They can prate about civil rights, which are the mere creatures of a political frame of government, but disregard, totally, those natural and inalienable rights which belong to the whole human family, whether black or white, which are the gift of God, and inherent in our very natures.

W. S. A.

was abolished in this State, and can no longer exist here, why do they not apply as well to fugitive slaves as any other? Why is it not as "contrary to natural right and the plain principles of justice" to hold them in bondage, or return them to bondage, as slaves who have come here by the consent of their masters? These principles apply to the system of slavery in itself, and not to the mode by which they came into the State. The rights of the slave must be the same in both cases.

But in reply to this it may be said, that, in the case of fugitive slaves, the State of Massachusetts has, by adopting the National Constitution, bound themselves to recognize slavery in the Southern States, so far as to deliver up fugitive slaves when claimed by their masters, but have not bound themselves to deliver up slaves who come here under other circumstances. But the question recurs again, what right have they to bind themselves by adopting a Constitution containing such a provision "against natural right and the plain principles of justice"? What right have they to assume dominion over the lives and liberty and welfare of a race of men who were not parties to this Constitution, and who had no voice, either in fixing its provisions or making the laws under these provisions—which were not represented in the Convention that framed it, or in Congress who made laws under it? If there is any truth in the assertion made in the Declaration of Independence, "That all just laws proceed from the consent of the governed," they are certainly not bound by these laws, for they never gave their consent to them in any manner, either directly or through their representatives. And I would further ask, what right had the States to bind themselves by an instrument, which, under certain circumstances, requires them to rob a fellow-man of all his rights, personal, domestic and civil, and to reduce him again to the condition of a brute and a chattel? If they have no right by the Constitution and laws of Massachusetts, grounded upon "natural right and the plain principles of justice," to deprive a fellow-being of all his rights, and treat him as a slave, they have no right to become parties to a National Constitution which is intended to produce this effect. This principle will apply to the one as well as the other.

But it is said by the Court, in this case, that the Constitution of the United States partakes of the nature of a treaty between foreign powers, and that it would be perfectly competent for one foreign power to stipulate by a treaty to deliver up the fugitive slaves of another foreign power. This position of the Court I would respectfully dispute. In my judgment, it is never competent for one foreign power to bind themselves by a treaty to do that to another foreign power, which the party stipulating consents will, in its consequences, lead to something "against natural right and the plain principles of justice." If it were competent, it would be competent for a nation to do what is an acknowledged wrong, and a violation of justice.

The plain distinction in the case appears to me to be this: that though a government has no right forcibly to interfere with the laws or institutions of another State, within that State, though such laws or institutions may be unjust and oppressive, yet it ought not, in any way, to cooperate with the other State within its own jurisdiction and territory, in the support of such institutions and laws. It is not bound to reform and purify the laws or institutions of another State of their injustice and evil, except by the exercise of a moral influence; but it is bound in any way to execute these laws, or uphold these institutions, within its own dominions. To do so, would be to make other nations do right, but it is obliged itself not to do wrong.

Again: see the absurdity which follows from considering a man a slave who comes into Massachusetts as a fugitive, and a freeman when brought here by his master. In the former case, he is considered a mere chattel—a movable—personal property attached to his master, which may be reclaimed as a stray horse. In the latter, he is considered a freeman, entitled to all the rights of a freeman. Yes, the same individual, having the same natural rights, which he has never forfeited or transferred, is to depend for the character, in which he shall be treated, whether as a horse or a man, upon the mere mode by which he shall have found his way into the State—a circumstance not at all affecting the fact whether he is a human being, endowed with all the faculties of a human being, and entitled to all the rights of a human being. If such a doctrine is not absurd and destitute of sense, and such as never would have entered into the head of anybody, but those who are wedded to the artificial principles of law, I do not know what would be such.

I have often thought that the habit of studying the law has an effect in obscuring the mind from the perception of the clear principles of common sense and common justice, which are so readily felt and understood by people in other occupations. Lawyers often make artificial distinctions, where no one else would think of making them, and carry the subtleties of special pleading into the great and fundamental principles of justice. A man may make a good lawyer, and a miserable statesman. The one allows his reason to be shackled by the rigid and often arbitrary rules and principles of law, in all the views he takes of great national questions. The other takes a broad and expanded view of these questions, in reference to their influence upon the welfare of society, and the great principles of justice and humanity. No other circumstances will explain the illiberal and irrational views which pervade the speeches of many of our legislators in Congress, and the opinions of many of our distinguished lawyers and judges. There are views expressed, in many of these speeches and these opinions, which are totally abhorrent to all the first principles of justice, and even to the plain principles of common sense. These persons talk with great flippancy about the rights of individuals to hold property in human beings, and the political rights of States to determine their own institutions and laws, while they totally ignore, and treat with the utmost contempt, the doctrine that these human beings have any property in their own bodies and souls, and the same right to make use of their faculties for the acquisition of other kinds of property as they themselves have. They can prate about civil rights, which are the mere creatures of a political frame of government, but disregard, totally, those natural and inalienable rights which belong to the whole human family, whether black or white, which are the gift of God, and inherent in our very natures.

