

Robert F. Wallcut, General Agent.

Subscription prices:—\$1 50 per annum, in advance.
If all remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be forwarded, (POST PAID,) to the General Agent.
Five copies will be sent to one address for three months, if payment be made in advance.
Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.—one square for \$1 00.

The Agents of the American, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Ohio Anti-Slavery Societies are authorized to receive subscriptions for the Liberator.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LEAVEL, EDWARD QUINCY, SAMUEL PALMER, WALTER PHILLIPS. (This Committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper—not for any of its debts.)

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XXII. NO. 1.

The Liberator.

ATTACKS ON FREDERICK DOUGLASS AND JOHN SCOBLE UPON GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P.

LONDON, December 1, 1851.

Mr. Dear Sir:
I am not presumptuous enough to imagine, that what you have already done, could have been better performed by myself. Difference of position, however, have given me additional means of knowledge to those possessed by yourself upon the question, and I may be able to render still clearer the relation of columns endeavored to be kept upon our common friend. You have, indeed, most ably treated the attack of the first gentleman named in the heading of this letter, and before this reaches you, in all probability you will have dealt with the other gentleman in like manner; but a few supplemental remarks to what you have already said, will, I trust, not be unacceptable from one who well knows, and can fairly take upon himself in some degree to represent, the sentiments of Mr. Thompson's friends on this side the Atlantic.

I never experienced greater pain and disgust than when perusing the article from Frederick Douglass's paper, upon Mr. Webb's letter, and the impudent statement of John Scoble at Brooklyn—pain at the offending, and I must say, wanton, attack of the Rochester New Organization proselyte—disgust at the hypocritical lull of the Broad Street Committee upon Mr. George Thompson. Here they have extended universal reproach of the ingratitude of the proprietors of the Liberator, and a sincere and true-hearted friend; and, and however their pride may remain at the application of the term, a generous and noble benefactor. Alas! that Mr. Thompson should ever have had cause to say of Frederick Douglass, as well as John Scoble, 'I gave him bread; he has cast it as a scorpion!' It is lamentable to see men, whose dignity of mental stature and moral influence were as great as that of a giant and dwarf, leagued together to endeavor to impair, and, if possible, to destroy the public and private character of one, whom I am certain all candid men among the New Organization, however they may differ with him in opinion as to the most fitting means to be employed to abolish slavery, will nevertheless delight to honor, and whose talent and devotion to the anti-slavery cause they will unhesitatingly acknowledge to have been without parallel in Europe. The simultaneousness of the attacks at Rochester and Brooklyn may have been accidental; but, certainly, it furnishes ground of suspicion for pre-concert, especially when viewed in connection with that extraordinary scene, a perfectly unimpeachable performance, which was favorably treated at the Buffalo Convention, of the ostentatious interjection of those two old abolitionist antagonists, 'Brother Douglass' and 'Brother Scoble.' The unbecoming kindness of Mr. Thompson to Frederick Douglass, in 1845, 1846 and 1847, and also the fact that John Scoble owes the very bread he has given to years to the same generous benefactor, renders the publication of falsehoods reflecting upon his public and personal character an act which I will not trust myself to designate, but which the world will know how to stigmatize.

I will, for the present, confine myself to the only really powerful and important of those assaults of Mr. Thompson—Frederick Douglass. Indeed, the difference in mental stature and moral position between him and his colleague is so great, that while the fall of the one would excite the attention and elicit the sorrow of mankind, the other might descend to the rank of an uneducated, and certainly uneducated, individual. I will, however, next week furnish you with a few facts, justifying even stronger expressions than those I have used towards this less potent antagonist of Mr. Thompson, Mr. John Scoble.

