

From the New York Telegraph.

NATIONAL DANGER AND SECURITY.

We copy the following paragraph from a recent correspondent of the N. Y. Evangelist, who is understood to be a gentleman of literary distinction, not accustomed to exaggerate facts. At the same time we invite attention to the two succeeding articles, suggesting, in connection with able ministry, the grand remedy for such evils:—

"Having travelled in Europe pretty extensively in the years 1843-4, and observed the state of society there; having seen, especially, much of the populace of those countries, the *las people* and the *canaille*, and witnessed the great desire of multitudes of them to get to this country, I am satisfied, that unless measures be taken by us, at least to modify the character, if not to check the amount, of emigration we are ruined. I look upon this as all but morally certain. Many of those wretched people—ignorant, shiftless, filthy, vicious, debased beyond measure—look upon this as the *land of promise* for such characters as they. Various schemes are advertised to induce emigration to other parts of the world; as to Australia by the English; to Algiers by the French, &c.; but the great drift is to the United States. Here, the knavish and the factious know there is no soldiery, no armed and vigilant police; and the vagrant and the strolling look upon us as a fine field for begging. And the despotic governments of those countries, burdened with so much crime and pauperism, the fruit of their own policy, and willing to see our popular institutions subverted, have a twofold motive for transferring their worst subjects to us. The authors of your Report on Charity and the Almshouse, dwell mainly on the great pecuniary burden of supporting so many foreign paupers. But the expense of subsisting them is not the only burden to which this unrestrained immigration is likely to subject us. It will soon be necessary for us to maintain a large military force, or at least, a large armed police, to keep down riot, and to secure life and property. Discerning men on the other side of the water, observing what sort of elements we are receiving into our bosom, predict such necessity as near at hand."

NATIONAL SECURITY.—Why should we tremble with forebodings of evil to our beloved country, when we possess the infallible means of rendering her prosperity durable as the luminaries of heaven, and abundant as the waves of the sea? And why should our time be spent, and our efforts comparatively wasted, in a partial and dilatory application of these means, instead of an immediate and universal effort? The Bible and the sacred Sabbath in every family of the land, would be the salt of the nation and the light of the world. The experiment is eminently practicable, and the result is certain; and why should the work of self-preservation mercy linger? Why should not the whole nation awake to its real danger, and make full proof of the power of the Gospel to save—not by governmental aid—but by the voluntary efforts of philosophers, and statesmen, and patriots, and Christians? Why trim the poisonous vapors, when the axe may be laid at its root, and its circumference of desolation be filled with trees of righteousness? Why temper with diseases of which so many nations have died, when the mercy of Heaven has provided One Tree, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations?—Dr. Beecher.

For the Recorder:

A "MUTILATION" ERROR CORRECTED.

Among other errors in recent strictures on the American Tract Society's publications, the following at least should be corrected. Commenting on Mason's Spiritual Treasury, the writer says:—

"Two or three instances of mutilation" have struck us painfully, in one of which there is the teaching of positive error. Speaking of the deep depravity of human nature, the author says, 'Such its enmity to God as to take away the life of his dear and only Son.' This is altered so as to read, 'Such its enmity to God as to take away the life of God,' p. 383. Again on the same page, the author says, 'Lord, [Law] thou hast sheathed thy strongest sting, and spent the poison of thy dart in the body of my Savior.' This is changed, and reads thus, 'Lord, [Law] thou hast sheathed thy strongest sting, and spent the poison of thy dart in the body of my God.' This language is neither biblical nor true. The Bible speaks of the death of Jesus—of Christ—of the Prince of life, and of the Holy One, meaning the Savior—but it nowhere speaks of the death of God—it no where intimates that men, however wicked, ever took away the life of God. Such language is painful!

"Speaking of sin as shown to be sinful in the death of Christ, the author says, 'Here see the exceeding sinfulness of sin; view its crimson dye in the atoning blood of the Son of God.' This is not a loved to remain as it is, but is changed to this: 'Here see the exceeding sinfulness of sin; view its crimson dye in the purple gore of the Son of God,' p. 297. In the original it is the atoning blood of the Son of God, which makes sin appear exceedingly sinful; but here it is his purple gore that does this!"

In reference to the above one of the Secretaries of the Society states, that in the London edition of the Spiritual Treasury, printed in 1785, vol. ii. p. 170 and 31, for June 18 and January 28, the three passages commenced on read as follows:—

"Such is its enmity to God, as to take away the life of God."

