

TERMS—The ARGUS will be furnished at Three Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, to single subscribers—Three Dollars each to clubs of ten at one office—in advance. When the money is not paid in advance, Four Dollars will be charged if paid within six months, and Five Dollars at the end of the year. Two Dollars for six months—No subscriptions received for a less period. No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher.

The Oregon Argus.

—A Weekly Newspaper, devoted to the Principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, and advocating the side of Truth in every issue.—

Vol. III.

OREGON CITY, OREGON, AUGUST 1, 1857.

No. 16.

ADVERTISING RATES. One square (12 lines or less) one insertion, \$3.00 Two insertions, 4.50 Three insertions, 6.00 Each subsequent insertion, 1.50 Reasonable deductions to those who advertise by the year.

JOB PRINTING.

THE PROPRIETOR OF THE ARGUS is happy to inform the public that he has just received a large stock of JOB TYPE and other new printing material, and will be in the receipt of additional material to all the requirements of this locality. HANDBILLS, POSTERS, BLANKS, CARDS, CIRCULARS, PAMPHLET-WORK and other kinds, done to order, on short notice.

The "Rebellion" in Ohio.

The truth that a false position can never be long maintained without the sacrifice of common honesty or common sense, has been continually illustrated in the recent political history of this country. It has just received another very striking confirmation in the State of Ohio.

At some time during the past summer, a slave escaped from Kentucky, and took refuge in the town of Mechanicsburg, Ohio. To that place he was pursued, by virtue of the odious law which converts the free States of the North into the accomplices of a system which they abhor—and there he would have been arrested, had he not possessed so much of the spirit and courage of a freeman as enabled him to turn upon his pursuers, and scare them from his track. They ran away at the sight and sound of his pistol, and when they returned with reinforcements, they found that some of the citizens of Mechanicsburg had helped the fugitive to a place of safety beyond our Republican borders.

Thereupon, the pursuers who had been defeated of their disgraceful object, set to work to ferret out, and bring to "punishment," the free white man who had dared to sympathize with a bold fellow fugitive and fleeing for his liberty. Armed at last with a quiver of suspiciously sufficient large and full, they procured writs from the United States District Court for the arrest of four persons in Champaign county, charged with the crime of "harboring a fugitive from labor." These writs were put into the hands of a deputy marshal, who, with his posse, departed to serve them.— They were served, and the parties named were arrested. The friends of the latter however, instantly applied to the courts of the county for writs of *habeas corpus*, which were of course immediately granted; and, with these writs, the sheriff of the county overtook the deputy marshal and his prisoners in the adjoining county of Clarke. The deputy marshal at first refused, with a show of reason, to obey the summons of the sheriff, on the ground that his functions could not be exercised out of his own shire—

but in a moment went on to declare that nobody should interrupt his progress. This question, being raised by him, was promptly accepted by another sheriff—the sheriff of Clarke—who took the writ from the hands of his colleague of Champaign, and, with one assistant only, put himself in the way of the deputy, and commanded him to stop. There was no ground for evasion here. The sheriff of Clarke was clearly in his right, and that the deputy marshal knew this to be so is proved by his first reply to the sheriff of Champaign. But, so far was he from any intention of obeying the law of the land, that he and his men made an onset upon the sheriff, and, after inflicting great violence upon him, left him, to pursue their way. By this time, however, the country was thoroughly aroused to the nature of these unheard-of proceedings, and a third sheriff of a third county—Greene—finally succeeded in bringing up this marauding deputy who had so intemperately undertaken to ride a raid through the heart of the Western Reserve. The marshal and his men were thrown in prison, from which it appears by the latest advices that two of them have been liberated on bail.

Upon this plain and straight forward narrative of the events which have just taken place in Ohio, it is not possible that two constructions can be placed. The deputy marshal of the United States has not brought the "United States authorities" into collision with the authorities of the State of Ohio. If any such collision shall result from his intemperate and outrageous proceedings, the responsibility of that collision will rest on the United States authorities, who shall be foolish enough to render themselves accountable for the acts of a blundering and brutal subordinate. We do not choose to believe that any respectable officer of the American Government will put himself into so unenviable and ridiculous a position. By the exertion of a very little moderation and a very little intelligence on the part of the superior functionaries of the Union and of the State of Ohio, this matter can be easily arranged—the offending deputy dealt with according to his deserts—and the parties implicated in the heinous charge of helping a man to his freedom, either exonerated from the imputation, or afflicted with such penalties as attach, in the United States, to such offences.—N. Y. Times.

