

bringing reckless charges will sufficiently appear from the following extracts:—

“Slaveholding is not a crime. A man by being the owner of slaves does not justly forfeit respect and confidence. He may be one of the best of men. It is therefore an act of injustice to condemn him as a criminal. And when this condemnation is connected with violent defamation, it becomes an intolerable grievance; that is, such a grievance as cannot ordinarily be submitted to without awakening the strongest resentment. It must be admitted that this is a grievance under which the South has laboured and is still labouring. The great mistake, however, of our Southern brethren, is that they charge this offence on the people of the North; whereas, the truth is, there is not one in a hundred of the people of the North who entertains these opinions and joins in these denunciations.”

“There are three different views entertained as to the moral character of slavery. The one is that adopted by the abolitionists, viz: That slaveholding is a crime calling for the execration of the world, and excommunication from the church. The opposite extreme is that slavery is a normal institution, good in itself, and one which should be perpetuated and extended, and, therefore, that the slaves should be kept in such a state of ignorance and dependence as is necessary to render the indefinite duration of the institution possible, safe, and useful. The third view is that slavery, as a system of domestic despotism, belongs to the same category with political despotism. It is not morally wrong in itself, and, therefore, under all circumstances, it is not to be denounced as a crime, nor are slaveholders, as such, to be held up as worthy of condemnation, or excluded from the fellowship of the Christian church. At the same time, as slaves are men, they should be treated as such, as the children of a common Father, entitled by the gift of God to mental and moral culture, to have the light of heaven let in upon their souls, to the rights of property, and to the prerogatives of the conjugal and parental relations. To deny them these rights is as great a sin as though they were freemen.”

To deny them these rights is allowed to be a sin. But is it not self-evident that to grant them these rights, would be virtually to grant them their liberty? The *Review* gives a quotation from the Virginia Correspondent of the *New York Herald*. We hope it is grossly absurd. But we shall allow our readers to judge:—

“There is one serious obstacle, which will probably nullify all efforts at conciliation, viz: the cotton States believe that secession, intrinsically, involves much more benefit to them than could result from a continuance in the Union. *Their prime, animating motive in pursuing this policy is to re-open the African slave-trade*, and that they are aware they never can do within the Union. Secession is, after all, with them a matter of material interest. I do not mean to insinuate that the movement is solely actuated by that consideration, but there can be no doubt of its exerting a controlling influence on it. This you may rest assured of. I have no idea that the cotton States will now forego the advantage which the election of Lincoln presents for the accomplishment of an object which to them is far dearer than the preservation of the Union. In the reopening of the African slave-trade they recognize one of the greatest sources of wealth and prosperity that any country could acquire. With such advantages, they feel that they could control the destinies of the world, and make Europe and the North bow in obedience to their will. There is much truth in the idea; but, whether there is or not, they entertain the conviction firmly, and argument will be unavailing in the effort to remove it.”

We learn from the *Presbyterian Banner* (Pittsburgh) that the Synod of South Carolina (Old School) met on the 29th Nov., and that a series of Resolutions was then presented, two of which were “That fidelity to the South requires us to sever all connection with the Northern portion of the General Assembly.” And “That a Committee be appointed to correspond with Synods and Presbyteries South, with a view of forming a Southern General Assembly.” This paper was