"Law, thou hast sheathed thy strongest sting and spent the poison of thy dart in the body of my God."

"Here see the exceeding sinfulness of sin; view its crimson dye in the purple gore of the Son of God."

These passages are all printed now for use and later for use in the Society's edition, pages 293, 270, respectively as they stand in the London edition, and as they stand in the New Brunswick edition of 1841, and the Committee know of no edition in which they are differently printed.

It is not to spread such strictures through the community. Dr. does this which, if written by Mason is truth, become error when printed by the American Tract Society just as his words are. And will intelligent Christians and ministers sound their opinions on such data?

From the Christian Reflector.

In the last of my letters on domestic slavery, a passage occurs which is, I find, liable to be misunderstood. I had already prepared a remark to accompany it, in the closing letter of the correspondence, when I perceived that Dr. Fuller had very properly alluded to it. I therefore ask the liberty of making an explanation in advance through the medium of your columns.

The passage with the remarks of Dr. Fuller is as follows:—

"As it does not belong to this argument, I have said nothing of your remark, that you never could, without doing violence to your conscience, do any thing towards the establishment, in a heathen land, of a church in which slavery could, by any means, find admittance. When it is considered, however, that you speak this as President of the Convention, and that in India there are millions of slaves, your observation is of vast importance, and the public ought to be informed by the Board, whether, in reference to slavery in India, our mission is to be pursued by a course different from that which, you admit, was pursued in the Roman Empire, by Christ and the apostles. Upon this point, I do respectfully, and earnestly, request that the highly and universally esteemed gentlemen constituting the Board, will not allow ignorance or doubt to perplex the Southern mind for a moment."

In the above remarks, I by no means intended to write as President of the Convention. That office confers no such right, and to have written thus officially, would have been clearly impertinent. My reason for alluding to the office which I hold was simply this, I perceived that, in the minds of some of my brethren, the opinions which I entertained might disqualify me for that office, and I therefore felt called upon to avow at once what my opinions were.

The opinion which I wished to express, was to this effect, I could do nothing with a good conscience, which should be the means of extending the institution of slavery. My mind, at the time of writing, was directed to the Karens, among whom our principal missions are established, and where slavery is unknown. I could never do any thing by which it might be legitimately inferred that I assented to its introduction among them. This principle would guide me in all similar cases.

When slavery was a part of the social organization of a people, as it was in the times of the apostles, I should treat it as I believe the apostles did. I should not make abolition a condition of church membership, but should rely upon the progress of the knowledge of divine truth to work out the entire extinction of slavery.

I should have sent you this note for the Reflector of the present week, but by accident my last paper did not reach me in season.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

F. WATLAND.

March 4th 1845.

THE RECORDER.

RALEIGH, SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1845.

Orders, payments, &c. &c. for the Recorder, by persons visiting Raleigh, may be left at the Book Store of Turner and Hughes.

RECEIPTS.—Those who have remitted funds for the Recorder during the last three weeks, will please examine our list of receipts, in this week's paper, and see that all is correctly entered. Should there be errors or omissions, they will please forward notice of the same as early as may be convenient. Should any who have ordered the Recorder, fail to get it in season, they also will please let us know. Having been absent from our post some little time, it is not improbable that some over-sights have been committed.

THE PROPOSED CONVENTION.

We learn from the Ch. Index, that the Georgia brethren have cordially met the proposition of the Virginia board; and that Augusta is the place, and Thursday before the second Lord's day in May, the time, fixed on for the proposed Southern Convention. Alabama will concur of course. What the Carolinas will do yet remains to be seen. As it respects ourselves, we should like to attend this convention mightily—especially could we find some one who would be willing to pay our travelling expenses, and manage our affairs while we are gone. There are many excellent brethren whom we should be pleased to shake by the hand, whose faces in the flesh we have never yet seen. It is our present opinion, however, that, were we to attend, we should vote to defer the whole matter until the meeting of the next General Convention, to convene in April, 1847; and having done so, we should then move for an adjournment sine die—believing it time enough to talk about disunion, southern organization, &c. &c. after the Convention aforesaid shall have refused to sustain their own constitution—not to say their own integrity as a Christian body.

THE FURMAN INSTITUTION.

