

# THE SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

THE INVOLABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IS THE ONLY SECURITY TO PUBLIC LIBERTY.

T. FOSTER,  
G. BECKLEY, Editors.

ANN ARBOR, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1844.

VOL. 4, NO. 20.  
WHOLE NO. 176.

## THE SIGNAL OF LIBERTY

Will be published every Monday morning, in Ann Arbor, Michigan, by  
BECKLEY & FOSTER,

FOR THE MICHIGAN STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

TERMS.  
One copy, paid in advance, or as nearly as may be, Two Dollars.

Five or more copies, to one Post Office, if paid in advance, at one time, One Dollar and twenty-five cents each.

Ten or more copies, to one Post Office, if paid in advance, and at one time One Dollar each. Clergymen, on paying arrears, can have the Signal for one year for One Dollar, in advance.

All old subscribers, on paying arrears, can join the club of Five or Ten at any time, by forwarding the advance price.

N. B.—All Club papers will be stopped as soon as the advance price shall be exhausted. All others will be forwarded until ordered discontinued.

All subscribers will be expected to pay within the year.

## TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

For one square, one insertion, 50 cents.

Each subsequent insertion, 25 cents.

Legal Advertising by the folio.

Terms of Advertising by the year or quarter made known at the office.

Manufacturers, Bookkeepers, Machinists, Wholesale Merchants, and all others doing an extensive business, who wish to advertise, will find the Signal the best possible medium of communication in the State.

All Remittances and Communications should be addressed, Post paid,

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY: Ann Arbor, Mich.

## POETRY.

### STANZAS FOR THE TIMES.

Written on reading the sentence of John L. Brown, of North Carolina, who was to have been executed on the 25th of April, 1844, for the crime of assisting a female slave to escape from bondage. [Sentence afterwards commuted.]

BY J. G. WHITTIER.

Ho! thou who seekest love and long  
A hence from the Holy Book  
For brutal lust and Hell's red wrong,  
Man of the Pulpit look!  
Lift up those cold and atheist eyes,  
This ripe fruit of thy teaching see;  
And tell us how to Heaven will rise  
The essence of this sacrifice—  
This blossom of the Gallows Tree—

Search out for SLAVERY'S hour of need.  
Some fitting text of sacred writ;  
Give Heaven the credit of a deed  
Which shames the nether pit!  
Kneel, smooth blasphemer, unto Him,  
Whose truth is on thy lips a lie;  
Ask that the bright-winged cherubim  
May bend around that scaffold grim,  
To guard and bless and sanctify—

Ho! champion of the people's cause—  
Suspend thy loud and vain rebuke  
Of foreign wrong and old world laws;  
Man of the Senate, look!  
Was this the promise of the free,  
That glory of our early time;  
That slave's poison vine should be  
Uphorn by Freedom's prayer-mus'd tree;  
O'er-aster'd with sack fruits of crime!

Send out the summons East and West,  
And South and North—let all be there,  
Where he who whipt the oppressed  
Swings out in sun and air!  
Let not a democratic hand  
The grisly hang man's task refuse;  
There let each loyal patriot stand,  
Awaiting Liberty's command  
To twist the rope and draw the noose!

But vain is irony—unmeet  
Its bold rebuke for deeds which start  
In fiery and indignant heat.  
The pulses of the heart,  
Leave studied wit and guarded phrase  
For those who think but do not feel;  
Let MEN, speak out in words which raise  
Where'er they fall an answering blaze,  
Like flints which strike the fire from steel.

Still let a mousing Priesthood ply  
Their garbled text and gloss of sin,  
And make the lettered scroll deny  
Its living soul within;  
Still let the place-deed titled knave  
Plead Robbery's right with purchased lips,  
And tell us that our fathers gave  
For Freedom's pedestal, a slave,  
For frieze and moulding, chains and whips!

But ye who own that higher law,  
Whose tablets in the heart are set;  
Speak out in words of power and awe,  
That God is LIVING YET!  
Breathe forth once more those tones sublime  
Which thrill'd the burdened Prophet's lyre,  
And in a dark and evil time  
Smote down on Israel's fast of crime  
And gift of blood, a rain of fire!

Oh! not for us the graceful lay,  
To whose soft measures lightly move  
The dryad and the woodland fay,  
O'erlook'd by Mirth and Love;  
But such a stern and startling strain  
As Briton's hunted birds flung down  
From Snowden to the conquered plain,  
Where harshly clanked the Saxon chain,  
On trampled fields and smoking town.

By Liberty's dishonored name,  
By man's last hope and failing trust,  
By words and deeds which bow with shame  
Our foreheads to the dust;  
By the exulting Tyrant's sneer,  
Borne to us by the old world's thrones,  
And by his victims' grief, who hear  
In sunless mines and dungeons drear,  
How Freedom's land her faith disowns!

Speak out in acts—the time for words  
Has passed, and deeds alone suffice;  
In the loud clang of meeting swords,  
The softer music dies!

Act—not in God's name, while ye may,  
Smite from the Church her leprous limb,  
Throw open to the light of day  
The bondman's cell and break away  
The chains the State has bound on him.

Ho!—every true and living soul,  
To Freedom's periled altar bear  
The Freeman's and the Christian's whole,  
Tongue, pen, and vote, and prayer!

One last great battle for the Right—  
One short, sharp struggle to be free—  
To do is to succeed—our fight  
Is waged in Heaven's approving sight—  
The smile of God is Victory!

\* Three new publications, from the pen of  
Rev. Dr. Junkin, President of Miami College,  
Rev. Alex. McCame, of the Methodist Protestant  
church, and of a clergyman of the Cincinnati  
Synod, defending slavery on scriptural grounds, have recently made their appearance.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

August 30th, 1844.

### TO THE LIBERTY PARTY IN MICHIGAN.

DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHREN:

Permit us as the State Central Committee of the Liberty Party, briefly to address you at this time. We are unanimously and most decidedly of the opinion that if every member of the Liberty party in the State will at once arise, and from this time to the approaching election be active, and make all the reasonable sacrifices of time and means to promote the cause in every proper way which the unparalleled importance of the present crisis demands—we shall MORE than DOUBLE OUR LIBERTY VOTE.

Our numbers at the East and in N. York were never increasing faster. This we have not the least doubt would do vastly more by a most salutary negative influence to prevent the annexation of Texas in the event of the election of either Polk or Clay, than though every Liberty vote in the country should be prostituted to the most unnatural and guilty purpose of elevating any slaveholder in the nation to fill the highest official station, not excepting Mr. Clay, who declared in his last Texas letter "PERSONALLY HE HAD NO OBJECTION TO ITS ANNEXATION." Nothing but a large Liberty vote will ever deter the south of both parties from pressing this desperate measure. We shall take it for granted that, at this important time you are a constant reader of the Signal of Liberty or some other Liberty paper, and that therefore you well understand that the late practiced pro-slavery humbug (at the north) that Mr. Clay and the whole whig party were fully committed against the annexation of Texas at any time, is now FULLY EXPLODED!!