I repeat that occasion should have arisen for a refutation of these calumnies; nor would I have attempted it, without a strong feeling of imperative necessity for so doing. I know the use which the pro-slavery party make of any breaches among the friends of the cause, and especially among men holding such prominent positions as Messrs. Thompson and Douglass. It is, moreover, painful to me to utter a word of disparagement of Frederick Douglass, towards whom I have entertained and uniformly expressed the highest esteem, believing that his genius has placed him at the head of the colored race, and that his magnificent oratory and powerful writings have demonstrated the natural inequality of his race with that of the Caucasian tyrants by whom even he is trampled upon and degraded in the United States. But, at the same time, I feel that a neglect to vindicate the character of so noble and distinguished a man as Mr. Thompson would be the greater evil of the two to the anti-slavery cause; and that a refutation of the fallacies and misrepresentations of Frederick Douglass, however damaging to his own personal and official character, will be more serviceable to the cause of abolition, than the political capital which slaveholders may endeavor to make out of disunion in the anti-slavery cause, or the personal friendship with Mr. Thompson, and a very desirable co-operation with him in anti-slavery labors, would demand from me a reply to what I know to be a lie, and upon a personal friend. If so, then, a lie, upon public grounds—my knowledge of the high position sustained by Mr. Thompson, which cannot be damaged without injury to the cause of freedom, not merely locally, but universally, as well as the official character I have sustained as honorary secretary to his Committee, would require me to do so.

I should, indeed, be guilty of a dereliction both of private and public duty, were I not to expose the falsehood of statements and insinuations, which, in October, 1851, Frederick Douglass has thought proper to make respecting the public and personal character of a man, whom up to the May preceding, he had publicly recognized as his warm personal friend, and whom he had eulogized as his noble, untrusting, and self-sacrificing colleague in the cause of the emancipation of his own race. Nothing has intervened since to be done by Mr. Thompson to provoke or justify this personal attack. The change has evidently

been made by party spirit, which, I fear, has made some havoc of the character of Frederick Douglass, but which, I trust, has not so far destroyed the truthful and generous within him, as to prevent his admission of the fact, that from the man whom he has thus attacked, he has not, during his life, received a single unkind word, or a solitary unfriendly action. Had the controversy rested simply upon the merits of the Bristol discussion, at which I was present,—although I have my own decided opinion on that subject, formed, too, very materially, from Mr. Douglass's own teaching,—I should not have written a word upon the matter. I have no fear of the result of any contest which may arise between Mr. Douglass and Mr. Thompson, and should not have interfered, on this occasion, had not the former gentleman had recourse to poisoned foils. In speaking or writing to you upon anti-slavery subjects, as you know, I have carefully avoided the painful subject of Mr. Douglass's secession from the American Anti-Slavery Society. The suddenness of the conversion certainly greatly surprised those who were his anti-slavery pupils, and to whom he preached, as his fundamental and well-nigh absorbing doctrine, the damnable guiltiness of the American Constitution, and the impossibility, without treason to God and a sacrifice of the cause of the slave, of taking political action under it. No damnation was more fearful, no thunder more terrific, than that launched by him against that which is now his anti-slavery gospel. The American Constitution was then the heresy of heresies, and whatever abolitionist was base enough to subscribe to it was with him anathema maranatha. By what miraculous conversion that book, of which he then told us 'every page was red with the blood of the American slave,' should instantaneously become the only divine revelation for the slave's salvation and the white man's regeneration in the United States, we were, and still are, at a loss to conceive. We were, indeed, amazed and confounded; but, knowing nothing of any tortuous indications in the career of Mr. Douglass, and giving him full credit for that which he appeared to possess when in England,—an ingenuous character, and a sincere attachment to the cause of the slave, not for any individual benefit or aggrandizement, but for the sake of the cause itself,—we acquitted him of the charge, of which an ordinary man would have been guilty, of apostasy, and freed him from the suspicion of anything like sinister motives. With the means of information we possessed, we charitably came to the conclusion, that his was one of those unhappy cases of 'perversion,' as they are now called in this country, like those of Protestantism to Popery, arising from some mental illusion, by which the jet black of yesterday appears the pure white of to-day. But, I regret to say that, with all our predilections in his favor, the style of his recent article, and his ungenerous personalities to his own friends and fellow-laborers in the same mission, have greatly weakened that belief in the conscientiousness of his change of communion. Making every allowance for the proverbially hot and overdone zeal of new proselytes, still there is something in the mode in which he defends his new party, indicative, not of an intelligent conversion, but, as some have unhesitatingly put it, of a consciousness of the pieces of silver being in his pocket, and that he must therefore do the bidding of the rulers, and surrender to crucifixion the characters of those whom he had just deserted, and with whom he had just broken bread. Else why that pettishness and that absence of cool argument which Frederick Douglass can employ, and which he knows is the most powerful means of convincing men who are in theoretical error? He knows that personal vilification is not a fitting instrument for conversion. A talented advocate, like him, would never have conducted his case in such an undignified and virulent spirit, had he possessed confidence in the merits of his case. He must have had a similar endorsement upon his brief to that said once to have been put into the hands of a barrister.—No case. Please to abuse the plaintiff's attorney!