The article on this subject referred to by two of our correspondents this week, was published during our absence from home; and the person left in charge, perceiving that it was from one of our favorite correspondents, and taking it for granted that this correspondent could speak only favorably respecting the Furman Institution, sent the letter to the printer without further examination. Had we been at our post we should not have published it, simply because we consider it uncalled for, and calculated to have an unfavorable effect on an institution which we believe to be entitled to the confidence and support of both the Carolinas. As it regards the professors, without meaning to disparage any of their predecessors, justice requires us to say, that we consider the prospects of the institution under the present incumbents, fully equal to what they have been at any previous period of its history. To our correspondent it is due to say, that we have no objection that he intended to do harm; nor is it probable that he was fully aware of the light in which his remarks were liable to be viewed. His was doubtless an error of judgment into which we are all more or less liable to fall. Still, however, we trust that no serious injury will ensue, and that the parties will soon feel as though nothing of the kind had occurred.

THE VIRGINIA CIRCULAR, &c.

In our present number will be found the Virginia Circular, in relation to the recent response of the Executive Board at Boston, to the resolutions of the late Alabama Baptist State Convention. As this document seems to involve at least one question of general importance, we shall take the liberty to express our own individual views respecting it, leaving all others to think and act for themselves. And that our readers may have a clear and comprehensive view of the whole matter, it will be proper to trace the movement to its origin. In the course of last year, it will be remembered, the Executive Board of the Georgia State Convention made application to the Executive Board of the A. B. Home Mission Society, at New York, for the appointment of

a brother Reeves, to operate as missionary somewhere in the State of Georgia. The New York Board did not sustain the application, as they declared, not because they had any objections to the man, but solely because they took exception to the application. The reasons assigned for declining the appointment of brother Reeves, were not satisfactory to our Alabama brethren, and hence the resolutions of the Alabama State Convention above alluded to.

These resolutions, though occasioned altogether by the action of the Home Mission Board, and designed as it would seem, primarily, if not exclusively, for their use, were general in their application; and, as we suppose, through courtesy, copies were sent to the other boards of our national societies. The board of the Triennial Convention, at Boston, though not at all implicated in the matter in dispute, and certainly not called on by circumstances to deviate from their usual reserve in such cases, was the only party that responded to the said resolutions. The board of the Home Mission Society, in the mean time, went on with their appropriate duties, leaving it to the world to decide from their actions what course they would eventually pursue.

In their reply to the interrogations of the Alabama State Convention, while they promptly admit the entire social equality of their Southern brethren, the Boston Board say, that, in case a slaveholder should apply for appointment as missionary, and should insist on retaining his slaves, he would not be appointed by the board—also, that they can never be a party to any arrangements which would imply approbation of slavery.

The Virginia brethren think that they can see in this ill-advised and self-contradictory response of the Executive Board, at Boston, sufficient cause for sending the denomination in twain; and, as if to convince the world that they are not "under northern influences," as has been charged upon them, have, all of a sudden, issued their circular, proposing the calling of a Southern Convention, &c. &c. This circular is the document to which the attention of our readers is now more particularly invited and which they will please find on our last page.

In a former number of this paper we took the liberty to state, that we considered this whole movement, from beginning to end, both uncalled for in itself, and hurtful in its tendencies. Whether the Executive board of the Home Mission Society acted wisely or unwisely in declining the appointment of bro. Reeves, they certainly did not deny, either directly or indirectly, the paramount right of the slaveholder, as such, to the appointment of missionary, or any other appointment in their power. On the contrary, they clearly admitted such right, by declaring their determination to adhere to the letter of the constitution; and also to the spirit of the compromise act, passed in May 1844. And as proof decisive and undeniable, that the board aforesaid meant what they said, and said what they meant, they have, to our knowledge, appointed two, if not three, slaveholders, as missionaries in the southern field. These facts show that, could our Alabama brethren have exercised a little patience, they would soon have had demonstrative proof of the policy and intentions of the New York board, far more satisfactory than could be furnished by any verbal response to their resolutions. From these considerations we infer, we think with good reason, that the Alabama resolutions referred to, were, to say the least, uncalled for. That they have proved to be hurtful in their consequences, will be denied by no one, who regards the existing difficulties which have grown out of them, as having an injurious effect on the cause of missions and the interests of Zion.

