

We had scarcely penned our remarks on the account of the Kentucky mob, when we heard the following resolutions read and adopted at a large public meeting in this city.

WILLIAM BURKE was elected President, MORGAN NEVILLE Vice President, and TIMOTHY WALKER Secretary.

The following Preamble and Resolutions, were then unanimously adopted:

Whereas, The Citizens of Cincinnati are now laboring under a serious excitement, in consequence of an Abolition Press, in this city, from the influence of which, the most deplorable results may be justly apprehended.

And, whereas, although we deprecate the existence of Slavery as a great evil, yet we hold it to be one for which the present generation is not responsible, and, disclaiming all right to interfere with the regulations of our sister States, on this subject, we regard the conduct of the Abolitionists as justly calculated to excite unfriendly dispositions on their part, and thus to affect injuriously, our own business and prosperity.

And, whereas, while we recognize the constitutional right of liberty of speech and of the press, in its utmost extent, yet, being anxious to preserve the peace and tranquility of our city, and continue those amicable relations which have hitherto existed between the States, we deem it our duty to utter a warning voice to those concerned in the promulgation of abolition doctrines, through the aforesaid press, because we believe their course calculated to inflame the passions of one portion of our yet happy country against the other, and to lessen that moral influence upon which the perpetuity of our Union mainly depends. Be it therefore,

*Resolved*, That the spirit exhibited by the immediate supporters of the abolition press in this city, so entirely at variance with the feelings and opinions of the great mass of our population, is as unjust to our sister States, as prejudicial to our own quiet and prosperity.

*Resolved*, That the establishment of the said Abolition Press, in this city, is a direct violation of the solemn pledge, heretofore given by its conductor, at a public meeting, on this subject.

*Resolved*, That, in the opinion of this meeting, nothing short of the absolute discontinuance of the publication of the said Abolition paper, in this city, can prevent a resort to violence; which may be as disastrous to its publisher and supporters, as it must be to the good order, and fair fame of our city.

*Resolved*, That we will use all lawful means to discountenance and suppress any and every publication in this city, which advocates the modern doctrines of Abolitionism.

*Resolved*, That a Committee, consisting of twelve persons, be appointed by the Chair, to wait upon J. G. Birney, and his associates, in the publication of the said paper, to communicate to them the actual tone of public feeling, in this city, to request them, by every motive of patriotism and philanthropy, to desist from the publication of their paper, and to warn them, that if they persist, we cannot hold ourselves responsible for the consequences.

The Chair then appointed the following persons, as the above Committee, viz:

Jacob Burnet, Josiah Lawrence, Robert Buchanan, Nicholas Longworth, John C. Wright, Oliver M. Spencer, David Loring, David T. Disney, Thomas W. Bakewell, Stephen Burrows, John P. Foote, William Green.

To whom, on motion, the officers of the meeting were afterwards added.

It was then resolved that the committee publish the results of their interview, and that these proceedings be published in all the papers of the city.

The following resolution was then offered by Willson N. Brown, and adopted.

*Resolved*, That we entertain the most profound respect for the memories of the venerated patriots of more than "sixty years since," who, in the harbor of Boston, without the sanction of law—but in the plenitude of the justice of their cause, took the responsibility of *re-shipping* the tea cargo—and for which illegal act, they were entitled to, and did receive the warmest thanks and gratitude of every lover of good order and well-wisher of his country; and that we, in imitation of the noble and fearless example set us by those true-hearted Americans, declare that whenever we shall find an existing evil, wicked and mischievous in its conception; warring against the best interests and happiness of our common country, by its effects aiming at the destruction and disunion of our happy government, and only prompted and sustained by those unwholesome engines of human ambition, hope of gain and love of notoriety—but shielded from legal abatement, according to the usual practice of our laws, so as to leave us but one channel through which we can rid our fair land from its withering influence, that in seizing that one tangible point our exertions shall be firm, united and decided.

WILLIAM BURKE, *Pres't.*

MORGAN NEVILLE, *Vice Pres't.*

TIMOTHY WALKER, *Secretary.*

Our opinion on the subject of mobs—and the conduct or principles which lead to them, is abundantly understood by those who have read former numbers—particularly the last Journal.

We had written at length on these resolutions for this number, but have on reflection deemed it best to await the progress of the matter; we shall then remark further upon the whole subject. Meanwhile

We insert below the opinion of a civilian in this place on the doctrines of the resolutions, and recommend it to especial notice.

For the Journal and Luminary.

MR. EDITOR,—In compliance with your request, I submit a few words on the resolutions adopted recently in this city. An allusion is made to the tea case in Boston in justification of the mobs of the present day. The distinction between the revolution by which these states threw off the authority of the mother country, and the trampling down the laws of our own make, is too obvious to require much comment. The right of revolution is a right in the great body of the people to rise up against a tyrannical government, break its power and establish another in its place. This right can scarcely exist in a representative government where the people have the power in their own hands of peaceably and by modes pointed out in their constitutions of making such changes as they may choose. But in the case under consideration, it is not proposed to revolutionise the government—there is no oppression in our rulers complained of—it is not the government or rulers which are the objects of attack—it is not resistance to oppression which the people are excited to raise—the government and the laws are of our own choice, and it is not whispered that they are wrong. What then is proposed? To what end is a revolutionary precedent cited? Nothing else but this: that the people in violation of all law may proceed to punish an individual—the object is not to secure a right unjustly infringed, but to take from another a right acknowledged to be sacred to him by the laws of the land—to break thro' the laws, not for the sake of enjoying our own freedom, but to deprive a fellow-citizen of his—to break down a law which protects him, not one that oppresses us. This is not the spirit of liberty, but of wanton reckless tyranny. We are incited to rise above the laws that we may exercise an irresponsible power—that we may crush a man who exercises an acknowledged constitutional right.