Before proceeding to his personal attack upon Mr. Thompson, I will dispose of some false statements of assumed facts upon which the whole of his superstructure is based; and here Frederick Douglass has placed himself upon the horns of a pretty considerable dilemma. Either he has been guilty of intentional misrepresentation, in the belief that the general want of information upon English laws and customs in America would enable that misrepresentation to pass muster there,—a motive which I do not impute to him;—or else he has made such bad use of his nineteen months' residence in this country, with all the facilities of knowledge afforded him, as to have returned to America ignorant of facts, public and notorious to the most superficial observer of public usages.

He tells his readers that Mr. Thompson, a member of the British Parliament, 'has sworn to support the British Constitution.' Now, this is false in fact. No member of Parliament is sworn to do any thing of the kind. There are three things to which they are sworn, only one of which is in fact applicable to the present day.—First, to abjure the Pope's spiritual supremacy in England, (a provision introduced by Henry VIII, after the Reformation;) secondly, to be loyal to the sovereign, (a precaution introduced by that wise monarch, James I.); and, thirdly, to abjure the Pretender, or, in other words, to support the House of Brunswick, and resist any attempt to restore the old and now extinct tyrannical dynasty of the Stuarts, (an oath introduced by William III, soon after the settlement of the Crown upon the House of Brunswick.) Notwithstanding you kindly pointed out his blunder in this as well as other points, he most perseveringly reiterates them. It may be humiliating to a man in his position to have to confess his ignorance upon matters public and notorious, but that will be less degrading than involving himself in a charge of willful falsehood. I hope this is not to be taken as a specimen of the general intelligence and scrupulousness of American editors in dealing with facts. It is a kind of ignorance by no means creditable to Mr. Douglass, as a journalist; for there is no portion of Parliamentary usage which has been so often and so thoroughly discussed, within the last four years, as the subject of Parliamentary oaths. Within that period, three elections have taken place in the city

of London, in the person of Baron Lionel Rothschild prominently bringing out that question; and one also at Greenwich, in the person of Mr. Alderman Salomon. At least half a dozen debates have taken place upon it in the Houses of Lords and Commons. If the Rochester editor reads any English newspaper, he must have seen leader upon leader on the subject, giving such an amount of information as leaves the ignorance of a journalist upon it inexcusable. If Mr. Douglass persists in his statements, that Mr. Thompson has 'sworn to the British Constitution'—that he has sworn 'to preserve the relations between Church and State,' or that he is not even at liberty to upset that connection to-morrow, if he be in his power—that he has even sworn 'to preserve inviolate the doctrine, discipline and government of the Church of England'—that, as a member of Parliament, he supports 'a system of things, by which one religious denomination has an exercise of power to compel all others to contribute to its support'—if he persists in these gross misrepresentations after his error is pointed out to him, then his character for veracity will be destroyed in the old world, and with all intelligent and well-informed men in the new. I do not wish to offend his *amor proprio*, in which I know he is not deficient, but it may serve to make him, for the future, more careful in ascertaining facts to know, that while believing the statements to have been made in error, and not wilfully, his old friends and admirers have regarded it as one of the most extraordinary instances of wool-gathering which any man of talent and genius ever fell into; and an editor, forsooth!

Mr. Douglass is equally at fault respecting the nature of the British Constitution, which he talks of as a simple, clear, concise document, with inflexible provisions, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, or the American Constitution itself. It would be treating this matter more gravely than it deserves, to quote any of the standard writers upon our Constitution. I have casually laid my hand upon a school book of one of my daughters, which contains the following question and answer respecting the constitutional powers of Parliament, and which will show Frederick Douglass the latitude of a member of that assembly:—
'What is the jurisdiction of Parliament?'
'It has uncontrolled authority in making, abrogating, repealing and revising laws. It can regulate and amend the succession to the crown, alter or establish the religion of the land; and even change the Constitution of the kingdom, and of Parliaments themselves.'