We can not doubt also that you must all see more plainly than ever, that from the most desperate course of both the pro-slavery parties in resorting to every possible means and stratagem in rivaling each other for party supremacy to force upon the north the greatest and most inveterate slaveholders in the nation; both of whom are for the ultimate annexation of Texas, that the ruling slaveholders of the south must be holding a jubilee of much more than ordinary exultation at their prospective triumph over their deluded, humbled and degraded northern supporters. We do most earnestly entreat you as you love principle and despise and abhor the most detestable and wicked time-serving expediency of pro-slavery party men, and pro-slavery parties which has already made 3,000,000 of slaves in our guilty country, and thereby reduced northern men to the most humiliating condition of mere degraded tributaries to slaveholders—manfully to buckle on the whole liberty armor, and fly to the rescue. It is true we have power!—misrepresenting, and artful pro-slavery enemies to meet; but, like David against Goliath, if we go forth to the battle in the same strength, we shall promptly meet and vanquish them. In this way let no true and principled liberty man fear for a moment to engage in the combat—when he knows he has truth, humanity and God on his side. From this time till Nov. we shall have all the lecturers in the field, whose services it is possible by your liberality to procure, and when Liberty meetings are appointed, it will be of indispensable importance to their usefulness, that every proper and efficient measure, by ALL the Liberty friends, in the vicinity where they are to be held, should at once be put in operation to give ample notice of the meetings, and also to provide means by way of teams, &c. to aid ALL who can be prevailed on to attend, to do so. Most of the usefulness of such meetings must of necessity depend almost entirely on the interest and activity of the liberty friends in their vicinity and in procuring as full an attendance as possible.

The other parties at present have many ways for giving notices, and getting up an interest in the full attendance of these meetings which we have not. Hence follows the obvious necessity for much activity and personal effort among our friends, be they few or many, in the vicinity where the meetings are appointed. In some few instances, through the mere neglect of the friends in giving due and timely notice to ALL within a reasonable distance of the place of meeting—not one half of the number which might easily have been obtained, have attended. Numbers afterwards have expressed their regret that they knew nothing of the meeting.

Even one man, filled with that true and consistent spirit of liberty which votes for no SLAVEHOLDER under the most preposterous pretence of preventing or abolishing SLAVERY thereby, will indeed accomplish wonders for our cause, by his fearlessness—activity, and perseverance. But he must be truly fearless and unwearied—against the numerical odds and the loud clamor to vote for slaveholders which he will on all hands have to meet. But the true spirit of liberty in the heart has long stood, and can still stand by that aid which stood by our fathers, all kinds of opposition however unreasonable and boisterous. Be well armed with truth—The contest now between the pro-slavery parties is almost entirely that of mere party supremacy to "chip out" and triumph over their old "party enemies." We have a far higher and nobler object to buoy us up, and to nerve us for the contest.

We hope no true Liberty man in the State will wait one moment for lecturers from abroad, but collect all the astounding facts and arguments to show that the Liberty party has infinitely higher claims upon public support than any parties that are elevating the greatest slaveholders in the country under a deceptive pretence (to catch abolition votes) of taking the best means to abolish slavery—prevent the annexation of Texas, &c. and then go into the different neighborhoods in your town and read them to all the people you can get together to hear you.

Depend upon it, friends, your labor and pains will by no means be lost. Almost any reading Liberty farmer or mechanic knows far more about the whole slavery question than any proslavery professional man, who, as a general thing, shut their eyes and ears to the great Anti-slavery truths that true liberty men have so long been promulgating. Radical reform, as a general thing, in these times must not be looked for from men who hold high and controlling places in the Church or the State. The sacrifice for them is too great at present. Our cause among the people must become more popular to secure their co-operation. On this account, those who are worthy to have their names "cast out as evil" must "redeem their diligence." Let all true Liberty men therefore for eight weeks to come, forego their ease, and cheerfully make the requisite sacrifice of time and means to forward our cause by all honorable and practicable ways, and be assured their hearts will be made to rejoice in November, and they will ever look back upon the time and means so expended with great pleasure and satisfaction.

Let a number of good liberty men volunteer to accompany each other to attend neighborhood and school district meetings, to speak upon, read about, and discuss the whole subject, and to show that the Liberty party, upon every principle of humanity—philanthropy, and patriotism have far higher claims to public favor and support than any party which will elevate and sustain slaveholders as their principal leaders! While you hold your meetings, as well as at all other times, we would earnestly recommend you to extend the Signal of Liberty every where as widely as possible on the 25 cent plan, for three months, and otherwise. A number of individuals have thus obtained from 25 to 30 subscribers by a half day's effort. Nothing could more effectively subserve our cause. One half day's effort spent in this way would often be of as great benefit to our cause as a number of lectures. We expect a number of large County and State Liberty Conventions will soon be held in different parts of the State, which will be of great interest, and attended by as many speakers from abroad as possible. Prepare the way for such meetings by previously visiting all parts of your counties and your towns.

S. B. TREADWELL, Jackson,  
N. L. PORTER, Detroit,  
A. M. THOMAS, Kalamazoo,  
L. WILCOX, Jackson,  
J. M. DIMOND, do.

St. Cen. Com. of Lib. Party.

## THE CONSTITUTION ANTISLAVERY.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I now proceed to remark upon the Three-Fifths clause of the Constitution—ar. 1, sec. 2, c. 3.

The term "persons" is twice used in this clause, and so used as to suppose a class of persons not free, and to impose the obligation to include three-fifths thereof in the enumeration therein directed. I trust that in my former communications I have proved that no unrecorded compromise or understanding which may have been entertained by the Convention who framed the Constitution can be any part of that Instrument, because, 1st, such compromise being unwritten, and consequently undefined, would supercede the Instrument, destroying, at the pleasure of parties, its essential features, set aside its fundamental principles for party objects, & so by removing the limits to legislative power, render Congress independent of the people—in other words, convert that body into an irresponsible oligarchy.

2. Because, however great the sacrifices of opinions, principles, or interests, they, to be part and parcel of the constitution, must have been included in the written Instrument, that being the ultimate conclusion of the whole matter.

3. Because, if the entire ultimate conclusion was not embraced in the written Constitution there must have been fraud or omission. But fraud will not be predicated of the transaction: then omission, the object of the compromise was lost: if lost the remedy is by amendment; but the amendment not having been made, the alleged object cannot be recognized or secured by the constitution. Hence that the constitution as it is, with its written objects, prohibitions and guarantees, is our only guide. Now the question is—Does the class alluded to consist of slaves? In solving this question, we must always keep in view the indispensable rule of construction, that when human liberty is jeopardized, the law should be construed strictly. That the clause does not mean slaves is inferred, because,

1. The law of nature, establishing the right to personal liberty, is coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself; and cannot be abridged or destroyed by human legislation: nor can the right be forfeited except for crime.—Blackstone.

2. All men are created equal and are entitled to equal liberty.—Declaration of Independence.

3. No person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law, and that for the commission of an offence—thus making all equal.—Constitution.

4. The constitution speaks in common law terms which know nothing of slavery, and therefore can have no allusion to slaves.

5. The constitution permits the permanent loss of liberty, for crime, in a public prison, and therefore designates persons as not being free.

