The Montrose Democrat.

"WE JOIN OURSELVES TO NO PARTY THAT DOES NOT CARRY THE FLAG AND KEEP STEP TO THE MUSIC OF THE UNION."

A. J. GERRITSON, PUBLISHER. MONTROSE, PA., DECEMBER 15, 1859. VOLUME XVI, NUMBER 49.

THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT,
PUBLISHED THURSDAYS, BY
A. J. GERRITSON, EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.
OFFICE ON PUBLIC AVENUE, OPPOSITE THE P. O

TERMS—$2 per annum or $1 50 in *advance*. Delinquents subject to charge of $2 50 per year, with interest. Discontinuances optional with the Publisher until all arrearages are paid.

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square of 12 lines; 25 cents per square for each insertion after the first three. One square one year, $8, each additional square, $4.

Job Work of all kinds executed neatly and promptly. **Blanks** always on hand.

ABOLITION DOCTRINE.

A PLEA FOR CRIME.

AN ASSASSIN EULOGISED.

TREASON & INSURRECTION ENCOURAGED.

MURDER ADVOCATED.

SECTIONAL WAR AND ANARCHY BOLDLY THREATENED.

BY ONE OF THE REPUBLICAN FREMONT CLERGY OF 1856.

A DEFENCE OF CAPT. JOHN BROWN.

Delivered at the Baptist Meeting House in Montrose on the evening after his execution.

BY A. L. POST.

The dark deed, probably, is done. The Moloch and minions of slavery are jubilant over the strangulation of another, and the noblest of all its victims. The drop of a Virginia gallows, in hot haste, has fallen, and the spirit of another martyr in the cause of human freedom, has taken its flight to that better land, "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." Peace to his remains and honor to his memory. Now that Capt. John Brown has been executed, on conviction by a Virginia court, of treason, murder and insurrection, it may be hoped, by many, that, all the excitement occasioned by his disinterested and noble daring, may die out; and that his name may be forgotten, or remembered only as connected with the fate of those who have suffered the extreme penalty of violated law. Vain hope! As to the excitement, we have had but the beginning of the evil; and as to the memory of Brown, it is impossible that it shall not be cherished. It must be wreathed in a hero's crown, and embalmed in the incense of a martyr's glory. May be this generation will not do him the anticipated honor. May be that lust for prerogative and power has so corrupted the heart of the nation; and the wisdom which an inspired apostle denominates "earthly, sensual, devilish," has so blinded its conceptions of law, justice and true glory, that his name may be handed to the next generation, with the tarnish of infamy, or apologies for madness. But that, or another shall surely wipe off the stain. Truth and justice will, some how, keep a clean and sufficient record. Some Mary, or Lydia Maria Child will go with spices to his newly made sepulchre; and if not "many noble or wise men," at least, some few, men who have reputation rather to gain not to lose, with honest hearts and truthful words, will vindicate his honor, and the justice of that cause, in which he has fallen. However malignant and threatening may be the cry of treason, still they will do it. But I expect more and better things, even of this generation. It is impossible that Brown's heroic deeds, followed if possible by more noble utterances, and an undaunted christian faith, while in prison, can be lost or prove destitute of power, in arousing the nation, even now. Governor Wise may take and give to southern blood-hounds the so much desired snuff of abolition blood, but that will only madden to destroy. He may become as famous, among the thousands who have urged him on, as Perseus, of old, whom mythology tells us cut off the head of Medusa; but he may have reason to fear that the mystic drops of blood which fell from that head, and produced innumerable serpents, may have a more substantial counterpart, in the blood of Brown. But the better hope is, that the martyr's blood may cleanse the church and ballot box, and restore to them the power to vindicate justice, re-establish human rights, "proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof," and give honor "to whom honor is due." Yes, may be this generation may do John Brown' memory justice; and finish the work, peacably if it can, which he attempted. Aiming at so desirable results, thus early, on this day of his execution, I bring my offering. However feeble, or in the light of the present,—presumptious, it is honest. Take it for what it is worth.