Now, that is an extract from a book most extensively used in schools, called 'Mangnall's Historical and Miscellaneous Questions for the Use of Young People.' Edited by the Rev. G. N. Wright, M.A.' It is very probable that Frederick Douglass may be able to purchase the work in the United States; if so, he had better do it, for I am sure he will agree with me, that it is not so commonly an American editor should possess an amount of information, upon a subject on which he writes, inferior to that of school-boys and girls. I think every one must admit that the powers of Parliament, as here defined, are tolerably comprehensive. As a matter of history, we know they enabled us to abolish colonial slavery, and they would have enabled us to have done the same, had slavery been with us a 'domestic institution.' Search the debates in Parliament, and all the multitudinous printed speeches and articles written on the subject, and you will find no quibbling about the wording of clauses in the British Constitution. If a slave escaped to our shores, what did that Constitution do? Set him free. If a slave escapes from one State to another, in the United States, what does the American Constitution do? Return him to his bondage. And yet, Mr. Douglass, himself an emancipated slave, thinks that Mr. Thompson is criminal in supporting that Constitution which sets the slave free, and that he would be virtuous in supporting the other, which returns him to slavery!

Mr. Douglass talks about the 'anomalies' of the British Constitution. What are they? Why, all reformers in this country, even the most democratic, look to the powers of that Constitution as the instrumentality for remedying the imperfections of our political institutions. Fairly carried out, it has all the beneficial properties of the American Constitution, without any of its pro-slavery clauses, consigning one-sixth part of its population to hopeless personal slavery. Had Mr. Thompson, in fact, sworn to support the British Constitution, he would have sworn to a Constitution, which, without any mental reservation, or torture of language, he could, before God, have subscribed to; and that is more than Frederick Douglass, upon his own showing, could do. For the information of those who believe Mr. Thompson to be an honest and honorable man—and I do not think the number will be lessened by Frederick Douglass's communication—I will quote Mr. Thompson's own views of the British Constitution, delivered to his constituents, at the commencement of the election in 1847, and a copy of which was put into the hands of every elector—18,000 in number—at the time:—
'Let me also state, that I have a high regard for the British constitution, as its principles are laid down and expounded by our greatest jurists. I rejoice that it is my privilege to live under that constitution, and I would, and will, labor to maintain and perpetuate it, believing it to be consistent with, and conducive to, the liberty, order, security and happiness of society—the great ends for which all constitutions should be framed. But I do not regard every institution which has grown up under that constitution as equally sacred and valuable with the constitution itself; for, while the constitution guarantees equal liberty to the citizens of this country, I find many institutions, so called, operating to restrict, if not to destroy, in important respects, that liberty. I am, consequently, in favor of reviewing, revising, and reforming the institutions of this country; and if I have not studied the constitution with a defective judgment, it has made ample provisions for effecting the salutary changes which I desire to see made—changes in fact required, if for no other reason, to extend the benefits of that constitution, equally, to all who live under it. Institutions are but the machinery for promoting the liberties and securing the rights of the people, and, like all other things,—the offspring of human invention,—are liable to defects, and prone to decay. In the nature of things, they cannot be expected to suit all ages. The world out-grows them. Experience proves that

necessity of remodelling them, and of sometimes substituting others in their place more in consonance with the ripened intelligence and new wants and circumstances of the people. They are means to an end, and should never be regarded as the end itself. 'Institutions for men, not men for institutions,' is the maxim by which my actions would be governed, in all proposals to alter, amend, or abolish any of the established customs of the country.'