The emigration from Germany this year promises to be larger than ever.—From all parts of Germany—even the parts that have never had the Western fever on before—from Pomerania, Western Prussia, and Brandenburg, parties are making up to leave for America. Most of the new-comers are mechanics and farmers,—men used to working, and used to the rewards and comforts which industry everywhere secures to a greater or less extent.

JUSTUS.

POPULATION OF CALIFORNIA.—A careful estimate, based on the latest returns of the local assessors, makes the population of California 507,067—of whom 332,280 are Americans, 65,000 Indians, 38,937 Chinese, 15,000 French, 15,000 Mexicans, 10,000 Germans, 10,000 Irish, 2,000 English, and 15,000 other foreigners, besides 4,000 colored persons.

The iron horse now pursues his way, without stop or important deviation, upon a direct line, from Bangor, Maine, to Jefferson City, Missouri, a distance of a little over seventeen hundred miles, in three days.

man, but the bare holding and claiming him as a piece of property, was visited at once, and for the first offense, with the heaviest penalty of the Jewish law.

The facts expressed and necessarily implied in the above passage, and in the one from Deuteronomy previously quoted, are absolutely incompatible with the idea of a tolerated and legalized slavery among the Hebrews. A man stolen may have been a servant or not a servant; but even if he were a servant, there is no direction to restore him to any previous master. But if a servant runs away, there is an express and positive direction not to restore him to his master; thus recognizing the servant's right to decide for himself whether the master properly performed his part of the contract; and thus rendering it certain (if we admit the Mosaic code to be consistent with itself) that the transaction called by the translators of the English Bible the "buying" of servants, must have been the buying of their services from themselves.

No other theory will explain the provision, unparalleled and absurd in a slaveholding state, that the servant who, finding himself unjustly treated by his master, left him and took refuge with his next neighbor, was not to be restored, but, on the contrary, was at liberty to make a new contract with some other master, or to maintain himself independently, without molestation. The Hebrews, then, did not hold slaves. The Hebrew laws provided for the protection of the poor and the weak. One would expect, as a matter of course, to find laws of a very different character made by a nation which systematically oppresses the poor and the weak. But in this matter we are not driven to speculation by the absence of facts. The past history and present condition of the American people show us precisely how tyranny is secured and fortified by legal provisions in the case of a nation that does hold slaves, and is determined to keep them.

We request special attention to the light thrown on the character and conduct of Mr. Stephens by the following facts: 1. He identifies himself, in theory and practice, with the slave power. He supports that power, not only in its enforcement of the infamous "Fugitive Slave Law" in the (so-called) Free States, but in the absolute prohibition, by law, of freedom of speech and of the press in Kansas, for the special advantage of slaveholders. 2. Pretending to give a true account of the regulation of servitude by the Hebrew code, for the purpose of showing a divine sanction for slavery, he has fraudulently suppressed two vital and characteristic passages which are irreconcilably at variance with his theory, and has wrested the passages actually quoted from their true meaning by a commentary which is also irreconcilably at variance with the suppressed passages.

3. Using the mask of piety to gain credit for the character, and aid toward the firmer establishment of slavery, he represents its opposers as opposing the will and law of God, and himself and his colleagues as co-operating with the will and law of God, knowing all the time that the testimony of Scripture which he has suppressed is contradictory and fatal alike to his representations of the Hebrew code, and of the support assumed to be given by that code to the atrocities of American slavery.

In view of these facts, is it too much to say that Mr. Stephens's claim of the Divine approval of American slavery under such circumstances, and on such grounds, shows hypocrisy added to oppression, and impudence to profligacy? But Mr. Stephens assumes a Divine sanction of slavery through Abraham, prior to the giving of the Mosaic law.—This is mere assumption. He has not yet proved that the "servants" of Abraham were not such by voluntary contract. But even if he could prove it, the practice of Abraham would no more justify slavery now than concluding *noe*.