I do not intend to go into the details of the old hero's life; nor the minutia of circumstances connected with his death. From my stand point there is no need, in the vindication of his character and conduct, to make apologies for, what is called, his last "raid" or "foray," at Harper's Ferry; and therefore no necessity that I should recount these scenes of slavery, ruffianism and outrage, in Kansas, which are supposed to have made him a monomaniac, or mad man, bent on revenge. Enough for my present purpose, that Capt. John Brown, who to-day expired on a Virginia gallows, inherited the name and spirit of a lineage, traceable, directly back through Capt. John Brown, one of the heroes of the Revolution, to Peter Brown, one of the Pilgrim Fathers, who in 1820, after a long and perilous ocean voyage, in pursuit of an asylum from the oppressions of the old world and a place of freedom to worship God, stepped from the May Flower upon Plymouth Rock. Enough that his conduct and conversation while, holding the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, while lying mangled and bleeding, surrounded by official dignitaries, the bristling bayonets and cutlasses of the soldiery, while chained in the Charleston prison, and confronting the mockery of a court, and the gallows, he honored that lineage, and established the right and justice of his claim. Let Col. Washington and his fellow prisoners witness to his bravery, humanity and self-sacrificing generosity. Let Brown's own indignant repudiation of the advantage which might have been gained by a plea of insanity, and his prison letters, humble, unequivocal, frank, truthful and sublime, vindicate him from the charges of enemies and the misjudged apologies of friends. Virginia's officials from the governor down to constable, or up to jailor—for he, Capt. Avis, seems noblest of them all—though thirsting for the poor remains of his blood, believe every word the old hero said; and were forced by their own convictions, to pronounce him the bravest man and the noblest old Roman they ever saw. On the conviction of Virginia and the whole nation, that Brown tells the truth I put in, for him, the plea of justification. In the light of these facts, muncipal law, as interpreted by the world's civilization and christian morality, as expounded by the christendom of the ages both alike, must acquit him of crime.

Now to the proof. First the facts and then the moral and civil law, as applied to them.

The facts include Brown's object; and the means of accomplishing it. His object was the liberation of the slaves, and the abolition of slavery. It was not the creature of a momentary impulse, but of a sober, long cherished, sense of duty to God and the millions of his enslaved fellow-countrymen—an object worthy of his life and death. In pursuant of this object, he fought the battles of freedom in Kansas; became the terror of border ruffians and the minions of slavery, and accomplished really more than any other man, in preparing Kansas to come into the Union, as a Free State. He finished up his labors there by running off a company of slaves from Missouri, and taking them, in triumph, to Canada. With a reputation thus established he entered upon the work of emancipation on a grander scale. He rallied a few brave and true men around him; and organized a provisional government, under a constitution which clearly set forth his object, and the means by which that object was to be accomplished. The preamble to that constitution is sufficently definite, upon this subject. It reads as follows:—PREAMBLE—*Whereas* slavery through its entire existence in the United States, is none other than the most barbarous, unprovoked and unjustifiable war of a portion of its citizens against another portion, the only conditions of which are perpetual imprisonment and hopeless servitude, or absolute extermination, in utter disregard and violation of those eternal and and self-evident truths set forth in our Declaration of Independence: *Wherefore*, we, the citizens of the United States, and the oppressed people, who by a recent decision of the Supreme Court, are declared to have no rights which the white man is bound to respect, together with all other people degraded by the laws thereof, do for the time being ordain and establish for ourselves the following provisional government, and ordinances, the better to protect our people, property, lives, and liberties; and to govern our actions."

Thus organized, with twenty-two men—seventeen white and five colored—he proceeds to Maryland. After maturing plans he took the town of Harper's Ferry, containing two thousand or more inhabitants, the United States arsenal, and a number of men prisoners, without the shedding of blood. The State and United States troops, in large numbers, urged on by Gov. Wise of Va. in person, made an attack upon him; shot down and butchered thirteen of his men—disregarding by the way the flag of truce held sacred at least among all civilized nations, and after two days of turmoil and conflict succeeded in capturing him and the remainder of his men, left in the arsenal—six of his combatants are reported to have been killed; and several wounded.

Trials before a Virginia court in hot and indecent haste have followed, resulting in the condemnation of Brown and four of his associates for treason, (excepting one colored man on this count,) murder and insurrection under the penalty of death. To-day, between 11 and 12 o'clock, Brown was to have been, and probably has been, executed.

Such is a brief, but plain statement of the facts; Does law, applied to this state of acts, condemn Brown as a criminal; and justify the judiciary and executive of Virginia? In the examination of this question, let us divest ourselves, as far as possible, of all prejudices, partizan predilections, and especially of the influence of those forms of law, which have either lost their substance, or been perverted to the service of injustice, wrong and outrage; and, with the full expectation that our conclusions will pass in review, at the judgment of the great day, honestly inquire after truth. What is right? What is just? In other words, what in its true sense, is law, as applicable to this case?

