THE LIBERATOR
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY
AT NO. 25, CORNHILL, BY
ISAAC KNAPP,
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor.

TERMS.

$2.00 per annum, payable in advance—3.00 if payment be not made at the time of subscribing.

All letters and communications must be post paid. We take it superfluous, in order to shield us from the imposition of free letters to be taken from the Post Office, to say that we will be careful to pay their postage. Page 3 is devoted to making one square, and four pages, length and breadth, will be received from us for one dollar.

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VIII. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 1.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.] FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1838.

BOSTON.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1838.

COMMEMORATION OF THE DEATH OF ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY.

A meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was held in Boston on Wednesday, Dec. December 22, 1837, to celebrate the tragical death of Elijah P. Lovejoy, the martyr to the liberal and universal emancipation. The chair was taken by the President, Francis Jackson. Prayer was made by the Rev. Mr. Grimes, and speeches delivered by A. A. Phelps, Esq. Charles Stearns, Esq. Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Ellis Gray Loring, O. W. B. Peabody, and Messrs. Crandall and Garrison. A collection was taken, amounting to about forty-six dollars, was taken up for his widow and family.

SPEECH OF A. A. PHELPS.

Rev. Mr. Phelps gave an account of Mr. Lovejoy's parentage, education, and of the leading facts connected with the recent tragedy; of which the following is part.

Mr. Lovejoy was a native of Maine, a graduate of Waterville College. He entered on public life, and was editor of a political paper in St. Louis, Mo. and attained great eminence as such. In 1832, he was converted to Christ, under the preaching of Rev. Mr. Nelson, and soon after abandoned his profession. He began to study for the ministry, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Princeton, New-Jersey; and was ordained, and installed pastor, (Mr. Lord now) in the city of Baltimore, Maryland.

About the time, it was determined to establish a religious paper at St. Louis, Mr. Lovejoy was invited to edit it. On the 11th of April, 1833, he arrived in that city, and commenced the publication of the "St. Louis Observer." He soon engaged the attention of the public. Perhaps he exhibited the public attention to his paper, and by the hatred of the Catholics, he incurred against him, was "the origin," says the Rev. Mr. Hall, "of his unpopularity with the people of St. Louis" in that city. When the intelligence of the anti-abolition riots in New York reached the city, he spoke strongly in their condemnation. He and his enemies charged him with being an abolitionist. A mob insulted and injured his office. Forthwith, he published an appeal to the public, in which he gave the testimony of his fellow citizens, declaring that he was an abolitionist, in the technical sense of the term, utterly disclaiming the principles of the fanatics, and disclaiming the true cause of hostility against him, was his opposition to Popery, and that the charge of abolitionism was made merely as a means of exciting a prejudice against him. The appeal was successful, some of the catholics even approving his spirit, and declaring that he should be protected.

In a few months, McIntosh, the colored murderer was burned alive by a mob, and immediately followed Lynch laws, and mobocratic and lawless violence in the place. Against Lovejoy was roused, and he spoke fearlessly in condemnation of the mob, and in defence of the laws. He was threatened, and was assaulted at Marion, in connection with the murder of Col. Muldrow and Dr. Nelson. An attempt was made to throw his press into the Mississippi, but it was rescued by the interposition of the citizens. The final result was the mobbing of his press, and the removal and extinguishment of his paper at Alton, Ill. as the "Abolitionist."

During all this time, be it remembered, Mr. Lovejoy was no abolitionist. He was no abolitionist, in the sense in which he was accused by those who subsequently published, is that "no one can possibly be more prejudiced or more hostile to the cause of emancipation than he was at first." Such were his views and feelings while in St. Louis, and at the time of his removal to Alton. Accordingly, though he had lost a large part of his patronage, and afterwards received a duty, he informed his friends in Alton, on his arrival there, that being now in a free State, he would not be induced to enter into the discussion of the slavery question. And for some time he did not do it; nor did he ultimately do it, in any other manner than to give his views, until he had the matter before a meeting of the friends of the Observer, and they decided that it was best for him to do so. The result was the destruction of the press by a ruffian mob.

From these statements it appears, (1) That the establishment of the Observer at St. Louis, and afterwards at Alton, was not the establishment of an abolition, but of a religious paper generally; and consequently, at the time opposed to abolition; (2) that the establishment of the Observer was not the establishment of a new, but the re-establishment of an old one; (3) that it was not even at the time of its establishment or re-establishment, a political or religious paper generally, in opposition to the institution of slavery, in common with the other papers of the day; (4) that the opinion at its commencement, was that of Lovejoy fell, was not whether establishing, but whether a religious paper, should be the means of all subjects, and be absolutely tolerated. In the broadest sense, then, Lovejoy's history is the freedom of the press.

The facts then detailed, the leading facts in reference to the tragedy at Alton. The following, in connection with Mr. Phillips's speech, it is deemed of important to lay before the public.]

WHY WAS HE THERE?

Although the answer to this, and Mr. P., does not affect the question of the lawfulness of the act, and we at the other, still as it has been asserted and insinuated, that he was there, and fired from within, and some have said, by Mr. Lovejoy himself, it seems desirable to get at the exact truth in the case. What, then, is the truth?

The mayor, in his statement, does not say positively that the first gun was fired from within, nor does he say that he saw the first shot, nor that the gun was fired from within; but merely "a gun was fired from one of the windows of the warehouse." &c. Mr. Gilmore, however, says that he saw the first gun fired. On the other hand, two witnesses, who were within the building, state expressly that the first gun was fired from without. One of them, who signs himself W. W. of the Cincinnati Journal, and who declares himself no abolitionist but merely a friend to free discussion, says:—

"They (within) all agreed that the gun should be fired as the doors were burst open, or till there was some one fell. Without Vallery (the valley of stones and bricks) was piled up in the warehouse, and from this gun was fired into the window from the mob. The second gun was fired, I think, at Allen Journon, one of the party, within. The concurrent testimony of the rest, levelled his gun upon the mob."