The response of the Board at Boston, besides being uncalled for, was, in our opinion, singularly unfortunate in various respects. In the first place, if they found themselves unable to give an answer which would serve to allay the excitement, it would doubtless have been the part of wisdom, to have held their peace; and especially as the question mainly concerned was strictly hypothetical, and so far as any practical purposes were concerned, almost entirely irrelevant. This was the more to be expected, as the same board, under circumstances much more imperative than the present, have persevered in maintaining a "dignified silence," if not a state of absolute neutrality.

In the next place, as the Virginia brethren earnestly affirm, the decision of the board is manifestly unconstitutional. This is clear, not only from both the letter and spirit of that document, but from the whole procedure of the Convention and board for thirty years. The same is obvious from the concession of the board, in other parts of the same reply. And could there be a doubt on the subject, it must be removed, if we refer, by reference to the compromise act above referred to; or well as by the action of the Home Mission board, in reference to the same question, while acting under a constitution of similar provisions, and so far as the question of neutrality is concerned, of similar import.

That the decision of the board is in direct violation of the compromise act, passed in 1844, by which it is expressly provided, that the subjects of slavery and of anti-slavery, are matters with which the Convention has nothing to do, can, in our view, be doubted by no one. Of course they are subjects with which the board, acting under the authority of the Convention, can have nothing to do. It, therefore, follows that the board, in appointing a missionary, has no more right to inquire whether an applicant is an owner of slaves, than they have to inquire whether he is an owner of houses and lands, or any other species of property whatever.

But what surprises us most, is that the above mentioned decision of the board is in direct contradiction to their own admissions in other parts of the same paper. They say, expressly, that they "have never called in question the entire social equality of their slaveholding brethren as to all the privileges and benefits of the Foreign Mission Union"—and further, that "slaveholders are entitled to all the privileges and immunities which the constitution of the Convention grants to its members." And yet, in immediate view of the free and sweeping admission, the board proceed to say, that, were a slaveholder to apply for employment as a missionary under the Convention and its board, he would not be accepted. If this is not a contradiction in terms, as well as in spirit, we confess that we have no adequate idea of the meaning of words.

How a person can be admitted on terms of strictly social equality with the board, and can be called to all the privileges and immunities of the Foreign Mission Union, and yet be ineligible to an appointment as missionary, on account of moral unfitness, occasioned by the owning of slaves, presents a problem the solving of which we must leave for those living nearer the sun than ourselves. It was this last consideration which induced the belief, when we first read the Boston reply, that the exceptional article was entirely unauthorized and nullified, by express concessions found in the same

paper. We need scarcely add, we are in the same opinion still. To the Virginia circular we take exception on the grounds. In the first place, we think it unconstitutional, as it is a principle for which the South manifestly contends, and on the principle chiefly in question, namely, the principle of entire social equality, is fully embodied in the Board at Boston, it seems to us that the point really at issue, between the board and the South, namely, what the board would or would not do in case, such as has never yet occurred, and such as is not likely to occur once in half a century, is really not worth disputing about.

In the next place, we think the action of the Virginia brethren is entirely premature. As the Boston document is confessedly self-contradictory, crying in *profrate*, or rather in *word*, what is clearly conceded in *principle*, there seems to be room to hope that our Boston friends may be misunderstood; and that when they say that they would not appoint a slaveholder, &c. they mean that they would decline such appointment solely on the ground of expediency, deeming it unwise to send out to India or elsewhere, a missionary with a troop of slaves in his train. This is the construction which we were disposed to put on the article when we first read it, and although the language, in strictness, forbids such construction, still there is room for the hope, it seems to us, that the board may after all be not fully understood. In any event, it would have been no more than wisdom and courtesy seemed to require, to have asked an explanation from our Boston friends, before taking any decisive action on a paper which was allowed to carry a self-contradiction on its face.

In the third place, we think the appeal is made to the wrong party. The Boston Board, with the consent of all concerned, are nothing more than an "agency," acting by the authority and in behalf of the General Convention. They have, on the supposition that they are correctly understood, as our Virginia brethren justly maintain, acted in violation of both the constitution and the compromise stipulation of 1844. For this they are clearly amenable to the Convention, and to the bar of the Convention they should be brought; at least before any measures are adopted tending to a final separation of the parties. Beyond all doubt, it is due to the Convention, as a matter of common justice, to say nothing of expediency, the good of the cause, the honor of religion, and all this, to know whether the offensive proceeding of the board will be sanctioned by that body, before any action can be properly allowed, predicated on any charge of delinquency and evil-doing, on the part of the latter institution. For one, we most protest against any proceedings, tending to the prejudice of the Convention, on account of the action of the board, until the Convention shall have been allowed an opportunity, at least, to express an opinion on the case, and thereby either ratify or disannul the action of their board.