Blackstone, the world renowned commentator on law, defines it as follows:

Civil or "municipal law is a rule of civil conduct, prescribed by the supreme power in a State, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

I am aware that casuists, and those who have endeavored to make it appear that laws are valid, right or wrong, have found fault with this definition; and yet it must be admitted as the true. The clear and unmistakable inference, I daw from it, is—that which does not command what is right, or prohibit that which is wrong, is not law, and as such, can have no binding force.

Justinian, the great Roman lawyer, in his Institutes (according to Blackstone) reduces the doctrine of law to three principles, viz: "We should live honestly, should hurt nobody, and should render to every one his due."

These Blackstone includes among "the eternal and immutable laws of good and evil, to which the Creator himself, in all his dispensations conforms."

Rutherforth, in his Institutes of natural law, ch. 10th, says, "as has been shown already, the law of nature, enjoins all those actions which are morally good and forbids all those which are bad. By this means the former become duties, and the latter become crimes."

With these testimonies, we can hardly mistake the nature of law, or the distinction between duties and crimes. If I am met here by a caviling lawyer with the declaration that there are important distinctions between municipal and natural law, my reply is, admitting that, yet still in a conflict between the two, the muncipal must give way to the natural. The former is null and void if it encroaches upon the authority of the latter. Let him turn to his Blackstone vol. I. pages 41, 42, 43—and he may read as follows: "The law of nature being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries and at all times, *no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this*; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and their authority mediately or immediately from this original." Further, "Those human laws that annex punishment to murder do not at all increase its moral guilt, or superadd any fresh obligations, in the form of conscience to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, *we are bound to transgress* that law, or else we must offend both the natural and divine."

Still further, "Those rights then which God and nature have established and are called natural rights—such as are, life and liberty, need not the aid of human laws to be more effectually invested in every man, than they are. Neither do they receive any additional strength, when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable. On the contrary, *no human legislature has power to abridge or destroy them*, unless the owner shall commit some act that amounts to a forfeiture." What act, by the way, has the American slave committed that amounts to a forfeiture of his natural rights, as "life and liberty?"

"The law of nature," says John Quincy Adams, and he is good authority, "is precedent and paramount to all human governments. Every individual of the human race, comes into the world with rights, which, if the whole aggregate of human power were concentrated in one arm, it could not take away. The Declaration of Independence recognizes no despotism, no tribial, aristocratic, or democratic. It declares that individual man is possessed of rights, of which no government can deprive him."

But let the Declaration of Independence speak in its own language: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed: that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to altar or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely so effect their safety and happiness." * * * "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariable the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

These doctrines, once at least, had the authority of law. On the strength of their vitalizing power, one nation sprang into existence, and gained an acknowledged sovereignty. True their authority has come to be denied. Shamocrats, assuming the names of Democrat and Republican, have publicly, in many cases, denominated them "nonsical abstractions," a "mere retorical flourish." Yet it is equally true that the fathers of our Revolution wrote them upon the world's statute book with a pen of steel dipped in the indelible ink of their lives, and sacred "honor." Can it be possible that half a century has changed the nature of "self-evident and eternal truths," and annihilated unalienable human rights? Then, O, Liberty, Liberty! what hope, in this sin cursed world is left thee! But, no. There is hope. Our Declaration of Independence is still law—law for every country and clime, for every kindred and color.

I will conclude these authorities, with a short, but sublime passage from the celebrated English divine, Hooker. "Of law, he says, "No less can be acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice is the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage, and the least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power."

Such then is law, and to its authority I would most humbly bow. If Brown cannot be justified on the doctrines of law as defined and promulgated by the authorities given, then let him be condemned and the speaker with him. "*Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*" "Let justice be done though the heavens fall." If they do not condemn him, now that he is dead, at least let his history be acquitted of crime. Whatever may be your decision; whatever may the decision of the nation, now, and so long cowardly staggering and reeling under the load and curse of human slavery, I must say however it may subject me to the charge of treason that so far as the authorities given go, (and they go to the full extent of acquittal,) that John Brown died innocent of the charges preferred against him. More, if treason and murder, and insurrection have been committed, it has been done by the court, and executive of Virginia; and that too against God, and Capt. John Brown.