Mr. Gilmore, the owner of the warehouse, who was in it, says, "I went out at the door in the second story, and addressed the mob, says:

"I stated them that we would not deliver it—that we had a right to do so—that the Mayor to protect our property, and we would do so with our lives. The mob began to advance, and soon heat in the second story window, and fire upon the mob through doors. Our men fired and killed one of their number."

A young man, one of Mr. Lovejoy's printers, says:

"It is fact, that at least four guns were fired into the building before any gun was fired from it. It cannot be known who fired the first gun, which was fired from within, but the assailed were not, I believe, the first to fire. Here, then, is a direct falsehood of mistake. The agreement, however, is only and the consultation afterwards, leave no room for mistake, or deviation from the hurry or confusion of the moment, but show, beyond dispute, that these witnesses must be correct when they testify that the firing began from the mob.

SANCTION OF THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES.

But a question of greater moment, and more important to a correct understanding of the merits of the case, is this: by what authority did those within the building act? Did they act as individuals, on the right of self-defence simply, or merely as the agents and by authority of the government, and for the time, themselves' the government, and as such wielding 'the sword not in vain,' but so as to make the minister of God, a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well? Most obviously, the latter. All the witnesses agree in this. It is the right of government, and duty, and to wield the sword as a magistrate be right, and in accordance with Christianity, Lovejoy did right, and fell not only a martyr, but a Christian martyr.

But what say the witnesses? In his first letter, W. speaks of "fifty armed men secreted in the warehouse, ready for the service of the Mayor." Mr. Gilmore says, "Fourteen citizens, of whom I was one, remained in the building with arms, which, under the authority of the Mayor, were secreted." &c. "We had been told by the Mayor to protect our property."

W. in his second letter says:—

"The citizens have, in no instance, since these late difficulties commenced, taken up arms, without the express advice and direction of the mayor. They acted under his authority and direction. On the night of the 21st ult. I was there in command, and I felt myself bound to stand by the Presbyterian church, where President Beecher was to preach, the mayor expressly advised that those who could conveniently do so, keeping the peace, should have their arms in some convenient place where they could get them on a summons. Accordingly, I stacked my muskets in this matter. Their arms were deposited near the church, and when there were indications of a mob, I ordered the men to stand near the window, they repaired immediately to their guns, and formed in a line in front of the church, awaiting the orders of the mayor. The mob, after further was dismissed, he advised them all to go home. They immediately obeyed, although, as they retired, some of the people threw stones at them. One was struck in the head; another in the back, and the third had the breech of his gun struck off his shoulder. But they did not retaliate."

Again on the night of the landing of the press, the mayor was with the thirty men secreted in the warehouse, and addressed them. Again, while the mob was raging, the mayor, after he had exercised all his official authority without effect, ordered the building to surrender. Of these within, on the expediency of giving up the property. They asked him whether they should defend their property with arms, in opposition to the mob, and he replied, 'I believe, that they had a perfect right to do so, and that the law justified that course.'

Mr. Lovejoy's printer says:—

"As threats had been currently made that the press would be destroyed on its arrival, and as there is no militia in Alton, seventy persons organized themselves into a company, with the approbation of the mayor, to preserve the peace of the city, and to defend the press. Many of them were not abolitionists, but friends of free discussion and good order. The press was daily expected, it was agreed that one half of the company should be under arms every night in waiting. Accordingly, on the night of the sixth, thirty-five were in the store, awaiting the arrival of the press. The mayor was acquainted with our plan of defence. The next night the other division (to which Mr. Lovejoy belonged) took their turn, but it was not thought necessary to have so large a force, only about half of this division was notified to attend."

A letter from Mr Lovejoy's brother, dated Dec 8, confirms the statements, and adds to this all: the Rev. Mr. Parker, in a letter to the New York Observer, in which he speaks of Mr. Lovejoy as "imprudent," "quick-tempered," "not a man to be imprudent," "not a man to be not convince him," &c. &c. and also:—

"The mayor attempted to rally help, but could get only about twenty men to stand by him. Lovejoy and Mr. Gilman, one was Mr. Long, with whom I am staying, and one was Mr. Lovejoy himself."

These testimonies put it beyond dispute, that those within were there at the request of the mayor, or, and were really, if not in form, acting with the sanct on of the civil authority of the City. They were, so far, THE GOVERNMENT, and *the authority of government was theirs*, and their action WAS THE ACTION OF GOVERNMENT.

REMARKS OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Mr. President:

I wish to make a few remarks on the details which have been presented to us.

It seems to me there exists in the community, a great deal of misapprehension in regard to these facts. The opinion of a portion of the press, the sentiments I hear uttered by those around me, strike me as inconsistent and hypocritical. We cherish almost as household words the memory of those patriots who lived in the bloody fields of stricken battle. Yet we hesitate to approve the conduct of one who but followed in their footsteps, sought the flickering torch of liberty from their hands, and has borne it forward, placing it, as we hope, above the reach of future danger, there to burn bright and unchanging for the eminence which our children's children will never desert nor betray. We must, I think, blot out almost every page in our annals, if we condemn the conduct of Lovejoy. I am inconsistent testimony against our fathers, before our conscientious scruples about Lovejoy's conduct can cease to be matter of serious and painful inquiry. It is a real for liberty which has burnt out. The cool observer will be apt to think, that a lurking prejudice against the abolitionists has caused the blindness of the eyes in which he fell—that the 'rattle of the negro's chain,' which he shook in the ear of a slumbering people, has deadened the ear to the voice of the call of citizenship, and the protection of the laws. I think this misapprehension has led us to make to a false issue. We have been asking, People are constantly asking each other, Had Lovejoy a right to resist? Sir, I protest against the question, instead of answering it. Lovejoy did not resist. The opinions of a portion of the press, the sentiments of a portion of the community, the conduct of those