His reliance upon the "original Greek," in the New Testament history, equally brings him into the dilemma of proving too much, and thus of proving nothing.—For if *doulos*, as he says, necessarily means slave, in distinction from servant, this fact draws after it the following consequences: It shows Jude (by the opening of his epistle), and Peter (by the opening of his second epistle), to have been the slaves of Jesus Christ; in which case he might have sold them to the highest bidder; or kept them at hard labor, besting them with many stripes when there was any failure in their appointed tasks; or set them to propagating other slaves, to be sold in the market when they grew old enough, thus prefiguring the present patriarchs of Virginia.

It reduces to falsehood and absurdity the illustrative statement of Paul (Gal. iv. 1). "Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a *doulos*, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father." The minor is in the condition of a servant, being subject to the direction, not only of a father but a tutor; but he is not in the condition of a slave, exposed to sale in the market, brutal beating and mutilation, privation of suitable food and clothing, and entire denial of instruction in letters, arts, and sciences.

The case of Onesimus is not only misstated, but impudently reversed and falsified by Mr. Stephens; since Paul desires Philemon to receive him "not now as a *doulos*, but above a *doulos*, a brother beloved." But the crowning and most gigantic specimen of Mr. Stephens's audacity is found on the 10th page, where, commencing the justification of slavery by the claim of imitation of the Hebrew system, he slides imperceptibly into the claim of beneficently bringing heathens into a Christian land, then quietly takes it for granted that they are equally to remain slaves after being converted, regenerated, and admitted to full Christian communion, and finally settles upon the comfortable ground that the *negro* (by which, it must be remembered, he means the entire progeny of a century of intermixture of the pure white Virginian blood with the constantly varying shades, blanching with every generation, of the mulatto Virginian blood) is, and will remain, exactly in his right place as a slave. Here is the passage. Speaking of the Hebrews, he says:

"It is to be noted that their bondmen and bondmaids were to be of the heathen round about them. Over their brethren they were not to rule with rigor. Our Southern system is in strict conformity with this injunction. * * * Our slaves were taken from the heathen tribes—the barbarians of Africa. In our households they are brought within the pale of the covenant, under Christian teaching and influence; and more of them are partakers of the benefits of the Gospel than ever were rendered so by missionary enterprise. The wisdom of man is foolishness—the ways of Providence are mysterious. Nor does the negro feel any sense of degradation in his condition. He is not degraded. He occupies and fills the same grade or rank in society and the State, that he does in the scale of being. It is his natural place; and all things fit when nature's great first law of order is conformed to."

no, not in Israel. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant [or slave] was healed in the self-same hour.

The word rendered here "servant" in our translation means slave. It means just such a servant as all our slaves at the South are. I have the original Greek.

Was Christ a "dough-face"? Did he quail before the slave power? If he did not rebuke the slaveholding centurion, but praised him for his faith, who shall now rebuke others for exercising similar authority, or say that their faith may not be as strong as that of the centurion?

VI. In no place in the New Testament is slavery held up as sinful. Several of the apostles alluded to it, but none of them, not one of them, mentions or condemns it as a relation sinful in itself, or violative of the laws of God, or even Christian duty. They enjoin the relative duties of both master and slave. Paul sent a runaway slave, Onesimus, back to Philemon, his master. He frequently alludes to slavery in his letters to the churches, but in no case speaks of it as sinful. To what he says in one of these epistles, 1st Timothy, 6th chapter, I ask special attention.

"1. Let as many servants (*doulos*, slaves in the original, which I have before me,) as are under the yoke [that is, those who are the most abject of slaves] count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.

"2. And they that have believing masters, [according to modern doctrine there can be no such thing as a slaveholding believer; so did not think Paul.] let them not despise [or neglect and not care for] them because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.

"3. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, and is proud [or self-conceited] knowing nothing, but doing about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, "3. Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself."

Here we have Mr. Stephens's case; the whole of his defence of slavery from the Bible; and in view of it, that the question may be definitively settled, and all further agitation of it stopped, he issues to us this final command:

"Let no man, then, say that African slavery as it exists in the South, incorporated in, and sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States, is in violation of either the laws of nations, the laws of nature, or the laws of God."