In the same address, Mr. Thompson stated what he intended to do upon ecclesiastical reforms, the language of which statement will, I think, settle the point about the swearing to 'support the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Established Church,' and to maintain the connection between Church and State; at least, it will be conclusive with all those who believe that Mr. Thompson would not purchase legislative honors at the expense of wilful perjury.—
'I think that the result of a tolerably extensive acquaintance among the most eminent and thoughtful of the Dissenters of this country—a patient study of their history and principles—and a reverent attempt to understand the scriptural nature of a Christian Church, and the divinely-appointed means of extending the knowledge and influence of religion—has been to bring me to an enlightened, as I am sure the process has brought me to a firm conviction, on the subject, that no man can be a member of the most perfect religious equality—of the non-interference of the State in matters of faith and conscience—and the withholding of all grants and endowments for ecclesiastical purposes, whether the creed set up and sought to be promulgated be Protestant or Roman Catholic. I would neither seek nor accept a grant for my own sect, nor consent to the bestowment of one upon another. With these views, I cannot disperse with a State-paid clergy and the Establishment, whether it be the Episcopal Church in England, the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, or the Roman Catholic or Protestant Church in Ireland. I would separate the Church from the State, and do it for the good of both. And this, not because I love the religion of the New Testament less, but because I think I, practically, love it more than those who would perpetuate its alliance (as they think) with temporal power and patronage. In my opinion, there is, and can be, no real and essential alliance between the true Church (the members of which are all those who love the common Head sincerely, and worship him in spirit and in truth) and the State. With my present views of the nature, the government, the component elements, and the ultimate design of the Christian Church, I can be no consenting party to the continuance of the connection between what is called Church and State; but earnestly desire a separation, that so the religion of the Gospel may be left to its own native, divine, and consistent energies. As a member of civil society, I cannot conceive of perfect civil freedom apart from perfect religious freedom. I cannot regard that man as enjoying the civil rights of a citizen, who is declared inalienable for public service on account of his nonconformity to the tenets and prescriptions of a particular sect; neither can I regard it as just to lay an impost upon any man for the support of religious forms and doctrines to which he cannot conscientiously subscribe. It is, in my view, at once an outrage on his conscience, and an unlawful exaction of his substance.'

I apprehend that Mr. Douglass will not go so far as to assert, that Mr. Thompson had a perfect knowledge of 'the connection of Church and State,' and 'the maintenance of the inviolability of the doctrine, discipline, worship and government of the English Church,' and 'the preservation to the bishops and clergy of England, of the rights and privileges which by law appertain to them.' (I omitted this rich list before, were component parts of the British Constitution, yet deliberately told the people of the Tower Hamlets, at the outset of his canvass, that, with a full knowledge of that fact, he would nevertheless go into the House of Commons, take a solemn oath to do all these things, and then immediately turn round and endeavor to undo them. If he believes Mr. Thompson capable of such an act, what does he say to his *par excellence* pious friend, John Scoble, being a *particeps criminis* in such baseness, for he supported Mr. Thompson's election at the hustings? The idea is a gross and silly libel upon Mr. Thompson, as well as the 7,000 men, who, if his foolish statement about British oaths and Constitution be correct, voluntarily voted for him to commit such an atrocious act of deliberate perjury.

The attempt to represent Mr. Thompson's theoretical preferences for republican institutions, as incompatible with the support of a limited monarchy like ours, is really puerile. Why, I have no doubt there are many Americans who have a liking for a limited monarchical government, but the world would denounce them as noodles were they churlishly to remain inactive, and refrain, upon that ground, to act as citizens of the United States. The history of England will show many varieties of circumstances, both in Church and State, the British Constitution may exist under—Popery, Prelacy, Puritanism—State Church and no Church—Kings and Commonwealth.

The Rochester editor appears to be just as much in the dark upon the subject of political action in this country, as he is upon the nature of the British Constitution. With Tories and Whigs, who invest capital in the purchase of seats in the Legislature, and get a return for their money, and a handsome profit to boot, out of governmental corruptions, the sole instrumentality is that identical political action which Mr. Douglass has now selected as his appropriate sphere of labor. To protect the interests of certain monopolies, such as the West India merchants, the East India Company, the land owners, the same means have also been resorted to. But no religious, philanthropic, or popular movement, has ever been conducted to a successful issue upon such principles. To assert that the British abolitionists, as a body, sought to achieve their object in the same manner as the Liberty Party in America, by forming themselves into a political section, and endeavoring to gain seats in the Legislature, is truly ridiculous. In the first place, they would have had to expend millions of pounds at every election, before they could have had a chance of making way in that direction. In the next place, that money would have had to be expended, not in the legitimate purposes of elections, but in debauching the voters, through the medium of bribery, drunkenness, and other immoralities. In the third place, when they had thus spent their money, and brought guilt upon their souls, they