We are here to-night because one of our brethren has fallen. But how? his foe has fallen. In the first place, he has fallen in his efforts in behalf of suffering humanity. He saw a portion of his fellow beings held in slavery. He felt that it was wrong. He said to their masters, it was wrong. And was that a crime in this country, which boasts of liberty, and at least every fourth of July reiterates the sentiment that all men are born free and equal? Was it wrong to say that one man has no right to enslave another? If that was a crime, Lovejoy did wrong. If that was not wrong, then Lovejoy fell, pleading the cause of universal liberty. I see in him a martyr to the great idea of Christian liberty; for, by what right do I call myself a freeman? Because I have it guaranteed to me upon parchment laid up in the archives of the nation? Or, by the hold my liberty by a higher grant than the charters of kings, nobles, or peoples. I appeal to no parchment—to no charter but that which God only has engraven upon my immortal nature. (much applause.) If I deny any individual the right to his liberty, I deny my own right. If I admit that any man may rightfully be reduced to slavery, I acknowledge the right of another to reduce me to the same condition. I cannot defend my own liberty, without laying down a principle which will throw a shield around every other man's liberty. My right to my freedom is the right of every other man to be free.

Are we to admit, for a moment, that it is wrong for a man to contend for universal liberty? Then Lovejoy was not wrong. If it was wrong defending the right of the slave alone; but in defending his right, he was defending yours—mine—the right of everyone here—yea anywhere so to contend for universal THE RIGHTS OF MAN! Are these words prohibited in this Republic? Ay—are men to die to be put to death, for defending them? Yes, Lovejoy has fallen a martyr to the *rights of man.*

But again, Sir, how has Lovejoy fallen? He has fallen in another cause—in defending the freedom of speech—the freedom of the press. It may be, that freedom of speech and of the press has but few friends. It may be, that its value is forgotten. But he seems to have a feeling or an idea to express, it can never be given up. He who is willing to give it up, is the veriest slave that ever bowed before Mammon.

What boast it that my limbs are free, that my feet are not fettered, that my body is not lacerated with the driver's lash, if there must be a padlock on my lips, that I may not utter my sentiments or thoughts! If I chance to have kindled in my breast a sentiment of kindness to the human brotherhood—an idea of universal liberty, which I wish to utter, I cannot open my mouth. They who are conscious of having within them something that is worth utterring, have a right to put upon them the liberty of the press. They who value it not, are not to be reasoned with, for they have nothing in them in which truth or argument can find a resting place.

But this freedom of the press is guaranteed by the constitution. It was guaranteed by the constitution of the State of Lovejoy's birth. Well did he fall, then. If our constitutions have become dead letters—if those who feel for their fellow-men cannot speak to the people of wrong, and dare not even to sympathize in the people's right to maintain the right guaranteed by the constitution, it is well that some martyr's blood to quicken them. It is in vain that we have the principles of freedom written upon parchment, if they be not written upon the human heart; and certainly, from the hearts of a large portion of our people, they have been erased. It is not, then, in vain, that Lovejoy has fallen; for we see now where we are. We see that our constitutions have become dead carcasses, to be hung up as scare-crows, and at which the crowd merely laugh!

But this right of free discussion I contend for, is not derived from parchment. It is a right inherent in human nature; and nothing is worth contending for without it—indeed, without it nothing can be gained. Without it, mind, the progress of mind, or moral improvement of any kind, can be effected without free discussion—free speech. What is it that raises our families and our nation, and produces the onward progress of human society, but the free utterance of mind—the speaking of mind to mind, and heart to heart? Deny us that right, and we are slaves indeed.

But I am told that this question is improper to be discussed, because it may be construed into the discussion—that it was improper for Lovejoy to discuss the subject of slavery, because the people of Alton opposed it. Well, suppose this fact be so? Am I to ask the people what I may say? No, sir; I have but one authority to which I appeal, and that is conscience—the voice of God that speaks to my inner soul. I know that bids me speak, speak I will, though peoples, though all hell rise to oppose me. (great applause.)

What is life worth, if for fear of it is the power of speech given to man, if he may not exercise it for the good of his fellow-men? I love the people, and love, prize, and defend my rights as man more than the r good; yet I never did ask them what I might say. What my own conscience dictates, that I will speak, and what my own mind conceives to be truth, that will I defend.

Again, it is said, this is an exciting subject. I know, sir, it is an exciting subject. And why? Because in every heart there lurks the conviction that slavery is wrong: and every man's better nature responds to the words of the abolitionist. And he finds his higher convictions at war with his interests. To be true to what he believes—to be just, he must give up something that he thinks profitable. But, if abolitionists were in the wrong—if there were no truth on their side, there would be no opposition. They would be allowed to speak, and write, and print what they pleased. No man is afraid to hear an argument which he feels able to rebut. This discussion is opposed, then, because it is felt that abolitionists speak the right.

But admitting that it is not so—that the abolitionists are wrong. Instead of being a reason why we should not agitate the subject, it is the reason why we should. Where there is no wrong feeling—where the subject can be safely agitated—where the views of the people are right, there is little need of agitation, for public opinion is right. But when opinions cannot be brought forward without exciting hostility, then is the time to agitate them. Then is the time for a man to rise up with his life in his hand, and go forth and proclaim with a voice of thunder, that which the people are afraid to hear!

