enemy, and a mean and base surrender of the field, under the miserable hope of gain and quiet.

But now that the logical results of this controversy are made practical, and the question of slavery is brought home to every man's hearth-stone—not slavery in the territories afar off, but slavery in our own states and at our own doors; not slavery created by and instituted among us, but slavery from without, brought to and forced upon us under the broad seal of the Supreme Court—now that it is no longer a question whether we may carry free institutions abroad into the national domain, but whether we possess the power to protect them at home—now that the grand struggle for freedom is transferred from Kansas to Bunker Hill, from the homes of the wild Indian to the soil of Saratoga and the Brandywine, let us see how men will act.

The Supreme Court has decided the right of the slaveholder in his human chattels, in Virginia, to be the common right of property throughout the world, and hence to be equally protected, whether in Virginia or in Massachusetts. The qualification (if there be such) that such holding in a free state may be "for a reasonable time," is utterly illogical with the ground of the decision, and can only have been designed to blind the eye temporarily to the appalling truth that *there are no free states in this Union.* The *common* rights of property have no "statute of limitations." If a man may go to Carolina with his horse and hold him there *ad libitum*, and if the rights of property in men are equal, then may the Carolinian remove his human chattels to Massachusetts, and the calling of the roll of slaves on Bunker Hill has already begun. We shall see what answer Massachusetts and Vermont, New York and the free West, have to make to this proposition.

If there yet remains among us a remnant of the spirit of the fathers, they will make haste to determine, by prompt and efficient legislation, that the "reasonable time" when the slave's shackles shall fall to the ground, is when his foot first steps across the line, and his lungs first inhale the air, of a free state.

In all this, I counsel no revolutions. But, thank heaven, no human tribunal is the arbiter of *truth!* That divinity yet points to the American constitution as the charter of personal liberty. The Executive and the Legislature may trample upon it, for they are human; the Supreme Court may trample upon it, for they are human also; and if the depravity of the times has at length been crowned by this great debasement of the powers of the government, I invoke only, in the name of Truth which yet lives, that force of public sentiment which makes and unmakes courts and decisions as easily as it makes and unmakes Presidents and Legislatures.

S. E. C.

March 7, 1857.

SLAVERY NATIONALIZED--THE CASE OF DRED SCOTT.

At length it has been judicially determined that ours is a slaveholding nation. The full extent to which the recent decision of the U. S. Supreme Court, in the case of Dred Scott, has gone, and the consequences which are to flow from it, will not be likely to be fully comprehended at its first announcement. The people of the free states will be slow to believe that the highest judicial tribunal in the land has deliberately decided that the sovereignty of the states themselves is not equal to the maintenance of liberty within their own borders. Yet such *is* this decision. When Massachusetts men and New Yorkers, the people of Connecticut and Ohio, when the Green Mountain boys and the men of the young West, come fully to realize that their cherished pride in the freedom and sovereignty of their own states is but an illusion, and that their own soil is to be blackened by the tread of the slaveholder without power of resistance, then—if there be not aroused among them a spirit of resistance and indignation which shall wipe out this decision and all its results, as the lightning wipes out the object it falls upon—then indeed, are the days of our republic numbered, and the patriot shall see light only beyond the storms of revolution and blood.

Hitherto the controversy on the slavery question has turned upon the question of the legality of slavery *in the territories*, under the constitution and laws of the *United States*. At the North we have maintained that the *territories* were the property and possession of the Federal government, held in trust, it is true, for the benefit of the people of the several states, but held, nevertheless, under the constitution and laws only of the United States, and not under those of any particular state. We have maintained that the constitution, as the organic law of that government, gives no more right to hold or make a man a slave, than to hold or make a man a king. We have denied, therefore, that slavery could exist in the national territories. The South have replied to us that the rights of property in each state were the rights of property in every other state; and that the constitution was ordained, *in its spirit*, if not in its letter, to protect those rights everywhere. The issues thus made have been hitherto fought out over the territories. No hardihood has been found sufficient to carry them further; and yet it is impossible not to see and admit, that in their full scope they embrace not merely the question of slavery in the territories, but everywhere, wherever the constitution reaches—in slave states and in the free. Upon the original theater, after successive victories in the earlier history of the country, we have at length been beaten. The Missouri Compromise was a defeat of freedom. The Compromise of 1850 was yet a more humiliating surrender, but it was left to the Supreme Court, in the case of Dred Scott, to complete the utter subjugation and extermination of all that remained of the protesting voice of liberty. And yet these have not been victories as in battle. We have been drugged, we have been stupefied, we have been betrayed by the delusive cry of peace into an absolute joining of the