would have had the satisfaction of knowing that they were opposed to a party who could best them hollow in length of purse and unscrupulousness in the employment of means.—Why, Wilberforce spent £100,000 in a single election in Yorkshire, and posterity do not look upon that as the most creditable part of his history. Shades of Sharpe, Clarkson, Wilberforce, Buxton and Allen, what a libel does this son of Africa cast upon your immortal memories! The Dissenters gained the abolition of their slavery, the Test and Corporation Acts, without having, as without the possibility of getting, a single man of their party into the Legislature. The Catholics achieved their emancipation under like circumstances. In 1832, the Reformers gained the Reform Bill from a Parliament composed principally of the representatives of rotten boroughs. By what instrumentality was all this accomplished? The very same as that employed by the American Anti-Slavery Society—the regeneration of public opinion. The excitement of the popular indignation against the legally established evil, and the bringing of the public influence to bear against the government and legislature, through the medium of petitions and remonstrances. The allusion to the course pursued by the free traders was as unfortunate a selection as Mr. Douglass could have made. The Anti-Corn-Law League tried political action, in the American sense of the term, and found its utter worthlessness. They tried the plan of contesting boroughs, and after some half-dozen attempts, with varied success, and the expenditure of many thousand pounds, they gave up the game, as too expensive and inefficient. They adopted Sir Robert Peel's plan of attending to the registration of voters. I could show that the result of that adoption, in the very best locality for its operations—the Lancashire boroughs—was, that after seven years' labor, and an enormous outlay, the free traders were just where they were at the commencement, and that they had not gained a single seat in the House of Commons. Then came the freehold land movement, in which, up to last Monday, they declare they have invested, nearly £2,000,000 of money. With what result upon the Legislature? Why, the attainment of some half-dozen seats, some of which are now held upon a very doubtful tenure. The potato disease was a much more efficient political action than the ballot-box, or, rather, the polling booth, in the attainment of free trade. The freehold land scheme is now avowedly maintained more for its social than its political advantages. The National Reform Association do not dream of achieving their object by gaining elections, which they avail themselves of only for the purpose of educating the people in the principles of political justice. Had the Dissenters and Catholics trusted to political action, they would have remained in political bondage until doomsday. Had the British abolitionists possessed no other means of rescuing the negroes, our 800,000 colonial slaves would still be clanking their chains on the plantations; and had free traders been shut up to that resource, the people of this country would now be hopelessly consuming their heavily taxed food. There was one power, and one alone, by which these various forms of personal, religious, and industrial slavery could be overthrown, and that was, the omnipotence of public opinion, which, when expressed in conformity with the will of God, becomes, in fact, the voice of God. For myself, I have no confidence in the success of any party, even with a righteous object, which loses its faith in 'the foolishness of preaching.' Whether means which have been proved materially inefficient for the promotion of a good cause, and are only potential for governmental corruption and the support of monopoly, may, when transplanted to America, become the most fitting means for slave emancipation and national regeneration, I will not venture an opinion; I merely testify to their utter failure here.

It is a pity that Mr. Douglass had not pointed out what he meant by the 'anomalies' of the British Constitution. He should not have left us to guess at his meaning. Has he, since he has become a political party man, grown so ultra republican, that he can see nothing but evil in our Queen and aristocracy? Why, when here, he was in the habit of paying them high compliments, and placing them in most advantageous juxtaposition with your President and democracy. Here is one of his pretty stock quotations, in the use of which he was very happy, which I have cut out from one of his printed speeches:—
'The lion at the virgin's feet
Crouches, and lays his mighty paw
Upon her lap—an emblem meet
Of England's queen and England's law.'

Well, now he must know, from reading the papers, that the British 'lion' still lives; that 'England's Queen' is the same as when he was here, except having got a little stouter and more matronly, and being still more popular with her people; and 'England's law' has also somewhat improved since 1847. 'If there are anomalies in our Constitution, or even in our political institutions, he, at all events, should deal gently with them, now he is a supporter of the American Constitution; for, after nineteen months' experience in this country, he thus describes the relative degrees of liberty he had enjoyed in America and England:—
'Sir, liberty in England is better than slavery in America. Liberty under a monarchy is better than despotism under a democracy. (Cheers.) Freedom under a monarchical government is better than slavery in support of the American Capitol. Sir, I have known what it was, for the first time in my life, to enjoy freedom in this country. I say that I have here, within the last nineteen months, for the first time in my life, known what it was to enjoy liberty.'

Then he went on to enumerate a long catalogue of foul insults and indignities, which, as a colored man, he was subjected to in America, the bulk of which, I imagine, still continue, although he has risen from the condition of a fugitive slave to that of an editor, and a leading member of a political party in the United States.