In the fourth place, we consider the remedy proposed by our Virginia brethren, entirely too extreme, and otherwise unsuited to the nature and demands of the case. The calling of a Southern Convention is the last resort, and may be regarded as equivalent to a formal disruption of the South from the North. Had such a Convention been called some five years ago, when the march of fanaticism was onward, when the tone of denunciation was at its height; when the views of our moderate men at the North were generally unknown; when all our boards were maintaining a "dignified," not to say a suspicious silence on the matter at issue; and when the question of union between the South and the North was rapidly approaching a crisis, from which scarcely any thing was to be hoped short of a disastrous and ruinous explosion; such measure might have been recommended by strong and plausible arguments, to say the least. But now, since the grand climacteric has been passed; since the march of fanaticism has clearly become retrograde; since the clamor of denunciation has almost ceased to be heard; since the principles of union and social co-operation have become pretty well settled in all our institutions; since the views and feelings of moderate men at the North, are beginning to be understood; and more especially, since the effect of free discussion is beginning to be seen among the northern brethren and churches; in short, now that the storm is nearly past, and the clouds in sunny places begin to break away—to call a Southern Convention for purposes of disunion, and all for no other reason than that a band of perhaps semi-abolitionists at Boston, have thought proper to say what they would not do, in some supposed case, which, in all probability, will not arise in fifty years to come—is, in our opinion, a measure entirely disproportioned to the magnitude of the evil.

In the last place, it may not be irrelevant to remark, that we regret the call of a Southern Convention, because it is the very course to which the abolitionists have been endeavoring to drive the South for the last ten years. To this point most of their measures have had a more or less direct tendency. Already are they clanking over the success of their schemes. And should the present movement lead to a final dismemberment of the denomination, the event will doubtless be commemorated by the disorganizers with as much triumph, as the minions of the Pope commemorated the tragedies of St. Bartholomew's eve. Will the South, can the South consent to minister thus to the schemes of fanatics, disorganizers, and schismatics?

In view of the whole matter, and in order to make a long story as short as possible, we are constrained to say, that our Virginia brethren recall their proposition for a Southern Convention, and in place thereof, call on the board of the Convention for an explanation. Should that prove unsatisfactory, let the appeal be made to the Convention. Should the regular meeting of that body be considered too remote, let there be called a special meeting of the same. Let it thus be ascertained, fully and properly, whether they will sustain their board in a course of policy which is not only unconstitutional, but inconsistent in principle, with the usages of the Convention from the day of its formation. And should it eventually appear that the Convention itself shall dissent the principles of its constitution—then the South may withdraw without a temple, without a dwelling place, and without even becoming a party to the disruption. But should the South withdraw now, while the constitution of the Convention remains in full force and effect—while the compromise act of 1844, the Convention's own recent interpretation of the constitution, is confessedly binding on all—and when, being the Convention an opportunity in act, is about to be heard, in the case—of a disruption will undoubtedly be changed, and with no small share of probability, to say of truth, on the unnecessary issue and in honor of the South. Without presuming to claim to say one, we simply give the above as our opinion on the

subject, with the hope and belief, that the friends of the cause will be able to see the propriety of the course we have taken.

STATE OF NORTHERN SENTIMENT.—Since it is generally supposed that the South are the aggressors in the present controversy, and that the prevailing state of sentiment at the North, is a long article on the subject of Union, we should rather say of disunion; perhaps, in the British denomination, in which the climate appears good well-complacency, and much satisfaction at the prospect of a disruption between the South and the North, among other things we find the following choice maxims:—

"A new era never opens in our denominational history. The Baptists of the North had the discipline of the South as of old, we must, however, in our day, and gathering hostile array, but they are, with a question, dissolving partnership, by mutual consent. The writings are not yet drawn, but the intention is avowed, and the parties are casting up their accounts. The consummation is evidently at hand—a consummation devoutly wished by some, and ardently deprecated by others.