Again, Lovejoy fell a martyr to human liberty—in defence of the rights of you and I. Is the discussion of this subject to be put down? Is slavery to be perpetuated among us? I tell you no. Slavery is not to be perpetuated in this or any other country. Any one who has looked at the march of events for the last 1800 years, must see that the fate of slavery, at war as it is with all the tendencies, the rights of man, is decreed. When the angels sang the song, 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men,' they sang the sentiments of every kingdom of darkness, and the establishment of the kingdom of universal peace and righteousness. The angel that then hovered over the world, saw such a new order of things ushered in, that—brother reconciled to brother—wrong dying—oppression ceasing—freedom every where lifting up her banner—the world then looked down the stream of time, he saw the family of man coming together as brethren—embracing each other—all fetters broken—all minds and all hearts free—not a tear nor discord died away—the last tear was wiped away—he gave the shout which rung back from heaven's hosts—Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will toward men!"

And is not that vision to be realized? Mark the course of events. See every nation—every country rising—see everywhere the tree of liberty rising; and say if slavery is to be continued. It has been expelled from the whole Christian world, with some few exceptions; and I see from the movements that are abroad in our land, that it cannot much longer exist among us. I see in the consciousness of man, in the plea in the heart war against slavery will not cease, so long as a single slave writhes under the lash—so long as a single human being is deprived of his rights. I see this pledge, and I therefore am satisfied. This work will go on. All we need is the free exercise of the right for which Lovejoy died. Let us speak—speak—speak—let us speak boldly—let us be undaunted and persevering, and slavery will die. Nothing is so powerful as truth—truth be but spoken, it must prevail. Bring against it what force you may, the civil arm, an armed soldiery, a mob, the press, the pulpit—truth shall triumph over all. I ask, like God from whom it emanates, it is omnipotent.

I would say to those who are banded together as abolitionists, while you pay three months' pay to him who fell in your cause, be not disheartened. All that is good in human nature—all that is enduring and sacred in history, encourages you to hope for success. Heaven is pledged to give you success. Be but true to the sacred principles of liberty; be but united; and though but a handful today, you will be an army to-morrow—next day, you are a people—the next day, you are a world—you have conquered.

REMARKS OF E. G. LORING.

MR. LORING said—I propose, Mr. President, to occupy the attention of the meeting, for a few minutes. I suppose there is not a woman or man in this assembly, who was not moved by the touching appeal to sight, the affecting allusion of Mr. Lovejoy to his wife and children, when speaking before the citizens of Alton, previous to his death. He said he lost his life, Sir, it touched and thrilled every heart here. His emotion betrayed no weakness. It belonged to a man who felt that he had been permitted to see the future, and look forward to the effects of his constancy, he would not have regretted, even for the sake of his beloved family, that he had to stand there. The legacy he has left to his children is far better than the longest life of prosperity were it purchased at the cost of his honor. Is a man in this assembly that would not be proud to leave such an inheritance to his family? *(Applause.)* That boy, Edward Parson Lovejoy, now sleeping in earth, is richer than the wealth of the world is the name left him by his martyred father! That boy ought to be adopted by every friend of this nation. The example of his father will not be lost upon him. I trust his widowed mother will not feel that she is left disconsolate; for this great sacrifice that has been made is in vain. I deeply regret that our brother died in arms; but who, for this, shall rob him of a martyr's crown? He has neither lived nor died in vain. His noble and determined spirit is still in the land. The cry of his blood is ringing in the ears of a people. The moral influence of his death will be felt in the ranks of Slavery. The victory is sure, if followed up with the arms of truth and love, alone.

I say, Sir, simply to relate an incident, which I recently met with, in the course of miscellaneous reading. In 1809, war was raging between Austria and France. Napoleon's Austrian soldiers in our mother army. I refer to the exclusion of slave-drivers from the communion of the Christian church; and the application to slaveholders of the apostolic injunction, "Obey them in 'the oracles of God.' I aware of the polemical bearing of the former topic, but you will perceive that I now cautiously exclude all the theological doctrines which might otherwise be called into alliance.

I. *The 'unjust severity' of our language.* You observe: "I have often lamented the disposition of many of your members to adopt violent forms of speech, in speaking of slaveholders. I cannot severity which I blame, some among you have been accustomed to denounce slaveholders as robbers and man-stealers. Now robbery and stealing imply that a man takes *unjustly,* and without his consent, what belongs to another. To steal is to seize privily, to rob is to steal by force, the acknowledged property of one's neighbor. Now is the slaveholder to be charged with robbery and theft? I know not. Is the slave he holds is not his own?" In reply to your two questions, I answer categorically—*Every slaveholder is chargeable with those crimes; and every slaveholder does know that the slave is not his own. Ergo—Every slaveholder is a robber and a man-stealer!—* For to talk of involuntary or invincible ignorance of the fundamental law of reciprocal equity, is no part of my creed. I am a Yankee. You seem to have forgotten, that in the use of the 'violent forms of speech' to which you object, we are only embodying the language of the scripture of truth; and I need only to remind you, that it is upon this ground alone, that they are embodied in our delineations of slavery. Not that we assume or make any pretensions to predict the future, or even to prophesy concerning the eternal destiny of men; but simply to speak of crime in the language of strong conviction, with the deepest abhorrence, and with no 'sophistry or exaggeration,' except those excrescences can be imputed to the infallible revelation of Jehovah.

It is sufficient to remark, that the use of scriptural terms in characterising sin, is indispensable in all moral controversies. I do not mean, that the terms used in our delineations of sin are to be deemed imperative; but when they convey the precise idea of the original, they should be used in preference to others, because they are sanctified by use, and consecrated by hallowed authority. I offer four remarks for your consideration.