Fortunately for us, this is only the crack of the whip. Mr. Stephens cannot yet apply it to our backs. He cannot yet order us a hundred lashes if we decline, as we certainly shall, to accept his authority as final, alike in regard to the "corner-stone of the whole Christian system," "the original Greek," the explanatory English, and the precepts and the spirit of Christ. Upon each of these topics we should regard Mr. Stephens as a "blind guide," if we had not reason rather to suppose him a deliberately treacherous one. We will now proceed to examine his several positions.

I. How stands the Old, or Jewish dispensation in regard to slavery?

Mr. Stephens asserts the covenant made with Abraham to be "the corner-stone of the whole Christian system." We hold rather with Paul (Ephesians ii. 20), "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone"; but since Mr. Stephens has chosen to rest his argument for Christian slaveholding on God's (assumed) express allowance to the Hebrews to hold slaves, and to the continuance of that permission under the Christian dispensation, we shall knock his whole foundation from under his feet by proving that the Mosaic direction respecting slaves was not an allowance, but an absolute prohibition either to seize, or to hold, or to sell them.

But how are we to prove this? Have not Mr. Stephens's quotations from Scripture and explanations of their meaning made the thing perfectly plain? Is it of any use to look at the other side in so clear a case as this?

It is always needful to look at the other side. It is for want of doing so that the hundreds of sects which crowd the pages of Theological Dictionaries confidently appeal to the same Bible to prove themselves in the right and all others in the wrong; and to prove the soundness of doctrines and practices as diametrically opposite as those of Catholic and Protestant, Calvinist and Universalist, Shaker and Mormon. Let either of these make his own selection of texts from the Bible, and put his own interpretation upon them, he will prove his case; but he will prove it overwhelmingly and triumphantly if he be further allowed the use of such arguments as are contained in the law of Mr. Stephens's own State—the prohibition of reading and writing to his antagonists

on pain of heavy fine and long imprisonment—or of such as Mr. Stephens has just imposed upon Kansas—the branding punishment as felony any denial by speech, writing or publication, of the right of slaveholding in Kansas. Such methods as these authorize suspicion of the party that finds it necessary to employ them. We will therefore inquire further before taking for granted, either that Mr. Stephens has quoted the whole of what the Scripture teaches respecting slavery, or has given a right interpretation to what he has quoted.

We have now lying before us two publications, one an octavo pamphlet of 75 pages, written many years ago by Theodore D. Weld, and entitled "The Bible against Slavery," the other a duodecimo volume of 272 pages, published within the present year by Rev. George B. Cheever, and entitled "God against Slavery." Both these give a full statement and explanation of the Scriptural laws respecting servitude, which they declare, and prove, absolutely to forbid such slavery as exists at the South, and such as Mr. Stephens defends. Both quote the original Hebrew, and even seem acquainted with the two words of "original Greek," which Mr. Stephens ostentatiously presents as at once the certificate of profound learning on his own part, and as a powerful charm to reduce his opponents to silence. Both these gentlemen make it clear, alike from Hebrew, and Greek, and a minute comparison of the various laws and customs bearing upon the subject, that the Hebrews were utterly and absolutely forbidden, on pain of death, even to claim, or to hold, a human being as a slave. This point they claim dogmatically to have proved, in both the publications above mentioned.

It appears, then, that there is something to be said on the other side, and that we are not compelled to acquiesce in Mr. Stephens's decision, either by the necessity of admitting a monopoly of learning and piety on his part, or by the absence of any alternative. But a real difficulty remains. "Who shall decide when doctors disagree?" How are we, the unlearned, to distinguish which of these two positions, diametrically opposed to one another, is the true one?

Fortunately, Providentially rather, the Mosaic law itself gives to each of us who can read English the means of absolutely deciding this question. The fifteenth and sixteenth verses of the twenty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, which Mr. Stephens had not time to quote in his speech, nor space to insert in his pamphlet, settle this matter conclusively. They fully corroborate the statement (which Mr. Weld and Doctor Cheever support by many other conclusive proofs) that the Hebrew servants were voluntary servants, made so by their own contract; that the buying of servants was buying their services of themselves; and are absolutely and absurdly inconsistent with the assumption that they were bought, independently of their own consent, of other parties, and held thenceforward as the absolute property of the buyer.

This passage, consisting first of an unqualified prohibition to the class of masters, and next of an unqualified permission and right guaranteed to the class of servants is as follows: "15. Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: "16. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, WHERE IT LIKETH HIM BEST: thou shalt not oppress him."