"What we anticipated has, to a great extent, been realized. Such is the position of the Foreign Mission Board at the present moment, that with a willingness to make slight concessions, and a disposition to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace, the great body of Northern Baptists can be readily united in cooperation with the South. Southern Baptists can also unite, and in their own way, without any sacrifice of the quality of their ministry, and employ such missionaries as they prefer. "Whereas, if brethren should resolve that the union between the North and the South must be maintained, and by concessions on the part of Northern men (concerning the subject of slavery) the time preserve it should be made, a breaking up of the present organization and a division in the North would be the immediate and inevitable result. From such a division and its fearful consequences, do we not all devoutly say, Good Lord deliver us!"

"There is another point, however, of great importance to the Baptists of the Free States, which demands the separate and special consideration of us all. It is our union, the union of Northern Baptists, in the cause of missions. We fear no evil, if brethren in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the other Northern States, will adhere to their friends in New England; laying aside minor differences of opinion on questions of expediency, or points which are not of radical importance, and giving to the great object of the world's salvation their earnest thoughts and united efforts.

"The withdrawal of the Southern churches from co-operation with churches in the Free States, will prevent a far greater evil—the disruption of our Boards themselves, and division and confusion in all our ranks and throughout all our borders. We have a divided shore to the past effort of harmony in our churches. Were this connection between the North and South to be much longer maintained, what has been, would be to some coming after, as the cool breezes of autumn to the howling tempests of winter. The elements of discord have been controlled with difficulty for the last three years. Opposing sentiments have been cherished and defined, and the utmost efforts on the part of the friends of peace and union have been requisite to keep the churches in a state of comparative quiet, and to prevent the aggravated and doubtful prospect of rushing in to access like judgments to themselves and to the cause of Christian benevolence. There has not been a day nor an hour during the last two years, when it was not in the power of the Christian Reflector, (we say it without boasting) it would be true of any paper in the same circumstances) to introduce discord and confusion into a thousand churches. We could have led the suspicions, aroused the indignation, and influenced the course of a multitude, against existing organizations and against all ministers and brethren who sustained them. We should have done so, had we not only admitted some communications, which we were earnestly desired to publish, and by means which we secured the lasting displeasure of some loyal supporters and friends."

What a state of society, and of Christian union and forbearance, is here described. It is in the power of the Christian Reflector, "at any moment, to introduce discord and confusion into a thousand churches."

And if this editor is to be credited, it has required all the prudence and skill and firmness, at his command, to keep these mad caps in check; and to preserve these volcanic churches from bursting into fragments!

This is the sort of spirit, be it observed, which is extending its baneful influence on the Southern churches, which is threatening the dissolution of our Northern Board, and to which it is thought to be well to sacrifice the union of the denomination. With all the spite and bitterness which we have attributed to these fanatics we had not an idea that they were so near an explosion among themselves—nor had we an idea that there are so much contending and warring power. We have been generally told, and we have received it all that, on all these exciting points, these northern churches were just about unanimous. The information is, consequently, let out above, is, in our opinion, of greater importance to the South, and ought to have no little weight with those favorable to the proposed Southern Convention.

It further appears from the above—that it is intended in almost so many words—that, if the South ever exercise a little patience and forbearance with the boards in their delicate and embarrassing situation, and adhere to our general constitutions a little longer, the abolition bomb will burst, and the union of the denomination will thereby be saved. To prevent this explosion at the North; to appease these combative spirits scattered among the churches; to prevent kicking up of the fanaticism in our general Board, the Reflector is willing to sacrifice the union of the denomination, and rejoices in the prospect of the event, a consummation devoutly to be wished. Will such as our Baptist brethren consent to be become instruments in bringing about such results? If we disapproved the policy of our Virginia brethren, we say, we would contend that we desire it still more to say. As before intimated, let us hesitate long and carefully before we consent to fall into the pit dug for us by abolitionists in order to preserve fanaticism from self-destruction.

NORTHERN SENTIMENT.

Every reader of leading articles we have written also the late Christian W. Chapman, which contained a long editorial on the Virginia Circular, the action of the Board at Boston, &c. &c. The Washingtonian, we think understood to be a fair exponent of the views and feelings of moderate men in the North. Chapman, States, in the Baptist Advocate is a moderate man in New York. In the present instance, the Washingtonian, the Editor may be regarded as the representative of the views of even a majority of the moderate men in the North, who are adhering to the Union. Chapman's article may be said to be the opinion of the moderate men in the North, who are adhering to the Union. Chapman's article may be said to be the opinion of the moderate men in the North, who are adhering to the Union.