It will be perceived that the first reason is based on the paramount law of nature: the 2d & 3d on conventional arrangements of '76 & '87 entered into with all the solemnity which could characterize a nation's pledged faith, by which the states most emphatically stipulated for the abolition of slavery by prohibiting themselves from depriving any person of liberty except on accusation before and conviction of crime by a jury of the country. The 5th on the Constitution, which permits punishment by imprisonment, and so furnishes a case to which the clause is applicable.

Now as neither the word slave, nor any condition or attribute of slavery is mentioned or described in the Constitution, its provisions being applicable to persons in a state of freedom from slavery, it follows that the constitution views all innocent persons as free. If all are thus viewed as free, there can be no constitutional slaves, the words "three-fifths of all other persons" cannot apply to slaves. It follows, that if those words have any application, it must be to persons deprived of liberty for cause, and not for color or caste. The clause then taken according to the legal meaning of its terms; the law of nature; the Declaration of Independence; the declared objects, prohibitions and guarantees of the Constitution, does not mean slaves.

It is not denied that an understanding, dignified with the epithet of compromise, did exist in the convention relative to the continuance of slavery for a time. It is contended only that such understanding can not be authoritative to supercede or control the legitimate action of the Constitution as it is. The 13 original States, at the adoption of the Constitution, with the exception of Massachusetts, were slaveholding states. Gradual emancipation was then the most advisable. The Constitution was every way adapted to a state of freedom. Not one word needs to be altered or expunged to suit it to such a condition;—which by the way demonstrates its anti-slavery character. What then was the understanding? Why, that as slavery was to be gradually extinguished, it should be suffered to continue or rather languish for a season, and at its end, the Constitution, being adapted to a state of entire freedom, would act legitimately throughout the Republic. That that Instrument interposes its broad shield for the protection of personal liberty to all persons under its control, taken in connection with the debates of the Convention, furnishes abundant evidence of the fact.

Is this then "the implied faith of the nation"? Has slavery been diminished? Have slaves not increased from some six hundred thousands to some three millions? Have not new slave states been formed out of the old; and also out of acquired foreign territory, to extend the limits of the accursed system, increase the amount of human suffering and to perpetuate the ascendancy of the slave power in these States? Is not Florida knocking

at the door of the Union for admission as a slave state? and Texas, slavery-cursed Texas, is she not proffering her long star to be added to the constellation which embellishes the national banner? Has the south redeemed her pledge? Shall a wanton perversion of such an understanding which cannot be authoritative to control the constitution, be persevered in to nullify the first principles of good government, and render slavery perpetual, contrary to the very character and design of the understanding itself? If it were authoritative it could be so only to compel a period to slavery. Let the paralyzed energies of the Federal Compact be resuscitated, and they will be amply efficient, it is believed, to accomplish that object.

As to "calling forth the militia to suppress insurrection," &c. n. 1, s. 8, c. 14, I remark, 1st, The law of slavery is that slaves are chattels. Chattels, in legitimate legal language—and such is the language of the Constitution—are not sentient beings. If the constitution authorizes Congress to suppress a rising of southern slaves, it recognizes them as sentient beings, and therefore nullifies the chattel principle. If it does this it frees the slave and destroys the whole system of slavery. 2d, Insurrection is a rebellion rising of numbers of sentient beings against rightful authority. To rebel against cruel tyranny, which is the attitude of rightful authority, is but a dictate of natural law. A rising of slaves to restore their lost rights of which they have been robbed by cruel tyranny, is not, then, insurrection. It follows that the "insurrection" of the Constitution is that of freedom. If, then, the slaves should assert their freedom, and during the contest, should fall into the hands of the general government, it would, were the Constitution rightly administered, be their redemption from slavery.

Pontiac, August 24, 1844.

J. M.

## GENESSEE COUNTY LIBERTY CONVENTION.

The Liberty Convention of Genessee County assembled at the Court House, Flint, on Tuesday, Aug. 20th, 1844, and was organized by calling J. W. King to the chair, and appointing Dr. W. C. Leach Secretary.

After some preliminary business, the convention went into committee of the whole for the purpose of nominating candidates to be supported by the Liberty party at the ensuing election.

After an informal balloting, the following persons were unanimously nominated:

For Representative: John Pratt, of Flint.  
Associate Judges: Daniel LeRoy, of Pontonville; Shubel Atterton, of Flint.  
Judge of Probate: Jeremy Hildcock, of Genesee.  
Sheriff: Nelson Chittenden, of Genesee.  
County Clerk: Harro Whitley, of Flint.  
Register: Isaac Russell, " "  
Treasurer: Isaiah Merriman, " "  
Surveyor: Pratt R. Skinner, " "  
Coroners: E. K. Marshall, Bushnell Andrews, of Genesee.

On motion, Resolved that a mass meeting of the 3d Congressional District be held at Pontonville, on Thursday, 26th September next.

On motion, the Chair appointed a committee, consisting of John C. Gallup, Wm. Chamberlin, D. W. C. Leach.

On motion, the Chair appointed O. Parker, John C. Gallup and Wm. Chamberlin, a committee to draft an address to the electors of Genessee Co.

A committee of one from each town was appointed to obtain and distribute tickets at the next general election.

On motion, the convention adjourned.

D. W. C. LEACH, Sec'y.

After the adjournment of the County convention, the Senatorial convention was organized by calling J. W. King to the chair, and appointing Wm. Chamberlin Secretary.

After an informal balloting, John C. Gallup of Pontonville was unanimously nominated for Senator to the State Legislature from the Sixth Senatorial District.

On motion, convention adjourned.

J. W. KING, Chm'n.

WM. CHAMBERLIN, Sec'y.

## For the Signal of Liberty.

### GENESSEE COUNTY.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The friends of the oppressed may look for a good account from Genessee next November.

There is a spirit of inquiry abroad—people are beginning to cast about to see if there be not some better way of securing their rights than to hark for slaveholders, whether they be Whigs or Democrats. There are some towns in this county which have never cast a Liberty vote, that will give a good account of themselves at the coming election. I saw a leading whig from Forest, a few days since, who frankly told me, that out of twenty-six voters, there were thirteen or fourteen that had seceded from the old parties since the Presidential nominations.

The whigs held a mass meeting at Flint the 29th inst., and a "glorious" time they had of it. One of the speakers (the nominee for Congress) congratulated himself that he was permitted to address six thousand of his constituents. What numbers were present I know not, but an individual who had counted the procession, informed me that he could make but seven hundred, and that two or three others made about the same number.

Most of the speakers on the occasion, were strong abolitionists—they sympathize very deeply with the oppressed—are horrified at the idea of perpetuating slavery; and as the surest way of preventing it, they would have all vote for "Clay," that uncompromising friend of free labor, and free institutions—the idol of the whig party. One of the speakers was almost transfigured by the pronunciation of that "sweet name Harry Clay" by a little child—he was sure that God would never suffer any evil to come upon that child. If there be any merit in strong attachments, surely the whigs are a meritorious people. No doubt they can say of Clay, "though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

Many of the Democrats in this region are beginning to doubt the propriety of voting for a slaveholder, and I have no doubt their conduct in November, will be consistent with their present feelings.

Our prospects are truly encouraging in Genessee. The convention was well attended—a unanimity prevailed which was truly gratifying.