But I may be told, that I have been dealing in the abstract generalities of law, and justice; that "circumstances alter cased," and these may so vary the application if not change the principles of strict law and justice, as to make them condemn what they seem to justify, and acquit what they seem to condemn.

To this I reply, that however circumstances may change things, which have no inherent moral character, they cannot make law valid against inalienable natural rights, "such as," in the language of Blackstone, "are life and liberty." These are the rights involved in the case under consideration. It is the law of slavery, that, directly or indirectly, condemns Brown and his associates. What is the law of slavery? I answer—It is the law of might against right—it takes the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness from one class of men, and hands them over, in perpetuity, to another class—it makes merchandise of the bodies and souls of beings, made in the image of God—it herds four millions of Americans with cattle, and makes the other twenty or more millions of Americans, blood-hounds, to run after them, if they run away—it is a law of war against man, and to say nothing of God, the fatness and fertility of a free earth. Or, in the more emphatic language of the preamble to Brown's Constitution, it is, "The most barbarous, unprovoked and unjustifiable war of a portion of its citizens against another portion, the only conditions of which are perpetual imprisonment, extermination, in utter disregard and violation of those eternal and self-evident truths, set forth in our Declaration of Independence."

Such is the law of slavery. Is it, can it be valid law? can it have force in a court of justice? No. I repeat it, no; it is absolutely void; and yet such is the law that has condemned and executed Brown. He guilty of crime? No. With the command of God ringing in his ears, "Remember those in bonds as bound with them," "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you;" he put on his armor, ran into the ruthless, barbarous and unprovoked war, which slavery had long ago commenced, and was now prosecuting with re-doubled fury, cruelty and madness. He went into a war of defence and rescue; more justifiable than the high purpose that brought the great and honored Lafayette into the Revolutionary struggle; or that which sent Americans to fight the battles of Greece. True circumstances wonderfully alter cases; but why a change of cases without a corresponding change of circumstances?

Here is a case. If I remember rightly, in the time of the Greek Revolution, the cry was raised in this county for bread and clothing and men and munitions of war, for Greece. It is reported that the renowned John Randolph pointed some benevolent ladies who had been deeply interested in making clothing for Greeks, to a company of ragged slaves and cried, "the Greeks!" the Greeks! there are the Greeks!" Doctor Howe, of Boston, was honored in being sent with the Nations liberality to the Greeks of the old world; and there covered himself with glory in fighting their battles, against the Turks. Now he is said to be a fugitive in Canada, because of his connection with John Brown, in freeing, from a thousand fold worse than Turkish oppression, John Randolph's "Greeks," in "the Old Dominion." Oh consistency! consistency! hast thou fled under slavery's scourge "to brute beasts!"

But I have not done with this question of defence. It is said that Brown took life.—There is no proof of this; and yet admit it. By all the rules of warfare, man has right to take life in self defence. Cooke, in his confession, gives the concluding portion of Brown's charge to his men, before taking the town of Harper's Ferry. Said Brown, "Now gentlemen, let me press this one thing upon your minds. You all know how dear life is to you, and how dear your lives are to your friends; and in remembering that, consider that the lives of others are as dear to them, as yours are to you. Do not, therefore, take the life of any one, if you can possibly avoid it; but if it is necessary to take life in order to save your own, then make sure work of it."

If they made 'sure work of it" in some few cases, is there any evidence that the simple orders of defence were disregarded? No.—But what is the law of defence? Rutherforth hands it down from Grotius thus:—(R. Inst., page 106.) "We ought not to take away any one's life immediately, or directly, for the sake of preserving our goods," but he allows, however, that "we may defend them till our life is in danger; and then we may justly kill the robber."

If we may, virtually, go to the extent of taking life in defence of our goods, certainly there can be no doubts about the right of defending persons, to the extent of taking the lives, if necessary, of the robbers of God's poor. While I give the law of civilization and christianity, as generally received, I give no opinion of my own upon that subject. I simply apply the law as I find it, and as almost unversally admitted; and apply it to the case of Brown. This law must acquit him of guilt. But I am told, perhaps, that he resisted the authorities, the Governors and Government. Very well; and yet he must be justified. How stands the law? As authority upon this point I will introduce again Rutherforths Institutes of Natural Law. The author says (page 453-4) says:—"Rights of resistence begin where civil subjection ceases," then, after setting forth, that subjection ceases where Governors abdicate, he proceeds—"Secondly, civil power or authority, in its highest degree, is limited by the laws of Nature and of God; it does not give those who are invested with it, a right of commanding what is inconsistent with these laws, or of compelling obedience to such commands. In respect therefore of what is inconsistent with these laws, civil subjection ceases. For where the civil Government have no right to command, or to compel; the people are under no obligation to obey or submit."