The enactment of this law incontrovertibly shows that slavery, the buying, seizing, holding, and selling men as property, had no legal existence among that people, and the introduction of such a law into the code of a slaveholding people would effectually and immediately put an end to slavery.

This statute remained in force, an integral and essential part of the Hebrew code, throughout the national existence of that people. Therefore we are sure that what we call slavery never existed among them at all, unless by disobedience to that law.

The penalty for stealing an ox, among the Hebrews, was a restoration of two-fold or five-fold, according to circumstances, to the owner of the ox, because the ox was property. The penalty for stealing a man, was death, but nothing is said about restoration, obviously because the man was not, and could not be, the property of another. Whenever a man is stolen, he is stolen from himself, and the very act of taking off from him the grasp of the kidnapper restores him to himself; so that nothing needs to be said about restoration. But the law goes further than this, striking at the very root of slavery. In the twenty-first chapter of Exodus, the chapter immediately following the decalogue, we read, v. 16th.

"And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Not only the stealing and selling of a

VIOLA, who has been misled a long time, is on hand again, and very gracefully excuses herself for past delinquencies in the following pretty fragment, where we learn that she has been engaged in the truly poetic exercise of "kissing the baby":

For the Argus.

A Fragment.

Sweet baby mine,
Those lips of thine
How often have I kissed them!
Yes, strange to say,
Through green each day,
The kisses, I've not missed them!
They're like the rill
That from the hill
Pours down its careless treasure,
And in spring hours
Awakes the flowers,
To fill the heart with pleasure.
They spring from out
The heart's deep fount,
The drops of love o'ersowing;
They ever pour
An endless store,
That costs not in bestowing.
And may they start
In thy young heart
Affection's cheering flowers,
To be a joy
Without alloy
In many future hours.
Iris Hill, July, 1857. Viola.

For the Argus.

Slave Labor or Free Labor.

No. IV.

PRO SLAVERY ARGUMENTS.

Mr. Stephens of Georgia, being a pious man, relies last, and chiefly, upon the revealed will of God, as showing the propriety of slaveholding; being also a learned man, he quotes from "the original Greek" to show that "servant" in the Bible means "slave"; and being also a logical man, he undertakes to show that the high reputation of Abraham and Philemon as true believers, the one under the old dispensation, the other under the new, authenticates their (assumed) slaveholding as an entirely correct proceeding, and fully justifies the slaveholding of the patriarchs now existing in the Southern States of the American Union.

We will present to our readers an abstract of this Scriptural argument, occupying the fifteenth and sixteenth pages of Mr. Stephens' speech, and then, (as far as an unlearned person restricted to narrow limits can state what is to be said in reply to it. We regret that we have not space to put the edifying devoutness of this portion of the speech in full before our readers; all we can do is faithfully to give its substance, with the whole of the quotations from scripture on which it is founded.

I. God made a covenant with Abram, afterwards called Abraham. That covenant is the corner-stone of the whole Christian system, and Abraham was the great first head of an organized visible church here below. He believed God, and was the father of the faithful, and was also a slaveholder and a slave dealer. Here is the proof, Gen. xvii. 13. God said to Abraham,

"I that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

II. In Ex. xx. 10 and 17, being the fourth and tenth commandments of the decalogue, slavery is expressly recognized, and in none of them is there anything against it. [Mr. Stephens does not quote these passages, perhaps thinking that they might weaken the impression of his florid description of the chapter in which they occur. The recognition of slavery asserted is merely the use of the words "men-servants" and "maid-servants."]

III. In Lev. xxv. we have the civil law on this subject, as given by God to Moses, for the government of his chosen people in their municipal affairs.

"44. Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them ye shall buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"45. Moreover, of the children of the stranger that do sojourn among you, of them ye shall buy, and of their families that are with you which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession.

"46. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor."

IV. Job, Isaac, Jacob, and all the patriarchs under the Jewish dispensation, were slaveholders.

V. Has any change been made since the Jewish dispensation? Is anything to be found in the New Testament against slavery? Nothing; not a word. Slavery was all around Christ and the apostles, where they were preaching, but not a word did they utter against it. Moreover, Jesus healed the slave of the centurion. Matt. viii. 7 to 13.