W. C.

## For the Signal of Liberty.

### THE CONSTITUTION IS PRO-SLAVERY, AND THEREFORE OUGHT TO BE AMENDED.

Mr. J. M. is informed that Mr. F. does not take the ground that the meaning of certain clauses is to be determined by a compromise said to have been effected by the framers of the Constitution. Whatever Mr. F. has written concerning the provisions of the Constitution, has reference to the printed Constitution, and not to the compromised one, he never had any knowledge of such an instrument. Mr. J. M. in his communication of July 26, appears to assume, that because the enactments of slavery are contrary to natural rights, and are morally of no binding force upon the conduct of men (that is, because no man is under any obligation to obey such laws,) they are nugatory, a nonentity, in other words, that such laws are not laws; in other words, there are not now and never were any such things as slave-laws. That no man is under any moral obligation to obey such laws, I readily and heartily concede; but this fact does not prove that such laws do not exist.

Mr. J. M. says, "If a State enact a law protective of mobocracy, it can be of no binding force. 1. Because it conflicts with natural justice. 2. Because the Constitution, conformably to natural justice, guarantees protection to the people from the operations of brute force." The latter part of this clause is an assumption by Mr. J. M. of the whole subject. The ground I take is, that the constitution tolerates and sanctions the subjection of a portion of the people to the operations of brute force (slavery).

Mr. J. M. says, "The Constitution is written in the language of the common law which includes no idea of slavery in its signification." Therefore the law of slavery is not the law of the Constitution." Now the most I shall say to this assertion is, that I have read the constitution a great many times and always thought it was written in plain English, some portions of which establish the principles of the common law, while other portions sanction principles and practices entirely at variance with the common law. The truth is this, the people made a Constitution containing provisions to maintain the liberty of a portion of the people, and provisions which sanction the enslavement of another portion. The most important of these are the following:

1. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. 2. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. 3. Religious Liberty. 4. Liberty of speech and the press. 5. Right to bear arms. 6. Trial by Jury.

All these provisions are contained in the constitution, and if those that sanction slavery are contrary to natural right, and have therefore no morally binding force upon the conduct of men, that is one thing; but if they are not part of the constitution, that is another thing. The first of these positions I admit; the last I deny. The constitution declares that it was ordained and established by the people of the United States and that it is the supreme law of the land. These are important provisions, and the fact that it was made by the people involves all the people in the guilt of its wicked provisions, and the fact that it is the supreme law of the land precludes the hope of removing these provisions by any other means than an amendment of the Constitution.

Art. 1, sec. 2, paragraph 3. "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

Here are many words used to speak the word slaves, but notwithstanding it is plainly spoken. This paragraph not only recognizes and sanctions the existence of slavery; but it embodies it in the very essence of the National Government. It invites it to come into the National Congress with its 25 Representatives and make laws for the whole country. Do these 25 Representatives come into Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution? No one will deny it. Then is the paragraph just quoted part of the Constitution, or is it "nugatory," a "legal nonentity"? Let the free States who have suffered for the last twenty years under the domination of the slave power in the National Government answer this question.

Art. 1, sec. 2, paragraph 1. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

The phraseology of this paragraph deserves particular attention. Migration and importation of persons are both distinctly recognized at the option of the States. Migration is the term used to designate the act of persons coming into a country with intent to make it their home. Importation is the term used to designate the act of bringing into a country such things as have been attached to them the character of property; hence the term importation applied to persons; it shows clearly that persons supposed to have the character of property attached to them were expected to be brought into the country. The language is as comprehensive as it could be made, and was sufficient to protect the slave trade from all the earth. But this is not all; provision is made for a tax or duty to be imposed on "such importation not exceeding ten dollars for each person." Nothing is said of any tax or duty on "such migration." This shows also that the persons who were expected to be imported were at the option of Congress to be made the objects on which to raise revenue as on other property imported. This provision of the Constitution made

the slave trade law of commerce, and threw over it the protection of the supreme law of the land, equally with other branches of commerce until the year 1808. Many vessels were employed and many slaves imported.

Art. 4, sec. 2, paragraph 3. "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

This provision clearly sanctions all the laws in all the States that hold persons to service. It is proper to observe that the words "held to service" are used here instead of "bound to service" which is the common phrase where persons are bound for a term of years, and is the phrase used in another part of the constitution to designate such persons. This clause embraces all persons who escape, without distinction, and if it meant apprentices, slaves would have been excepted. This provision binds all the people in all the States to deliver up fugitive slaves so far as the constitution could impose any such obligation, or in other words not to hinder their return to slavery. The fact that this provision is contrary to natural right does not prove that it is no part of the Constitution, but it shows very clearly that it is a bad part, and that it ought to be amended.

These several provisions sanction and sustain slavery, or they do not mean any thing. Their language is so clear and comprehensive that it cannot be construed to mean any thing else. The constitution has sustained liberty and slavery both for 57 years, and both have grown strong under its protection. The three-fifths representation has given it a power in the Government which has thus far successfully defied the efforts of Liberty to overthrow; and the present administration, which, through this representation, has alien under its control, is now using the whole energy of the government to increase its strength; while one of the great political parties, embracing nearly half of the political power of the Union, have distinctly embraced in its party creed the accomplishment of the most important object of the slave interest. The other great political party are so far under the control of the Slave Power that there can be no safety for the liberties of the people with the government in their hands.

Slavery has obtained this immense power directly from the support it received originally from the constitution, chiefly from the three-fifths representation which gave it power in the government, this power gave it control of the government, this control of the government gave it control over all the important affairs; which all together have given it almost unlimited power over the destinies of the nation. With these facts before us, together with the plain provisions of the constitution, we are told by some that the constitution is an anti-slavery instrument, and Mr. J. M. compares these provisions in favor of Slavery to a conventional conspiracy, a legal nonentity, and asks if these overturn the whole structure of the constitution and destroy the habeas corpus and the right of trial by jury!

That the insertion of these provisions in favor of slavery was a conventional conspiracy, I readily admit. It was a conspiracy of a large portion of the people of the United States against the liberties of another portion of the same people. This was a conspiracy against natural right, but not against human laws. The conspirators were themselves the law makers; they wrote that portion of the people of the United States who adopted the Constitution, and thereby made this act of conspiracy the supreme law of the land; and the present inhabitants are now guilty of this same act of conspiracy, and will continue to be, so long as they support these provisions of the constitution.

These provisions in favor of slavery do not necessarily interfere with the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. If a slave bring the question of his liberty before a Judge on habeas corpus, the Judge will decide whether he is a slave by the laws of the country; and if so, remand him back to slavery—if not, set him at liberty.

These provisions in favor of slavery do not necessarily interfere with the right of trial by jury, so far as that right is secured by the Constitution. Art. 6 of amendments secures this right in criminal cases; the slave is undoubtedly entitled to it when tried for crime.

Art. 1, of amendments secures the right of trial by jury at suit at common law, where the value in controversy exceeds twenty dollars. If slaves could bring suits or be sued at common law for money, they would be entitled to a jury trial, and this would not interfere with those provisions of the Constitution which support slavery.