Our author goes further, even to the annihilation of duty to suffer the penalty of void law, when we disobey its commands. "Tho'," he proceeds, "the people are at liberty to submit patiently if they will, it will be of no consequence that they are obliged thus to submit, though no law of nature or of God has forbidden passive obedience—unless perhaps the law of self preservation, upon which I shall not assist; yet you cannot conclude from hence that such obedience is duty. To support this conclusion you must produce some law of nature or of God which enjoins it. In the meantime, it seems self-evident that when the civil government of a society have no right to command; they have no right or authority to make use of force either to compel obedience, or punish disobedience. But it is a known principle of natural law, that where there is no right on one part, there is no obligation on the other part. The people therefore are not in subjection to any force which is made use of by the civil governors for these purposes, or are not obliged passively to submit to such force." This would have been good grounds for either Brown's acquittal or rescue.

Upon this point, let Virginia, when she was the "Old Dominion of Liberty, instead of slavery as she now is, in her History speak:

"On the arrival" says that History, "of the Stamp act in America, the smothered feelings of the Colonists broke forth in one general burst of indignation. The house of burgesses in Virginia, being at that time in session made the first opposition. In five resolutions which were introduced and supported by the eloquent and ardent Patrick Henry, they asserted the rights and privileges of the Colonists and declared that they were not bound to yield obedience to any law imposing takes on them, unless made by their own Assembly. It was here that the conduct of the King was for the first time in America, publicly arraigned; and Henry was the first man who dared publicly assert "that the king had acted the part of a tyrant in taxing the Colonies without their consent."

As applied to the present case, all I have to say is, that Patrick Henry's name is proved to be in the same category with Brown's; and that if justice is done, fifty years will not have passed before the daring of Brown will be as highly honered as that of Henry. It should be more highly for the reason that the former ran the greatest hazzard. Henry bearded the Lion three thousand miles off; Brown knocked out some of his teeth, and bearded him in his den.

But take another historical incident, a nearly, if not exact parallel with the case of Brown.

In 1795, Gov. Gage, of the Massachusetts Colony, sent from Boston, a force consisting of 800 men, under the command of Col. Smith and Maj. Pitcairn, to destroy a large quantity of ammunition and stores, at Concord.—When they arrived at Lexington, they found the Militia of the place drawn up and ready to receive them. On the refusal of the Militia to lay down their arms, the regulars fired upon them, and killed eight men. This following up the Boston Massacre commenced the American Revolution. Were the Militia justifiable in resisting the Collonial authorities of Great Brittain? Americans, what say you? Will you dodge a justification of the beginning of your own Revolution, for the sake of condemning "Old John Brown!"—Shame on such degenerate cowardice and injustice! You dare not.

I conclude, therefore, this part of my defence by saying that, it matters not, that Brown and his associates were contending against Governors, or civil magistrates, those authorities had no right to command his submission, nor to use force to compel it; and Browns right was that of disobedience and defence.

But I may be told, that there are "Constitutional remedies for existing evils, and these alone should be resorted to."