W. S. A.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTIONS IN NEW YORK.

We call special attention to the series of Anti-Slavery Conventions to be held in Western and Central New York, commencing this day at Buffalo, and extending through the entire month of January—culminating in the anniversary of the State Convention, to be held in Albany, February 4th, 6th, and 8th. It will be seen that a strong array of speakers is advertised, among whom we are highly gratified to see the names of Gerrit Smith and Beriah Green. In all the various localities named, every effort should be made to secure a full attendance, by giving extensive notice of the meeting. It is by this process of "agitation" that the chains of the slave are to be broken, and the impending judgments of Heaven averted. Therefore, be up and doing!

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE TRIBUNE AND WENDELL PHILLIPS. The editorial article we have copied on our first page from the Tribune, caricaturing Mr. Phillips for his noble devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause, has not a particle of truth or wit to redeem its coarseness and assurance. The Tribune has many anonymous contributors to its editorial columns, so that it is often a matter of guess-work as to the authorship of particular articles. In this instance, it is not difficult to identify the writer; and whatever intellectual smartness he may possess, his well-known habits are such as to render him as incompetent to measure the philanthropy, and moral elevation, courage and disinterestedness of Mr. Phillips, as a Hottentot is to judge of the merits of Shakespeare or Milton. In this he is out of his element. Let him learn to speak "the words of truth and sobriety."

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION AND THE "SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY."

It were a "consummation devoutly to be wished" that the citizens of this country could be brought to understand the true character of our boasted Union. There are indications that Northern men, at least, will see, before the present agitation subsides, the utter and eternal incompatibility of freedom and slavery.

For the last quarter of a century, the changes have been rung so incessantly on the "ineestimable value of the Union," the might of its power, the dread consequences of its rupture, that we at the North have not ventured to breathe a possibility of its disturbance, however slightly, even to ourselves. In direct violation of our finer instincts, we have been persuaded to press the paper of slavery to our bosoms, and suffer it to suck out our life-blood, as preferable to a dissolution of the Union.

It is only within a few short weeks that most of us have been made sensible of a marked modification of our proclivities in this respect. The possibility, nay, the probability of a dissolution, will we or will we not, has been precipitated upon us by the South; and whatever may have been our previous misgivings, as to dissolution, we have no choice but to look its responsibilities, if there be any, fully in the face. However cheerfully Northern men would have sacrificed for its maintenance in the past, under the impression of its incalculable benefits, the facts we find ourselves pondering in this season of anxiety force upon us all the question, whether the Union, under any such circumstances as we have been compelled to behold it, is, after all, so valuable a boon and worthy of so great sacrifice.

A few weeks more of opportunity to observe the Southern temper, as well as Southern weakness, in the elements of either intellectual or national strength, will not fail to convince most of us at the North that the presence of the South in the Union can well be dispensed with. It may be well for the South to understand, first and last, that the North, so far from dreading her threats of secession, has occasion to rejoice that she has taken the initiative, and proposes of her own accord to go out of the Union, and thus relieve us of the unpleasant necessity, at some future time, of forcibly removing from the body politic so hurtful an excrescence.

The North and the South, or freedom and slavery, are irreconcilable terms. Nothing like a Union in any rational sense has existed, or can exist, in the face of such facts as have been forced upon our contemplation for twenty-five years past. Whatever efforts may be made by the shuffling politician and statesman, unworthy the name, to force together what God and nature intended should be forever antagonistic, will be futile in all time to come.

Union by force of law or by external pressure, as opposed to the laws of nature and reason, is inconsistent with the intelligence, the freedom, the wealth and power of the North. Whatever may have been the exigency existing when the thirteen States entered the Confederacy for Union against foreign and internal aggression, no such necessity now exists with the free States, which of themselves are a power sufficient to command the respect of every civilized country in the world. They are amply able to hold their place among the nations. They have the inherent skill to make the most of their great natural advantages, and could they once for all be entirely relieved of the burden of slavery, a new impulse would be given to their energies, and the good effects would soon be visible in a rapid growth in wealth, intelligence and population.