I perceive that Rev. R. B. Bement takes the ground that the constitution does not sanction or support slavery, because, as he says, the States themselves have no conventional right to hold slaves, these rights having become obsolete at the time of the American Revolution. It appears to me that even if these conventional rights (or more properly speaking, conventional wrongs) did become obsolete, any community could re-establish them at any time, through conventions that framed the State Constitutions, or by legislative enactment. In countries where slavery has existed by law, it has originated by legislative enactments, or been sanctioned and protected by them. Any State can establish slavery in this way at any time, where the State Constitution does not prohibit it; and conventional powers bestowed upon individuals in this way, receive the greatest amount of conventional authority that can be embodied in them. If Great Britain could at any former time grant to her subjects the conventional power to hold men in slavery, any independent State can grant the same thing now to her citizens.

S. W. FOSTER.

Sci'o, Aug. 17, 1844.

The Philadelphia U. S. Gazette says the Recorder has issued thirty-seven warrants for persons engaged in the late riots. Of these, eight are in prison, one dead of wounds received from his fellow rioters before his arrest, seven are under bail for trial, seven have fled, and four are not taken, but supposed to be in the neighborhood of the city.



## SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

ANN ARBOR, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1844

## THE LIBERTY TICKET.

For President,  
**JAMES G. BIRNEY,**  
OF MICHIGAN.  
For Vice President,  
**THOMAS MORRIS,**  
OF OHIO.

## ELECTORAL TICKET.

ARTHUR L. PORTER,  
CHANDLER CARTER,  
JOHN W. KING,  
FRANCIS HUSSEY,  
CHESTER GURNEY.

For Representative to Congress,

FIRST DISTRICT.

CHARLES H. STEWART.

SECOND DISTRICT.

EDWIN A. ATLEE.

THIRD DISTRICT.

WILLIAM CANFIELD.

SENATE.

FOR SENATOR—FOURTH DISTRICT.

SEYMOUR B. TREADWELL.

FOR SENATOR—SECOND DISTRICT.

MUNN'S KENNY.

FRANCIS M. LANSING.

FOR SENATOR—FIFTH DISTRICT.

JOHN F. MARSH.

JAMES L. BISHOP.

OAKLAND COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

JAMES WILKINSON.

GEORGE SUGDEN.

MELVIN DRAKE.

JOHN THOMAS.

HENRY WALDRON.

SEBRING VORHIES.

MACOMB COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

PLINY CORBIN.

CHANCY CHURCH.

JACKSON COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

THOMAS MCKEY.

ROSWELL B. REXFORD.

LAXMAN WILCOX.

KALAMAZOO COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

DELAWARE DUNCAN.

HENRY MONTAGUE.

CALHOUN COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

JOHN HARRIS.

GEORGE INGERSOLL.

SHIAWASSEE COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVE.

ELIAS COMSTOCK.

WASHTENAW COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

ROBERT POWELL.

GEORGE MILLER.

IRA SPAULDING.

DARVIS S. WOOD.

ALVAN PRATT.

JOHN DIMOND.

HILLSDALE COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

LEVI TREADWELL.

WILLIAM SAVAGE.

GENESEE COUNTY.

FOR REPRESENTATIVE.

JOHN PRATT.

"Now, great as I acknowledge, in my opinion, the evils of slavery are, they are NOTHING, ABSOLUTELY NOTHING, in comparison with the FAR GREATER EVILS WHICH WOULD INEVITABLY FLOW FROM A SUDDER, GENERAL, AND INDISCRIMINATE EMANCIPATION."—Mr. Clay to Mr. Mendenhall, Oct. 16, 1842.

DALLAS ON ABOLITION.  
"It should be recollected that the northern and central Democrats have maintained THE FIGHT AGAINST ABOLITION for years." "For my own part, I am ready for EXAMINING AND DISCUSSING WAR against a principle, (ABOLITION) whose mere enunciation in this country would in my own life be a TOCIN to REBELLION, AND THE REASON TO THE CONSTITUTION."—Letter to J. Willis, Aug. 20, 1840.

OUT AT LAST!  
CLAY, ANNEXATION, AND SLAVERY!!

This week we are enabled to present to our readers the following letter from Mr. Clay, to John M. Jackson and Thomas M. Peters, of Alabama, in which his true position on Annexation is fairly and fully avowed. It will be seen that he is FOR IT WITHOUT ANY REFERENCE TO THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY.

ASHLAND, 27th July, 1844.  
Gentlemen:—I have received your favor informing me that my views, as disclosed in my letter from Raleigh, on the question of the Annexation of Texas, are misconceived, if not misrepresented in your quarter; and that it is supposed that I have changed my opinion from what it was in 1819. I endeavored to express myself in that letter as explicitly as I could and I do not think now that it can be fairly misinterpreted.

In 1819, when I addressed the House of Representatives, the Executive had negotiated the treaty with Spain, by which Texas was ceded to that power, but Congress had not then given any sanction to the cession—I believe now, as I thought then, that the Treaty-making power is not competent, without the concurrence of Congress, to cede away any Territory belonging to the United States. But Congress, by repeated acts, rendered it as valid and obligatory upon the United States, as if Congress had given its assent, prior to the conclusion of the treaty. At that period of 1819, Texas was claimed by us, was unpeopled. No hostile incursion had been made into it by citizens of the United States. In 1825 and 1827, there were but few inhabitants of Texas, consisting of some colonists, plant-

ted there under the authority of Mexico. At neither of the three periods above mentioned had any State or section, in this Union, manifested any opposition to Texas composing a part of it. It has been said that Mr. Adams' administration offered to negotiate with Mexico for Texas, notwithstanding the existence of a war between Spain and Mexico, and that it could not therefore have believed that the acquisition of Texas, at that time, would have involved the United States in war with Spain. Hence it is argued that the ratification of the late treaty could not have compromised our peace.

Mr. Adams thought it desirable to obtain Texas. Two foreign powers claimed it.—Mexico was in possession, and Spain was doing nothing to assert and enforce her claim.—Her representatives had even gone so far as to stipulate, in a convention, to acknowledge the independence of Mexico, although that convention was not ratified by Spain.

Mr. Adams had a right to authorize the negotiation of a treaty for the acquisition of Texas with both or either of the powers claiming it. It was natural that he should begin with that power which had the possession of Texas. Spain had interposed no obstacle. She had made no declaration that she would regard the acquisition of Texas as an act of war. It is point of fact no overt act was formally made to Mexico to purchase Texas no negotiation was opened, no treaty was concluded.

If a negotiation had commenced or if a treaty had been signed and Spain had protested, the prudent and cautious policy which characterized Mr. Adams' administration, would undoubtedly have prompted him to quiet Spain, and accommodate the matter, previous to the annexation of Texas to the United States, and without plunging them in war with Spain.—How totally different are all the circumstances under which, with Mr. Adams' authority, I authorized the overture to Mexico from those which attended the recent treaty of Mr. Tyler!

So far from Mexico being silent she repeatedly and solemnly declared that she would consider annexation as war with her. Texas was no longer an uninhabited country. It had been reseeded from the dominion of Mexico by citizens many of whom went armed from the United States. The war between Mexico and Texas had not been terminated by any treaty of peace. Mr. Tyler not only did not consult Mexico, but he announced that her assent to the annexation was altogether unnecessary. And he proceeded to conclude a treaty, embracing a large extent of territory and a numerous population, not comprehended in the Texas which the United States ceded to Spain in 1819.