The next assertion in his article is so unfounded and personally offensive, that it really deserves to be characterized by a few short but expressive Saxon words; but I will forbear. Frederick Douglass asserts that Mr. Thompson has 'labored hard and long

to convince his constituency, that it was for their interest and political well-being to elect him' to the House of Commons. Now, here again, Mr. Douglass's statement is completely without foundation. The fact is, that, in 1847, at least twenty boroughs competed for the honor of having Mr. Thompson as a representative; and, after much solicitation, the Tower Hamlets gained him. Here, again, I will quote his own words, delivered at the time, which conclusively refute Mr. Douglass's statement, inasmuch as, in addition to the reliability of Mr. Thompson's own word, there is the fact that they were delivered before a multitude of persons, who could and would have contradicted them, if they were untrue. Your readers will also be enabled to judge from the extract, whether it is the language of a man standing cap-in-hand before the constituency:—
'For more than a year, I have been aware of the wish, entertained by a considerable section of the electors of the Tower Hamlets, that I should offer myself as a candidate to represent this large, important, and influential borough in Parliament. A requisition, bearing a thousand signatures, is, I believe, in existence, to support the truth of this assertion. Since that period, I have been honored with communications, both personal and written, from other parties, who are fairly entitled to be regarded as to some extent the organs of numerous and influential portions of the liberal constituency of this borough; and still more recently, I have had laid before me such facts, and have at the same time received such assurances of support and co-operation, as have left me no room to doubt, that the number of the electors in this borough, who are desirous of sending to the House of Commons a gentleman holding the views and opinions which I hold, is sufficiently large to place the individual they select, and sustain by their votes, in a position of success at the poll. My appearance among you this evening, therefore, is the result of an observation for more than a year of the political aspects of this borough, and an intercourse, during that period, with gentlemen intimately familiar with, and often officially representing, the sentiments and wishes of large bodies of the electors. Those gentlemen will bear me witness, that I have acted with candor and with caution throughout the whole of our correspondence; and that I have shown no inclination to obtrude myself on the attention of the electors of this borough (cheers); but, on the contrary, have sought, nay, have regretted, the most convincing and satisfactory evidence of the existence of something like a general feeling in favor of the appearance of a candidate cherishing the opinions and principles, to the advancement of which my public life has been devoted. What those principles and opinions are, I am here to explain, and I doubt not you will afford me the opportunity of placing them before you, with the frankness and honesty which you have a right to demand of the individual who aspires to the honor of representing you in Parliament.
'Gentlemen, let me assure you, that the sentiments I am about to avow are not adopted for the occasion; neither have they been at any period taken up, to serve a purpose, or to square with the prevailing spirit and temper of the times. They are my genuine, my heartfelt, my conscientious convictions. I hold them, because I believe them sound and just, and because I can hold none other, until I am convinced in my judgment that they are wrong. Should that ever be the case, I will fling them away, and adopt better—for I have no other—than that I will not be wiser to-morrow than I am to-day.
'It is now for you, gentlemen, to judge how far these sentiments are in accordance with your own, and how far they are such as you require in your representative. Should they be found to be generally in unison with those you entertain, there is still the question whether I, as the impersonation of those principles, am the person you ought to select as your representative. Upon this point I am as anxious, as I have no doubt you are determined, that you should exercise the freest and most deliberate choice. In presenting myself before you, I can make no seducing promises, nor can I come under any engagements, but those of most honestly discharging my duty, and carrying out, as far as I am able, the principles which I have declared. I am here to solicit no favor, nor can I undertake to confer any. I do not conceive that a faithful representative contracts any obligations, save such as are mutual and reciprocal. You of your own choice select him as your servant, and if he, in the end of his term, is able to say, 'I have done my duty; he may cry quits with his constituents. (Cheers.)'
'Of myself, personally, it is always irksome and embarrassing to speak; but my difficulty is diminished by the thought, that I am going to utter nothing of a self-flattering character. In origin, in station, and in influence, I am a most humble individual; but I am willing to apply all the energies I possess, and to use the small modicum of talents with which I am endowed, for the good of the many; for the advancement of the liberties, the rights, and the happiness of my fellow-creatures, by pursuing the great objects I have set before you. (Cheers.) I have neither rank, connections, pedigree, nor wealth to recommend me to your notice. I cannot promise to build docks, or make railroads, or establish manufactures amongst you.
'As I shall not go into Parliament as a party man to do the bidding of the Minister, I can hold out no prospect of obtaining any gift for those who may place me in the hall of legislation. If you choose me, therefore, it will be for the sake of my principles, and because you deem me, as a man, not unworthy to be the advocate, in your name, of those principles. Let it be understood that I do not appear before you as the representative of any exclusive section of the constituency of this borough, or the opponent of any particular individual in Parliament, or seeking your suffrages to get there.
'I hope every gentleman who claims your notice will have as fair a chance as myself of winning his way to your good opinion, and that you will select the best from among the number, be they few or many. I shall experience no feelings of bitterness or disappointment, if I am rejected by your vote of this evening; but retire with the most friendly sentiments, and the most earnest wish that you may find a more fitting representative, and that the great measures to which I am sure you are truly and consistently attached, may, by your exertions, come to those of your countrymen at large, be soon brought to a successful issue.
'In reply to a question, Mr. Thompson stated he could be no party to the distribution of intoxicating liquors during the election. He would not purchase his seat by the demoralization of a single human being.
'Mr. Thompson acknowledged the vote now passed, and expressed his deep sense of the obligation conferred on him. He had received invitations from many other constituencies. These he had declined. He now accepted this invitation, and would stand for the Tower Hamlets. (This decision was received with tremendous cheers.)'
(Continued on last page.)