1. Neither the sacred volume, nor our natural reason, nor our statutes, have conferred on the slaveholder, under the implied, that men can habitually violate the law of God in its most flagrant form '*by misappprehension.*' There is one remarkable construction in the original Hebrew language, to which our Biblical critics have not duly adverted. In the *Pinil* and *Pual* forms of Hebrew verbs, there is implied not only *will,* but also the strongest determination, with the utmost activity to accomplish the design. I select only one example. In the fortieth chapter of Genesis, verse fifteen, it is recorded, that Joseph informed Pharaoh's chief Butler, '*I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews.*' Now the form of the verb there used, implies both the above ideas—resolution and diligence in all the parties concerned in that robbery and man-stealing. Notwithstanding, the grievous wrong done by every criminal's statement, and his silence respecting the various traders by whose instrumentality he was transferred from his father's dwelling to the dungeon of the king's prison; yet, he declares, he was taken away by force, openly stolen; and it is obviously implied, that the situation in which he was then placed, necessarily comprised a continuation of the original wrong. Now, when the slaveholder pretends to admit, that he who *diligently* commits a nefarious act, as the *Pual* verb distinctly asserts, is the 'victim of a voluntary blindness.'

2. Both the Hebrew and the Greek words, which are used in the sacred volume in reference to slaveholding, express the highest voluntary turpitude. The Hebrew word *Ganab,* which is softened by us into *Kidnap,* is precisely synonymous with *Andrapodistes;* and they mean, to enslave or treat as a slave; a *man-stealer* or a *kidnapper.* Probably the most comprehensive definition is found in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, in the ninetieth and ninetieth second question of the Larger Catechism. The reference is to Exodus xxi: 16, and I. Timothy 1: 10. 'The law is made for man-stealers. This curse among the Jews was pronounced, except worst of all capital punishment; and the apostle classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing men into slavery, or holding them in slavery, or in retaining them in it. Stealers of men are all those who carry off slaves or freemen, and keep, sell or buy them; which act, says Grotius, 'is the highest kind of theft; and the apostle adds, that men, who, for the sake of mammon, set up 'the throne of iniquity and frame mischief by a law;' and then, as you declare, regard *their* unjoyly' Statute book as of equal authority with the Divine statutes; and look on *such* 'legal as synonimous with moral right, are no more guilty of robbing and stealing, than he would be, who by misapprehension should appropriate to himself that belonging to another. To cite your own words, I think, that not only does your principle 'furnish a pillow for the conscience of the slaveholder;' but if carried out to its legitimate extent, it also gives to every criminal a complete exculpation for his sins, provided he can plead in extenuation, voluntary ignorance, long practice, and the influence of those evil communications which corrupt good manners.

3. The Jewish law made a grand distinction between man-stealing and all other kinds of theft. For the latter, restoration fourfold was appointed; but for 'stealing, or selling a man, or for taking merchandize of a man, or if he was found in hand,' the command was decisive; 'he shall surely be put to death,' then that *Goner,* that *Andrapodistes,* then that *thief* shall die.' You will perceive, therefore, that there was no question respecting decrees of the legislature, bringing up in sight of slaves, the habit of treating human beings as slaves, or any other of the excuses which modern times have alleged. The whole inquiry was devoted to a single point.—Is the man detained in bondage contrary to the Jewish law? If so, that slaveholder was pronounced a thief, and was to be treated as the punishment denounced by Jehovah. I only subjoin, that any man, who attempts to persuade the Christian churches, that the Hebrew word *Ganab,* or the Greek term *Andrapodistes,* is equivalent to a slaveholder, Southern states, is either ignorant of those languages, or wilfully falsifies 'the scripture of truth.'

4. You are conscious that slavery can be demolished solely by the power of the gospel. I am therefore convinced, that the 'monstrous delusion, that violation of man's most sacred rights,' must be portrayed in the language of scripture, if we would cure its heinous criminality. By our common epithets, we have totally concealed the wickedness of 'the Southern institutions.' God calls them *man-stealing,* and we call them slavery! He calls the slaveholding God pronounces the slave a stolen man, and denominates him who makes 'the claim of ownership of a human being,' a thief worthy of death; and we call the 'legal relation of master and servant, talk of 'innocent slaveholders,' and acknowledge them to be Christians. To cite your own phrase, that 'delusion is a monstrous one;' and that too, without the slaveholder, we dare call that act *kidnapping,* which God defines to be so; and that man a *thief* and *man-stealer,* whom the Bible thus denounces. And I maintain that such phrases contain no 'unnecessary,' but the very propriety of remark, it is 'speaking the truth, and the whole truth, in the language of strong conviction,' without 'policy or passion or excitement,' but from the severe principle of duty presiding over the guilty, 'saying plain'

II. '*Exclusion of Slaveholders from the privileges of the Christian church.*'—I shall strictly adhere to your own definition. You state that all persons who are not admitted from the communion table, who 'give proof in their lives of hostility to the Christian law.' Let us apply your own principle. 'To own a man is a mon trous delusion.' You 'regard that as with horror?' Slaveholding is 'a violation of man's most sacred rights.' No language can exceed the enormities of the wrong. The man who holds slaves for gain is '*the worst of robbers.* He is guilty of robbing, by violence, men of human rights, necessarily, systematically, from its very nature. No robbery is so great as that to which the slave is habitually subjected.' Many similar passages are contained in our present publications, from which it manifestly appears, that the 'FANATICS' have not *selfishly* appropriated all the 'violent forms of speech, and all the unjust severity of language,' so themselves 'regard with horror.' Few remarks upon your general principle.

1. If you will ascertain what slaveholders *do not hold slaves for gain,* and publish their names, they will be exempt from your censure. 2. '*the worst of robbers and of tyrants.*'

2. I ask you, does a man who is a continual practitioner of a system which 'necessarily violates all human rights,' and subjects the victim to the 'worst of robbery' perpetrated by himself—does that man not give proof in his life, of constant 'hostility to the Christian law?'

3. Is that 'an unenlightened zeal,' which erects some 'unnecessary barriers' and which wall to exclude men who are guilty of an enormous wrong, which no language can exaggerate?