In the mean time, too, a powerful opposition had arisen in the United States against the annexation of Texas to them. Several States had declared, thro' their legislatures, against it, and others if not whole sections of the Union, were believed to be adverse to it. This was the opposition to the measure, to which, in my Raleigh letter, I alluded, when I spoke of a "considerable and respectable portion of the confederacy." I did not refer to persons but to States or sections.

Under such circumstances, I could not but regard the annexation of Texas at this time, as compromising the honor of my country, involving it in a war, in which the sympathies of all christendom would be against us, and endangering the integrity of the Union! I thought then, and still believe, that national dishonor, foreign war, and distraction and division at home, were too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas.

But, gentlemen, you are desirous of knowing by what policy I would be guided, in the event of my election as Chief Magistrate of the United States, in reference to the question of the annexation of Texas. I do not think it right to announce in advance what will be the course of a future administration in respect to a question with a foreign power. I HAVE, HOWEVER, NO HESITATION IN SAYING THAT, FAR FROM HAVING ANY PERSONAL OBJECTION TO THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, I SHOULD BE GLAD TO SEE IT, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I DO NOT THINK THAT THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY OUGHT TO AFFECT THE QUESTION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. WHETHER TEXAS BE INDEPENDENT OR INCORPORATED IN THE UNITED STATES, I DO NOT BELIEVE IT WILL PROLONG OR SHORTEN THE DURATION OF THAT INSTITUTION. It is destined to become extinct, at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population. IT WOULD BE UNWISE TO REFUSE A PERMANENT ACQUISITION, which will exist as long as the globe remains, ON ACCOUNT OF A TEMPORARY INSTITUTION.

In the contingency of my election, to which you have adverted, if the affair of acquiring Texas should become a subject of consideration, I should be governed by the state of fact, and the state of public opinion, existing at the time I might be called upon to act.—Above all, I should be governed by the paramount duty of preserving this Union entire, and in harmony, regarding it as I do, the great guaranty of every political and public blessing, under Providence, which, as a free people, we are permitted to enjoy.

I am, gentlemen, respectfully,  
Your obedient servant,  
H. CLAY.

We have only space for a few brief remarks.

1. Observe Mr. Clay's present position. "I should be glad of it, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." This, we think, will meet the minds of all Annexationists. Very few of them, certainly, would say, "I should be glad of it with war, with dishonor, and upon unjust and unfair terms." In his first letter, Mr. Clay was opposed to present Annexation; in his second, he had "personally no objection to it;" in his third "he would be glad to see it," if rightly accomplished; and

should he write a fourth, he could take no other ground than that of Mr. Tyler, that he would go for it reckless of all consequences. So drive a stake down here—that Mr. Clay would be glad to see Annexation perfected, if rightly done.

2. We would call attention to what Mr. Clay says on Slavery. Hear him:

"I DO NOT THINK THAT THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY OUGHT TO AFFECT THE QUESTION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. Whether Texas be independent, or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of that institution. It is destined to become extinct, at some future day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population. It would be UNWISE TO REFUSE A PERMANENT ACQUISITION, which will exist as long as the globe remains, ON ACCOUNT OF A TEMPORARY INSTITUTION."

What now becomes of Mr. Clay's anti-slavery character, which has been held up in such delightful colors by Slade, Giddings, Seward, and C. M. Clay? Will Mr. Clay act for Abolition in any way? No; because "it is destined to become extinct." When? "At some distant day!" How! By constitutional legislation? No, but "BY THE INEVITABLE LAWS OF POPULATION." Look at this, ye Demagogues, and cease your idle tales about Mr. Clay's Abolitionism. Mr. Clay thinks slavery will become extinct—not through the anti-slavery action of the whole people; but through "the inevitable laws of population"—that is, in the course of two, three, or four hundred years!! Drive down another stake here.

3. Mr. Clay would admit Texas WITH Slavery! There is no escaping this conclusion. Here are his own words:

"It would be UNWISE TO REFUSE A PERMANENT ACQUISITION, which will exist as long as the globe remains, ON ACCOUNT OF A TEMPORARY INSTITUTION." Mr. Clay certainly would not act "unwisely." Consequently, he is FOR ANNEXATION WITH SLAVERY! The conclusion is inevitable. And now what becomes of all the declamation which has been addressed to abolitionists about voting for Clay to keep Texas out—to withstand the aggrandizement of slavery—to put down southern slaveholders—who would trample on the rights of Northern Freemen—to hasten the liberation of the poor slave—"to stand by the cause of Human Freedom"—the Whigs are the "true Liberty party," &c. &c. Every man, every politician, and every paper, which has addressed these considerations to Liberty men, must and will do one of two things: They will forsake Mr. Clay, and act consistently with their exhortations to Liberty men, or they will vote for CLAY, ANNEXATION AND SLAVERY! The three things are now as inseparable as Polk, Annexation, and Slavery!

4. If Mr. Clay would "be glad" of Annexation, it is a fair presumption that he would not only permit it to be done, but would labor for it with all his might.—We should expect this from his character. To vote for Clay, is to vote for an able advocate of Annexation, and for the extension of Slavery!

5. Mr. Clay has named the "common consent of the Union" as one of the conditions of Annexation. What does this phrase amount to practically, but a bare majority of both Houses of Congress, and such a "consent" on the part of the States as will preclude them from bolting from the confederacy on account of Annexation. This kind of "consent" can be as readily obtained as was that which was given to the admission of Missouri as a Slave State. Mr. Clay was the presiding genius which secured that consent: now he aspires, not to add one more Slave State to the Union, but a Slave Territory large enough for a dozen Slave States. Will you help him in this infernal project by your vote?

6. Liberty men have been cautioned loud and long against voting for Birney lest they should help Polk, Annexation, and Slavery. What is now the real difference on this question between the two Slavery parties? Polk is for slavery in the United States at present, and against disturbing it in future: so is Clay. Polk is for Annexation: so is Clay: Polk is for Annexation with Slavery: so is Clay. Polk is for immediate Annexation: Clay is for it as soon as it can be had upon such terms as he may think to be peaceable, honorable, just and fair. Here is the only difference between the parties. The question is not "Shall Texas be annexed?" But "when and how shall it be annexed?" What have Liberty men to do with this issue? Let the proslavery parties settle it between themselves: but let us redouble our exertions against the abominable project.

Next week we shall present some further considerations. In the mean time, we would say one word to Liberty men. We have been sneered at, misrepresented, and in many cases abused and insulted, by Whig politicians and papers, for months together, because we would not vote for Clay, and thereby keep up Texas, and put down the Slave power. Every kind of artifice has been used to persuade Liberty men to vote for Clay because he was pledged against Annexation, and the consequent extension of Slavery. What Whig paper has not urged this

times without number? What Whig orator has not kindled as he spoke of the conspiracy of Polk, Calhoun, and McDuffie for perpetuating and extending the horrid institution, and the prompt and manly rebuke with which it had been met by the noble HENRY CLAY? And now what do we find? The same Harry Clay would be glad to see Annexation take place, and deems it "unwise to refuse" on account of slavery—a mere "temporary institution!"