It is time the South were made sensible of the impotency of her threats of dissolution; that she should open her eyes to the causes of her own ignorance, poverty and weakness; that she should be forced to understand, and if possible be grateful for, the immense advantages she has enjoyed in times past by her connexion with the North; and that when bereft of the vitality and support which she draws from union with superior forces, she must soon sink to decay. Let Northern men but once become conscious of their strength and of their immeasurably superior advantages, and they would have less occasion to tremble before the phantom of dissolution. The cry of Union is generated in pride, cowardice, and the consciousness of a bad cause. Whence comes the necessity for eternal preachment of the value of the Union, but that in the depths of our being we know the utter nonsense of attempting to force together elements which, in their essential nature, are eternally disjoined?

Let the North duly appreciate its own strength, and the justness of its cause. In no spirit of defiance, but in the calmness of its own self-respect, let it afford to be generous; and if the South, either from taste or by force of its geographical position, desires to try the experiment of an independent existence, let it come with our good will. Let the separation, if it must come, be amicable; give them all the United States property now located within their present boundaries, pay all the existing national debt, and then make them a reasonable gratuity in ready cash to meet the smaller contingencies connected with setting up the new government. This would be a good outfit for a Southern Confederacy, and all connexion of the North with slavery forever ended. It would be the best bargain the North ever made, and perhaps the poorest for the South.

Let the great truth be made to stand prominent before the civilized world, that the Northern section of this country alone embraces nearly all that is valuable in a material, moral and intellectual point of view; that it is the *most superior civilization of the North* that the United States are entitled to respect abroad and at home; and if the character of a people, rather than the extent of its domain, furnishes a criterion by which to estimate its magnitude and power, then the sixteen Northern States, once made independent of slavery, are richer in all the elements of greatness than the present thirty-three burdened with the cost of supporting an institution which can operate only decay and final destruction wherever it goes.

Yes, gentlemen of the South, your cotton and your beloved "institution," lay the foundation of your Southern Confederacy. You have your slaves; draw on your own loins for your increase; swell by every means the product of your own greed; go forward in your stupidity and ignorance in the labor of exhaustion of your soils; establish your military rule; tax yourselves most liberally, as you will be obliged, to do to maintain vast naval and army establishments; enlist the flowers of your new-fledged nobility, as well as your "mud-sill" constituency, in the glorious task of preserving order from within and without. With your thousands of miles of frontier, both on the land and the sea; with your vast plans for the conquest of Cuba and the dismemberment of the Mexican Empire, the robbery and pillage of the present territories of the United States, for the protection and maintenance of the high road from the Rocky Mountains to the Gulf of Mexico, the reopening of the African slave trade, for possible conflicts, not only with your immediate neighbor,—so recently your co-partner,—but with the mighty powers on the opposite side of the Atlantic, to say nothing of the glorious opportunities you offer to one or more Anglo-African Garibaldi in your midst, and to John Browns on your borders and in the fastnesses of your mountains.

Go, we say, ye chivalric gentlemen, ye worshippers of yourselves, and of the "divine institution"! Go, and inaugurate your darling experiment of a Southern Confederacy, before which all Christendom must "pale her ineffectual fires." Give it a fair trial; and when you have suffered enough, and become wiser, knock at the doors of your abused brethren of the North, and we will not turn you away penniless. W.

NEW DRESS. The Liberator makes a handsome appearance in its new typographical dress. Our founts of type were obtained at the foundry of Phelps & Dalton, 32 Washington Street, Boston. We ask for a careful perusal of our paper from week to week; for, to be appreciated, a paper must be read, as well as readable; and good type is a great improvement in this direction.

NEW DRESS. The Liberator makes a handsome appearance in its new typographical dress. Our founts of type were obtained at the foundry of Phelps & Dalton, 32 Washington Street, Boston. We ask for a careful perusal of our paper from week to week; for, to be appreciated, a paper must be read, as well as readable; and good type is a great improvement in this direction.

NEW DRESS. The Liberator makes a handsome appearance in its new typographical dress. Our founts of type were obtained at the foundry of Phelps & Dalton, 32 Washington Street, Boston. We ask for a careful perusal of our paper from week to week; for, to be appreciated, a paper must be read, as well