4. Is the Lord's supper turned into a 'weapon of assault,' when men are excluded from it who are living in that *monstrous delusion,* which so blinds them, that although 'the worst of robbers, and the worst of tyrants, necessarily systematically reduce their slaves to the greatest robbery,' yet they profess to be Christians; and pretend to believe that their habitual 'violation of man's most sacred rights,' leaves no 'proof of hostility to the Christian law.'

To my apprehension, you exactly maintain the proposition which for several years past has been urged by the Christian churches of the North in reference to this topic. Why do 'the Friends' tenaciously exclude all slaveholders from their community? Because, as they believe, slaveholders 'give proof in their lives of hostility to the Christian law.' Why have many Baptist churches, all the Reformed, the Associate, and the Associate Reformed Presbyterians, with many other isolated Christian societies of different denominations, erected this 'partition wall round the communion table?' Not as a 'weapon of assault;' but because they adjudge that slaveholders, as Dr. Channing *smoothly* entitles them, being '*the worst of robbers, and the worst of tyrants* so long as they continue to exemplify those characters, cannot consistently claim the 'privileges of the Christian church.'

Your rule has been the only argument which has been urged against the exclusion of slaveholders from christian communion—their practical 'hostility to the Christian law.' If a notoriously profane, intemperate and lewd man were to offer himself for the Christian ministry, and his habitual immorality was alleged against him as a barrier—it would be useless for him to reply—'I was nurtured in those habits. I have always lived among persons who engage in those things—and I strongly think I am right. My heart is not open to your inspection.' 'Has God assigned to you his prerogative of judgment?' 'Is it not a violation of the laws of Christ to attempt to shut me out from the privileges of the Christian church; and by a monstrous abuse, to turn the Lord's supper into a weapon of assault 'upon me?—If such an immoral man should thus appeal—I presume that you would reply—'I view violate no law of Christian charity, nor do I usurp God's prerogative. I know not your heart, but I am commanded to judge of the heart by its fruits. Your conduct is blasphemous, a drunkard, and a debauchee—your whole life and your defence of it give proof of hostility to the Christian law—therefore, until you bring forth fruits meet for repentance, I feel bound here that you are a follower of the holy, harmless and undefiled Jesus.' That is our principle; and until all the Northern churches adopt it in practice, in reference to slavery, so long as the slaveholder defends the overall, and men who would kidnap, enslave and 'claim the ownership of angels,' will continue to violate all human rights, and to be '*the worst of robbers, and the worst of tyrants.*'

The exclusion of slaveholders from all communion with the christian churches in the nonslaveholding states is the simple, but the only effectual remedy for the monstrous delusion of those men to a sense of their duty; and by the application of gospel eye-salve, to release them from their 'monstrous delusion.' A deadly sin against 'the light and the truth' has been contrived, perpetrated, and persisted in by the disciples of Jesus in this republic—and that is the recognition of slaveholders as Christians. Until that error is banished, and a total and universal change of practice shall have been adopted; all attempts to abolish slavery will be nearly as abortive, as it would be to attempt to overturn the rock of Gibraltar by a paper pellet from a common gun, or to stop the falls of Niagara by holding a sieve in the midst of the whirlpool.

With one remark more I close; only premising, that I conceive you have embarrassed yourself in self contradiction, merely because you have fruitlessly endeavored to combine immutable religious truth with carnal expediency. That effort will always be vain. By no process can that which is false, be made to seem true. Yet, that Abolitionists 'justify their severity of language by the strong rebukes uttered by Jesus Christ,' thereby implying that the Anti-Slavery champions are an unhallowed band, who, in their zeal, have misconceived their motives, their feelings, and their design. They use scriptural language—they inculcate evangelical truth—they promulgate the divine law of love, they inculcate benevolence emphatically; because they thereby only embody in their contest for humanity and freedom, the religious and moral instructions which they have learned of him who was 'meek and lowly in heart.'—Without an overpower emotion of vain glory, they think that they can appeal, in proof of their brotherly love for the slaveholders, to the sacrifices which they make to reclaim them from the reproach and scorn and privations which they endure in the cause of philanthropy; and to their quenchless resolution to toil and suffer, so that by divine grace, they may 'convert the sinner from the error of their ways, and hide a multitude of sins from death, and hide the multitude of their sins.' Samuel Rodgers G. B.

TO WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

BROOKLINE, 12th mo. 1837.

DEAR BROTHER:

Whilst I shrink with feelings of instinctive abhorrence from joining in that bitterness and violent invective, which has been raised by the slaveholders of the South, and their pro-slavery brethren of the North, by men who have themselves no conscientious scruples against human slavery, and who, without repentance there may exist some sanctimonious hesitation, whether it is right for a minister of the gospel to 'resist evil,' though their Christians may and ought to do it; yet I feel impelled, at this fearful crisis, to examine the conduct of our brother by the light of eternal truth, and hold him up as a beacon to warn abolitionists, that when the Lord Jesus said, 'They that take the sword shall perish by the sword,' he uttered a prophecy which was fulfilled in the case of Elijah P. Lovejoy. The sacred cause of Human Rights has U en baptized with blood, not only by its enemies, but by its friends. For years, many of our abolitionists have defended the course of our fellow coadjutor in taking up arms, just in that proportion they are identified with the crime which he committed, and are bound to defend the fundamental principles, and fundamental principles, a little reflection will show, that this was not the case. Principles can never be defended by violence, personal, nay, even by those who are professedly defenders of principles, takes them in reality to defend his person, which has become obnoxious, in consequence of his having embraced those principles. I wish this fallacy was exploded, that we are, in any sense, professedly take up arms to defend his principles, shows, in my apprehension, that he is not willing to sacrifice his life for those principles. No man is prepared to come out as the public advocate of Truth, until he is prepared to die a martyr to the Truth; and unless he is willing, unreservedly, to lay down his life for his principles, he has not learned their intrinsic value, which is the first lesson every reformer ought to understand. Of what importance is any man's life to the establishment of truth? God is Truth, and the cause which is based on Truth cannot be endangered by the death of any individual; their fully may destroy those who are commissioned to preach repentance to them, but they cannot destroy Truth. Eleven of the apostles suffered martyrdom! Did Christianity perish with them? Is my faith in the fundamental doctrine of abolitionism, which is based on the unutterable worth of every human being, on his inalienable rights as a rational, moral and responsible agent, is this faith, I say, that I Jehovah should permit the most conspicuous and the holiest men and women in our ranks to be mowed down by a lawless mob? I should be sufficiently expect that others would be raised up to fill their places. Our cause is 'instinct with immortality:' it can neither be silenced nor destroyed.