LIBERTY MEN! Now is the time to act! Stand forth for your principles, and show that you are men! Make your influence felt. You have been abused unresistingly long enough. It is time to act on the offensive. Begin immediately.—Go to that Whig neighbor of yours, who has so often lectured you on this subject, and tell him his duty. Read to him this letter of Mr. Clay, and ask him if he approves its positions. If he says no, he is bound as an honest man to repudiate Mr. Clay, and not vote at all, or vote for a man who will carry out those same anti-slavery and anti-annexation doctrines which he has been preaching to you! If he says yes, he is a hypocrite! Confront him with his hypocrisy by showing him from this letter:

1. That Clay "WOULD BE GLAD" of Annexation.

2. That he would be glad of it with the "temporary institution" of HUMAN SLAVERY!

He cannot deny it; and unless he renounces Clay, he is recreant to his own principles, and convicts himself of gross hypocrisy.

FRIENDS OF LIBERTY! The issue is fairly before you. Both the candidates are for Slavery and Texas: now rally for the only true representative of American Freedom. You have been hammered upon, like the anvil, for a long time; now that the hammer is placed in your hands, spare not, but STRIKE HEAVY!

## WHIG FALSEHOODS.

It is with much reluctance that we find ourselves compelled to come before the public with statements impeaching the veracity of individuals. Yet we are driven to this, from time to time, in self defence.—The object of the Whig managers, as evinced from the lead of the Detroit Advertiser, and from other indications, is to circulate such slanders concerning the conduct of the Liberty press in Michigan, as shall impair the confidence of the Liberty men in its editors, as a preparatory step towards inducing the party generally to abandon Mr. Birney, and vote for a slaveholder. Hence the necessity, we are under of meeting again and again the same falsehoods, so long as men calling themselves respectable can be induced to repeat them. The following letter from Adrian, presents a specimen of the personal warfare with which we are assailed:

"ADRIAN, Aug. 29, 1844.

REV. G. BECKLEY:  
Dear Sir:—I write you a few lines to-day, calling your attention to the three following accusations preferred against you and the Liberty Party of Ann Arbor.

The general wholesale accusation is that the Liberty party and the Locofocos are one and the same, and their objects the same, viz: the destruction of the Whig party. In confirmation of the above, Capt. Daniel Hicks, a prominent Whig, stated this week that he had vouchers in Ann Arbor to the number of 5 or 6, that you stated when you came to Ann Arbor, that you intended to break down the Whig party, and that that was your object in coming there, and that secondly, he had several good vouchers to prove that you had at two or three elections, since you had been there, voted the straight Locofoco ticket. The third specification was made at the same time and place by a Mr. Lothrop, a wealthy and respectable man of this village, and a member I think of the Presbyterian church. It was, that the Liberty party of Ann Arbor last winter and spring had agreed to unite with the Locofocos at the coming Presidential Election against Mr. Clay, and some five or six of the most influential and leading Liberty party men in Ann Arbor had stated this as being their plan, and the authority was endeavored to be placed beyond all cavil and doubt. He stated that his authority was the Rev. Mr. Curtis, of the Presbyterian Church of your place, a brother of the Presbyterian minister in this place. You doubtless see the bearing it is intended to have on the minds of some abolitionists.

J. L. PETERS.

Now in reference to the charges above mentioned, we will merely say:

1. That when G. Beckley came to Ann Arbor in 1839, there was no Liberty organization, but Abolitionists voted with their respective parties—that he opposed the organization in 1840 when it was first proposed at Jackson—and that he has never stated to any one that he intended to break down the Whig party, unless he mentioned the destruction of the other party in the same connection. G. Beckley expects that both the proslavery parties will be "broken down" by the Liberty party, unless they adopt the principle of universal and immediate emancipation, and equal rights to all. Consequently, that "prominent Whig, Capt. Daniel Hicks," will either retract his assertions, or save his reputation for veracity by bringing forward his "5 or 6 vouchers."

2. G. Beckley has never voted any other than the regular Liberty ticket since he came into Michigan. Whoever says otherwise, is misinformed, or guilty of wilful falsehood. "Capt. Daniel Hicks" will therefore produce his "several good vouchers," and prove that G. Beckley has voted "a straight Locofoco ticket," or he must acknowledge himself to be a propagator of falsehood. It is no more than just that he establish what he has asserted, acknowledge that he was mistaken, or be justly accounted a slanderer. Which course will he take?

3. As to the statement of Mr. Lothrop, that the Liberty party of Ann Arbor had "agreed to unite with the Locofocos at the coming Presidential Election against Mr. Clay, and some five or six of the most influential and leading Liberty party men in Ann Arbor had stated this as being their plan, and the authority was endeavored to be placed beyond all cavil and doubt. He stated that his authority was the Rev. Mr. Curtis, of the Presbyterian Church of your place, a brother of the Presbyterian minister in this place. You doubtless see the bearing it is intended to have on the minds of some abolitionists.

I am sorry I have not the list of placers and the number opposite their names. If I had, I would publish them, it would be so highly creditable to their great devotion to this cause. This labor, well performed, will irradiate the 8th District. A committee, of which Charles O. Shepard is chairman, is appointed to superintend this remarkable pledge of labor."

## CONGRESSIONAL NOMINATIONS.

These are now completed. In the first District, we have C. H. Stewart, the nominee of the Liberty party; the Democrats have re-nominated Robt. McClelland; and the Whigs have selected Edm. Lawrence, of this village. J. M. Howard was the choice of the Convention, but he declined. The vote in this District last year stood thus:

McClelland, (Dem.) 7,862  
Howard, (Whig.) 5,495  
Porter, (Lib.) 829

In the Second District, the Liberty candidate is E. A. Atlee; the Democratic, J. S. Chipman; the Whig, Henry W. Taylor, of Marshall. We have a favorable opinion of Mr. Taylor as a gentleman & a man of talents. He is the ablest and most candid opponent the Liberty party

has met in this State; and his published articles against the Liberty party present a striking contrast to the late malignant and vindictive attacks of J. M. Howard upon Mr. Birney and his friends. But no sensible Liberty man will be tempted to throw away his vote on Mr. Taylor, as the state of parties forbids any rational hope of his election, as a glance at the result of last year will show. It stood thus:

Lyon, (Dem.) 7,171  
Williams, (Whig.) 5,102  
Bement, (Lib.) 1,232

The Liberty vote this year will largely increase.

In the Third District, the Liberty party have again nominated Gen. Canfield; the Democrats, James B. Hunt; and the Whigs have selected G. W. Wisner.—The vote last year was as follows:

Hunt, (Dem.) 6,206  
Drake, (Whig.) 4,007  
Canfield, (Lib.) 685

Read the spirited and soul inspiring "Stanzas for the Times" on the first page by Whittier. They are indeed appropriate to the present age of the world. O'Connell, the champion of Irish freedom, is incarcerated as a felon by the most liberal government of Europe for his peaceable efforts to benefit his country; while in South Carolina, Brown was sentenced to death—in Missouri, three young men are sent to the Penitentiary for twelve years—in Florida, Jonathan Walker, a citizen of Massachusetts, is now chained in a dungeon—and in Maryland, Rev. C. T. Torrey, of Massachusetts, a clergyman of unblemished character, is lying in a loathsome jail in Baltimore—all charged with no other crime than helping their fellow men peaceably to escape from their oppressors. To cap the whole, T. W. Dorris, of Rhode Island, is sentenced to imprisonment for life for his efforts to secure a larger measure of freedom to his fellow-citizens! What a mockery of justice is presented by human laws, and the decisions of human tribunals, and how consoling to good men the thought that there is a Supreme Tribunal, whose decisions will rectify the errors of men, and place the characters of upright men in their true light.