There may be more in this, as applied to the case, than in any other objection; and yet it must be construed in the light of the Declaration of Independence to be in all cases, valid. It must admit that the Constitution is a Constitution for freedom; and that its forms must furnish all needed facilities for the remedy of wrongs. If it, and all legal forms may be put under duress, or, by construction be made to annihilate natural and unalienable rights; and to tolerate injustice and outrage, then the objection becomes invalid. Have not petitions and remonstances, for a whole generation, been urged against slavery with all possible eloquence and pathos, only to be treated with ridicule, contempt and mob violence! Has not the Ballot Box been adjured to come to the rescue, against the peril of insurrection and general devastation; and yet, under the terror of a threatened dissolution of "the Union," has it not cowed and truckled, spaniel like, at the feet of despots? Has it not been stuffed with illegal votes, by officials, and bought by promises of preferment, until it has become so corrupted that even pretty good men think they have done wonders in bringing even the free States up, with faltering step to the stand, that slavery may be let alone where it is, but must make no further aggressions upon free Territory? May not slavery propagandism have half the credit of even this? Has not slavery, all the while been growing stronger, more arogant, and murderous? What power has made, for many years, all of our Presidents; commanded our armies; represented us in foreign courts; passed Fugitive Slave Bills; knocked down Senators; destroyed a great compromise which favored free territory; butchered free State men, rewarding that butchery with office; encouraged filibusterism against weak nations; revived foreign commerce in the bodies and souls of Africans; and so corrupted the Supreme Court of the United States, as to force its *dictum*, that "the black man has no rights that the white man is bound to respect? What power but slavery, and that too, under a construction of the spirit and forms of the Constitution? Slavery has done all this, and more; and yet twenty-two men under the noblest captain of the age, the noblest "Old Roman" of all modern Romans, must be shot down or hung for "Treason, murder and insurrection," because, "a forlorn hope," they dashed into the conflict to rescue Constitutional liberty, and emancipate the crushed and bleeding slaves. Slavery is an outlaw, although making war on God and humanity, professidly, under the banner of the Constitution. It is Constitutionally an outlaw; and as has been demonstrated on every principle of natural justice, it is an outlaw. It is a modern Cain without God's mark on him to shield him from retribution. So Brown believed, and so, to put the worst possible construction upon his conduct, he acted.

As a last resort, for a law by which to condemn Brown and his associates, we are pointed to that of expediency. We are told, in the language of Paul, that "all things are lawful, but all things are not expedient." Well, it is not a small thing that Brown's opponents are driven to this. It acquits of guilt, on the great principles of justice and abstract right. But admit that this law, or rule of expediency has been violated. That Brown's conduct partakes of the character of impracticabilities, the wild and incoherent doings of a monomaniac, and what then? Is a man to be hung for inexpediency? Then there should be a gallows in every town and hamlet; and angels must needs turn executioners. Is inexpediency treason, murder, and insurrection? What a commingling of is this. Lawful but inexpedient treason! lawful but inexpedient murder! lawful but inexpedient insurrection! Here is found the solution of the fact that American liberty, once so sacred and inviolate, has become inexpedient. But I take issue with those who introduce this rule of expediency. That rule, if I understand it, is this: Oppressed nations or communities should make no attempt to throw off the shackels or to vindicate their rights, until such time as there may be a reasonable prospect of success. Against this I put in the following plea:

1. There is a maxim which in its time and place, contains as good and valid a law, at least as that of epediency. It is that submission and forbearance may cease to be virtues. The time may and does come, when property and life are of no account, but to be offered up on the altar or justice and liberty. Patrick Henry gave utterance to this doctrine when he cried "give me liberty or give me death." The Colonies responded to it, and rallied to arms. Considering the power of England did they run no hazard? Were not the probabilities all against success? To all human foresight was there not a reasonable ground to anticipate trial and execution, on the part of the patriots of the Revolution for treason? If you say no, you rob them of at least half their glory. The truth is, they had petitioned and remonstrated against the burden of an oppressive government, without success, until, in their opinion, "forbearance had ceased to be a virtue." They said death was preferable to such oppressive, and ignoble burdens; and resolved to take that alternative, if fail, as reasonably they might expect they should, of liberty. They did not mean to say simply, "if there is a reasonable prospect of liberty, we will fight for it. No; "give me liberty or give me death, had no such tame and cowardly significance as that. But it may be said, after all, that the success which did follow was their justification. Then, had they failed, in truth, as well as by authority of tyrannic edicts, they were traitors, subject to a traitors doom. Beautiful doctrine that, which justifies a man by results which he cannot foresee! Hail to those who with wicked hands crucified the Lord of Life and Glory! Ye have brought redemption to a lost world!

2. But secondly.—Temporary defeat may be necessary to ultimate success. Apparent failures may be real success. True courage is rather strengthened than weakened by a defeat. Bastard courage, when, in the language of old Brown, there is "but little risk," may prove ferocious, but it is cowardice still; and all its apparent successes are ultimate defeats.