Thine in the bonds of Peace,

S. M. G.

NEW YORK, DEC. 15, 1837.

DEAR GARRISON:

I was much gratified with your remarks respecting the *mode* in which our brother Lovejoy met death. Is it not now a very suitable time to discuss, in the Liberator, the Peace question fully?

There is much misapprehension on the minds of many abolitionists, respecting the meaning of the Declaration of Sentiments adopted by the Convention, at the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It is true, that a large majority of the members of that Convention were non-combatants, and they meant, in adopting the Declaration, to publish to the fact to the world, and to consider themselves solemnly bound to abstain from physical resistance, as it is usually termed: but it is also true, that there were some members of the convention, those minds were made up as to the anti-christian practice of using bloody weapons, and who were not prepared to subscribe their names to the Declaration with the understanding, that it was to be binding on their minds as abolitionists, the cause in which we embarked was not to be carried on by weapons of carnal warfare. We would neither use such weapons to advance the cause, nor approve of the slaves resorting to arms to achieve their independence. But these brethren did not, in any way, pledge themselves not to resist, in any legal way, disciplined aggressors who would seize their property. Now many of the majority in that Convention were to think that the Declaration itself contained a pledge, that all those who sign it will never resist to physical force under any circumstances, and especially while acting in the character of abolitionists. And many, who have since joined with the American Anti-Slavery Society, consider than non-combatants, and consider the Declaration as binding on every member of the American Anti-Slavery Society. But it is a mistake, I apprehend. The Declaration was drawn up by those who adopted and signed it, and the brethren who signed it, should afterward voluntarily adopt the same principle; and in the case, every subsequent adherent would act in his own meaning to the document. The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, adopted by the members of the Convention, at another document entirely, and set forth the principles to which all must agree, who come, who became them, or should hereafter become members of the Society. This document says nothing about the subject of non-resistance, or war, as abolitionists are concerned. Now, as well as moated question, so far as the Constitution of the Society, is the true state of the case, concerned. This is the true state of the case, I believe; and it will save some misapprehension and difficulty in the minds of the 'signers' to the Declaration are refreshed on that subject, and if those who think and contend that signed the Declaration are correctly informed of the facts in the case, they will cease to have hard feelings against brethren on that score.

Now, as one of the signers of the Declaration, who entertained the belief that all resort to bloody weapons is anti-christian, and who still believes that abolitionists who use them, are not liar as to their duty as christians, and that such use is contrary to sound policy, I feel anxious

not fire the gun which shot down Bishop. That matters little; he was as truly implicated in the crime of murder, as was Saul, when he kept the clothes of those who stoned Stephen. Did the murderous bullets which penetrated the hearts of the contending brethren, carry to those hearts the message of peace on earth, and good will to man? Ah, no! Death was borne the fearful truth, that man hates man. In Bishop, fell the victim of mistaken zeal, and in Lovejoy, fell the victim of a fiery zeal the victim of an infuriated populace, drunk with the spirit of slavery; but I cannot regard him as a Christian martyr. I cannot behold him awaiting his execution with the holy calmness and unshaken faith of Paul, when he says to his heart,—'Behold the cruel death which he anticipated, I am now ready to be offered; and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.'

Much has been said in extenuation of brother Lovejoy's conduct, about 'defending his life and his property in a manner justified by the laws of this and all other civilized countries.' If this be any justification of crime, then the whole system of abominations, comprehended in that word slavery, may be justified on the same ground. The South has contended, the third of its inhabitants into chattels personal. She has legalized murder, man-stealing, cruelty; yet we are waging war against her behavioristic institution, because we believe that her laws contravene the laws of God, and therefore that they are null and void, and cannot palliate the guilt of slavery. If, then, human laws cannot confer upon man a title to hold property in my fellow-man, how can they give a right to take his life? If I cannot, without criminality, reduce man to property, commenced and prosecuted in violation of my country; simply it is a self-evident truth, that I cannot concently reduce the image of God to a mangled and lifeless corpse, without at least equal guilt, however I may be sustained by the laws of man.

The principles of truth will be always maintained, let who will suffer. We cry this out when we say of all slaveholders, they are thieves and robbers. Our business is with principles, not with persons. We must sacrifice our affections and our sympathies to our principles, and not permit the tender sensibilities of our nature to warp our judgment. Besides, it seems to me, that although it is not our business to defend persons, but our fundamental principles, a little reflection will show, that this was not the case. Principles can never be defended by violence, personal, nay, even by those who are professedly defenders of principles, takes them in reality to defend his person, which has become obnoxious, in consequence of his having embraced those principles. I wish this fallacy was exploded, that we are, in any sense, professedly take up arms to defend his principles, shows, in my apprehension, that he is not willing to sacrifice his life for those principles. No man is prepared to come out as the public advocate of Truth, until he is prepared to die a martyr to the Truth; and unless he is willing, unreservedly, to lay down his life for his principles, he has not learned their intrinsic value, which is the first lesson every reformer ought to understand. Of what importance is any man's life to the establishment of truth? God is Truth, and the cause which is based on Truth cannot be endangered by the death of any individual; their fully may destroy those who are commissioned to preach repentance to them, but they cannot destroy Truth. Eleven of the apostles suffered martyrdom! Did Christianity perish with them? Is my faith in the fundamental doctrine of abolitionism, which is based on the unutterable worth of every human being, on his inalienable rights as a rational, moral and responsible agent, is this faith, I say, that I Jehovah should permit the most conspicuous and the holiest men and women in our ranks to be mowed down by a lawless mob? I should sufficiently expect that others would be raised up to fill their places. Our cause is 'instinct with immortality:' it can neither be silenced nor destroyed.