## IONIA COUNTY.

A friend writes us from this county, Aug. 29:

"It is said by some that it is a time of discouragement: we have no confidence in either of the two great parties. Yes, even here on Grand River, as far down stream as Ionia and Kent counties, the leaves are working in the great mass.—Many are sick, heartily sick of their former adhesion to the proslavery parties. Birney and Morris are their choice, and many are halting, waiting as they say to get more information. Here is a place for work, work rightly done.—Have you any Lecturers for Grand River? Can you send us a Treadwell, a Stewart, a Beckley?"

But why do we ask for Lecturers? Freemen of Grand River! we are all lecturers; though we have some chiefs in the cause, we can all speak out for freedom; Liberty or Slavery is ours, which will we have, choose ye this fall. Messrs. Editors, You shall soon hear a good report from Ionia County. She is good and true. Her voice will be heard at Grand Haven and echo back to Jackson, where it will be met with a hearty welcome."

## HOW THEY DO IT IN NEW YORK.

Alvan Stewart writes to the Liberty Press concerning a recent convention:

"I took the liberty, on the second day, to call for volunteers, to hold anti-slavery meetings in the 8th District of this State; and it was soon seen that the 8th District had more than her share of strong men. Mr. Johnson, a Lawyer of high character and standing, led off by saying, 'put down my name for 50 meetings before the first of November, to be held by me or some one whom I may procure; and by some 10 other orators of that District; different numbers of conventions were pledged, until the whole number amounted to 535 conventions."

I am sorry I have not the list of placers and the number opposite their names. If I had, I would publish them, it would be so highly creditable to their great devotion to this cause. This labor, well performed, will irradiate the 8th District. A committee, of which Charles O. Shepard is chairman, is appointed to superintend this remarkable pledge of labor."

## NEW JERSEY.

It is stated that the new Constitution of this State, through some of its provisions abolishes the remains of Slavery. It denies to colored persons the right of suffrage. The Liberty party are organizing here. Their new paper, the New Jersey Freeman, published at Bonton, has reached us this week. Presidential electors have been nominated. Every one of the Free States have now a Liberty electoral ticket, and one or more Liberty papers, except Rhode Island. Surely, this does not look like dying away!

## CIRCULATE THE DOCUMENTS.

There is time enough yet to do much good by circulating Liberty papers and tracts. How much has been done in your town? How much do you intend to do? We want at least 500 more subscribers. Our list at present is but a little more than two thousand. If you would have your vote increased, circulate the documents.

The Essex Transcript, a Massachusetts paper, says that a depression in many kinds of manufactures begins to be felt. It attributes this partly to over-production in this country, and partly to the floods of foreign goods imported. We have expected a depression of the manufacturing business, but did not anticipate that it would so soon commence.

has met in this State; and his published articles against the Liberty party present a striking contrast to the late malignant and vindictive attacks of J. M. Howard upon Mr. Birney and his friends. But no sensible Liberty man will be tempted to throw away his vote on Mr. Taylor, as the state of parties forbids any rational hope of his election, as a glance at the result of last year will show. It stood thus:

Lyon, (Dem.) 7,171  
Williams, (Whig.) 5,102  
Bement, (Lib.) 1,232

The Liberty vote this year will largely increase.

In the Third District, the Liberty party have again nominated Gen. Canfield; the Democrats, James B. Hunt; and the Whigs have selected G. W. Wisner.—The vote last year was as follows:

Hunt, (Dem.) 6,206  
Drake, (Whig.) 4,007  
Canfield, (Lib.) 685

Read the spirited and soul inspiring "Stanzas for the Times" on the first page by Whittier. They are indeed appropriate to the present age of the world. O'Connell, the champion of Irish freedom, is incarcerated as a felon by the most liberal government of Europe for his peaceable efforts to benefit his country; while in South Carolina, Brown was sentenced to death—in Missouri, three young men are sent to the Penitentiary for twelve years—in Florida, Jonathan Walker, a citizen of Massachusetts, is now chained in a dungeon—and in Maryland, Rev. C. T. Torrey, of Massachusetts, a clergyman of unblemished character, is lying in a loathsome jail in Baltimore—all charged with no other crime than helping their fellow men peaceably to escape from their oppressors. To cap the whole, T. W. Dorris, of Rhode Island, is sentenced to imprisonment for life for his efforts to secure a larger measure of freedom to his fellow-citizens! What a mockery of justice is presented by human laws, and the decisions of human tribunals, and how consoling to good men the thought that there is a Supreme Tribunal, whose decisions will rectify the errors of men, and place the characters of upright men in their true light.

"CAUSE OF TROUBLE."—Our attention has been called to the following paragraph from a report of Rev. C. G. Clarke, of the Washtenaw Presbytery, at a "Western Convention" at Cleveland, June 22, 1844, as published in the N. Y. Evangelist of July 11:

"A large part of their population were Irish Papists, who now hold the balance of political power, and were disposed to break up common schools, because the teachers read the Bible and prayed in the schools. Political Abolitionism is another cause of trouble. They had protected meetings carried on with care—but most of their really good men had become satisfied that these spasmodic revivals were rather a curse than otherwise."

## INDIANA.

We have scarcely any returns of the Liberty vote. The New Garden Advocate, of August 8th, says:

"The Whigs have again triumphed in this county. The Democrats had no candidates for the Senate, and but one for the House. The highest vote for Whig Senator, was for A. M. Bradbury, 2000. C. Burroughs and H. P. Bennett, Liberty candidates for the Senate received the former, 1834, the latter, 1255, a considerable portion of the Democratic party voted for them. The highest vote for Liberty representatives was for J. Unthank, 335, of which 133 were given in New Garden township."

The Whigs have a majority on joint ballot of ten; but the popular vote is said to be Democratic by 2,000 majority. The aggregate Whig majority on 12 members of the Legislature was only 77, being but about 6 majority to each member. The majority for Harrison in 1840, was about 13,000.

The Goshen Democrat has the following returns of Grant County:

Democrat, 418  
Whig, 189  
Abolition, 252!!

## NEW JERSEY.

It is stated that the new Constitution of this State, through some of its provisions abolishes the remains of Slavery. It denies to colored persons the right of suffrage. The Liberty party are organizing here. Their new paper, the New Jersey Freeman, published at Bonton, has reached us this week. Presidential electors have been nominated. Every one of the Free States have now a Liberty electoral ticket, and one or more Liberty papers, except Rhode Island. Surely, this does not look like dying away!

## CIRCULATE THE DOCUMENTS.

There is time enough yet to do much good by circulating Liberty papers and tracts. How much has been done in your town? How much do you intend to do? We want at least 500 more subscribers. Our list at present is but a little more than two thousand. If you would have your vote increased, circulate the documents.

The Essex Transcript, a Massachusetts paper, says that a depression in many kinds