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!
THE U. S. CONSTITUTION IS 'A COVENANT WITH DEATH AND AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL.'
Yes! it cannot be denied—the slaveholding lords of the South prescribed, as a condition of their assent to the Constitution, three special provisions to secure the perpetuity of their dominion over their slaves. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, of preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipulation to surrender fugitive slaves—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and, thirdly, the exacting, fatal to the principles of popular representation, of a representation for slaves—for articles of merchandise, under the name of persons. . . To call government thus constituted a democracy, is to insult the understanding of mankind. It is doubly tainted with the infection of riches and slavery. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress, and thereby to make the PRESERVATION, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.—JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.
J. B. YERRINTON & SON, PRINTERS.
WHOLE NO. 1095.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.
BOSTON, MASS., FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1852.

The price of lavish enclaves... the footstool of...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

of the Bible, of chastity, wife, husband, and child... only to persuade slaveholders to aid in securing for...

the opponents of tyranny in every land—those who... would honestly exclaim against oppression under...

And I am glad to hear that the noble generosity... of the United States Government, in providing a...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...

By the following paragraph, which we copy from... the last number of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery...



POETRY

For the Liberator. TO KOSUTH.

Spurn! spurn the bribe! ford not the Southern river! Death courses in its crimson tide forever!

LINES ON THE RECEPTION OF LOUIS KOSUTH IN NEW YORK.

'Tis all a farce, Kosuth!—the very knives Who've yelled, and drank champagne, and yelled again.

F. DOUGLASS AND GEORGE THOMPSON.

(Continuation of the Letter of WILLIAM FARMER, Esq. from the first page.)

Mr. Douglass's next blunder I am willing to regard as a clerical error; the assertion that Mr. Thompson is a Director of the East India Company.

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

THE LIBERATOR.

Mount them on donkeys, bid them scream and yell— They'd frighten people more—and fight as well.

There is a lesson which thou yet must learn— Men have one destiny—had equal birth;

JOHN OLIVER, CARPENTER. No. 33, FRIED STREET, (BY SIGN), BOSTON.

BEAUMARSH, No. 25 Cornhill, has the following valuable books, viz:

Practical Phrenology. The best Diagrams are those of the mind; and the highest property is to know and improve ourselves.

Eye and Ear Infirmary. DR. STONE, Oculist and Aurist.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT TO FEMALE PREPARATORY PARTURITION. M. A. D. BOVIN'S.

DR. FORTIER'S Anti-Serofulous Panacea. ORIGINALLY made by Zak & Porter, and offered by the proprietor for the cure of Scrophulous Humors, and chronic diseases.

SOUTH SCITUATE CHURCH. FRIEND GARRISON: I learn, from the Liberator of last week, that the South Scituate Town Hall has been closed against the Plymouth County A. S. Society.

RUSSIA BALNE VEGETABLE OINTMENT. CURED thousands of the most obstinate cases of Rheumatism, Gout, Neuralgia, &c.

TRY IT ONCE! YOU NEVER WISH WITHOUT IT. The Good it Does is Felt at Once.