The ultimate conflict may be to great for the present amount of true courage. The sacrifice of a few whose noble daring may lead them in advance of their comrads, may be needful to educate and discipline the remainder, for the contest and victory. Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans at Thermopyle, furnishes an example in point. Abundance more of them may be found in the history of our own country. The massacre at Boston, where Crispus Mattuck, a colored man, fought for the rights of Americans, Bunker Hill, Lexington, Concord, and a host of other places, come up with their witnesses that failures are successes; and defeats victories.—Who in the light of such examples, can say, surely, that the taking of Harper's Ferry, at the sacrifice of Brown and his comrads, is not a defeat pregnant with the glory of success?—that ultimate results may not prove that the sword descended from the great Washington, rightfully and ominously came into the hands of Brown?

Defeats, again, may be needful to show the weaknesses, as well as the strength of an enemy. Here Brown's failure has already proved a success. Why all this parade of military—these 2500 or 3000 armed men, with all the munitions of war, surrounding the gallows of a wounded and helpless old man, doomed to die? Why? Because Joun Brown is the hand of God writing on the wall of the Old Bastile of oppression, "mene tekel upharsin." The conscious guilt and cowardice of slavery is out, at last trembling knees and coward bravado, indicate its doom. The ghost of Virginia's State Seal pictured with a freed slave standing with foot upon the Tyrant, and exclaiming "*Sic-Semper Tyrannis*,"—May this ever be the fate of tyrants has sent terror through all slaverydom.

What a contrast to all this is the quiet, peace, resignation and sublime faith of the condemned and imprisoned old man, Brown. Hear him while yet in prison and in chains, waiting to be led out to the gallows, speak—"As I believe most firmly that God reigns, I cannot believe that anything I have suffered, or may yet suffer, will be lost to the cause of God and humanity. And before I began my work at Harper's Ferry, I felt assured that in the worst event it would certainly pay. I often expressed that belief and now see no possible cause to alter my mind. I have been a good deal disappointed as it regards myself, in not keeping up to my own plans, but I now feel entirely reconciled to that, even, for God's plan was infinitely better, no doubt. As to the time and manner of my death—I have but very little trouble on that score, and am able to be of good cheer." Again—"So far as *I am concerned*, I count all joy. I have 'fought the good fight,' and have, as I trust, 'finished my course.'"

In the olden time, there was another John Brown, a pious Edingburgh carrier, who thought it to be his duty to succor persecuted ministers of the gospel. He dwelt in "The Cottage on the Muir." Claverhouse, with a band of soldiers came to that cottage in pursuit of a good minister by the name of Aitkin. He demanded of Brown his whereabouts—but Brown would not tell. Claverhouse commanded his soldier "Do your duty," shoot him down. They hesitated, and during the suspense, the wife of Brown broke the awful silence, with a "God Almighty bless your tender hearts." Claverhouse drew his pistol and did what his soldiers refused to do, and turning with insolence to the wife of the deceased man, and asked, "What think ye, good woman, of your bonny man now?" She replied, "I always had good reason to think well o'him, and I think mair o'him than ever."

"The cottage," says a correspondent of the "American Presbyterian," to whom I am indebted for this incident, "of John Brown has long disappened from the muir; but the little spot, where the 'House in the Muir' stood, is still green, amidst surrounding heath; and in the very centre of that spot there lies a slab, now almost covered with grass, upon which, with a little cleaning of the grass from the faded characters, the following rude but expressive lines may still be read:

"Clavera might murder godly Brown,
But could not rob him of his crown.'

"The courts of Virginia, and Gov. Wise, may execute John Brown; but there will be another monument erected, and another century couplet thereon inscribed:

"Although you murder godly Brown,
You can not rob him of his crown!'

"And his death may 'light such a fire' in our land, as will never be extinguished, until the principles of true liberty enlighten the nation."

I conclude in, perhaps more rude, yet patriotic versification:

I'm very glad,
A word to add,
Of honest approbation,
And give renown,
To "godly Brown,"
In face of all creation.

The two John Browns,
With golden crowns,
In spite of Wise and Claver!
In realms of light,
Where all is bright,
To-day have met together.

Then, let the throng
Join Freedom's song
And toll the hero's story;
Give "Old John Brown"
The martyr's crown;
To him *the victor's* glory.

FROM EUROPE.—The Bohemian, at Portland, brings dates from Liverpool to the 16th last. The Regency of Central Italy has been tendered to and declined by Prince Carignan but finally conferred upon the Chevalier Buoncompagnie.