Thine in the bonds of Peace,

S. M. G.

NEW YORK, DEC. 15, 1837.

DEAR GARRISON:

I was much gratified with your remarks respecting the *mode* in which our brother Lovejoy met death. Is it not now a very suitable time to discuss, in the Liberator, the Peace question fully?

There is much misapprehension on the minds of many abolitionists, respecting the meaning of the Declaration of Sentiments adopted by the Convention, at the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It is true, that a large majority of the members of that Convention were non-combatants, and they meant, in adopting the Declaration, to publish to the fact to the world, and to consider themselves solemnly bound to abstain from physical resistance, as it is usually termed: but it is also true, that there were some members of the convention, those minds were made up as to the anti-christian practice of using bloody weapons, and who were not prepared to subscribe their names to the Declaration with the understanding, that it was to be binding on their minds as abolitionists, the cause in which we embarked was not to be carried on by weapons of carnal warfare. We would neither use such weapons to advance the cause, nor approve of the slaves resorting to arms to achieve their independence. But these brethren did not, in any way, pledge themselves not to resist, in any legal way, disciplined aggressors who would seize their property. Now many of the majority in that Convention were to think that the Declaration itself contained a pledge, that all those who sign it will never resort to physical force under any circumstances, and especially while acting in the character of abolitionists. And many, who have since joined with the American Anti-Slavery Society, consider than non-combatants, and consider the Declaration as binding on every member of the American Anti-Slavery Society. But it is a mistake, I apprehend. The Declaration was drawn up by those who adopted and signed it, and the brethren who signed it, should afterward voluntarily adopt the same principle; and in the case, every subsequent adherent would act in his own meaning to the document. The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, adopted by the members of the Convention, at another document entirely, and set forth the principles to which all must agree, who come, who became them, or should hereafter become members of the Society. This document says nothing about the subject of non-resistance, or war, as abolitionists are concerned. Now, as well as moated question, so far as the Constitution of the Society, is the true state of the case, concerned. This is the true state of the case, I believe; and it will save some misapprehension and difficulty in the minds of the 'signers' to the Declaration are refreshed on that subject, and if those who think and contend that signed the Declaration are correctly informed of the facts in the case, they will cease to have hard feelings against brethren on that score.

Now, as one of the signers of the Declaration, who entertained the belief that all resort to bloody weapons is anti-christian, and who still believes that abolitionists who use them, are not liar as to their duty as christians, and that such use is contrary to sound policy, I feel anxious

BOSTON:
FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1838.

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will be held on the 24th inst. at 10 o'clock, A. M., in this city. Distinguished advocates of the cause of emancipation, from abroad, are expected to be present.

Auxiliary societies are requested to send delegates.

They are also requested to send to Mr. Phelps, immediately, by mail or otherwise, the name of each society, the time of its formation, the number of its members, and the names of its President and Secretary. There are many of the societies of which we have heard, who never report themselves at all, and many more, the reports from which are very imperfect. Special and immediate attention to this matter is therefore earnestly desired.

FRANCIS JACKSON, *Pres.*
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *Sec.*
Boston, January 4, 1838.

AGENTS FOR THE LIBERATOR.

Samuel Dwyer, Abington,	Mass.
Noah P. Rogers, Abington,	Mass.
David Hartwell, Pepperell,	Mass.
Josiah V. Marshall, Dorchester,	Mass.
Noah Jackson, Lynn,	Mass.
R. C. French, Fall River,	Mass.
Rev. Jos. S. Ellis, Lunenburg,	Mass.
Charles A. Eastman, Mason Village,	N. H.
Rev. Thos. Merrill, Lyme,	N. H.
Elias Smith, Providence,	R. I.
George W. Benson, Brooklyn,	Ct.
N. Bland, Poughkeepsie,	N. Y.
Wm. P. Griffin, Albany,	N. Y.
S. Keese, Peru,	N. Y.
Charles Marriott, Hudson,	N. Y.
Jonathan Blanchard, Pittsburgh,	Pa.
H. C. Howells, Fetynsburg,	Pa.

☞ All Anti-Slavery agents and officers of Anti-Slavery Societies, in any part of the United States, are hereby commissioned to act as agents for the Liberator; and the facts presented in this notice will be considered valid by the publisher. It is very desirable to have local agents in various parts of the country, and to have a list published in the paper. All who are willing to act as such, are respectfully requested to forward their names to the publisher, as soon as practicable.

ISAAC KNAPP.

MEETING ON THE 3RD.

A third part of the meeting was occupied with the speeches, delivered at the Marlboro' Chapel, in this city, on the 23d ultimo, in commemoration of the death of E. P. Lovejoy. The pleasure with which they were listened to, and the interest with which they were first printed in pamphlet by Mr. Phelps show that Mr. Lovejoy acted under the direction of the civil authority, and that he felt strictly in defence of government. All, therefore, who believe that government should be sustained at all hazards and at whatever sacrifice of life, are bound, on the score of consistency, to applaud his courage, his devotion to the public good, his generous disdain of consequences, and his zeal, in the spirit argued by our eloquent friend, Wendell Phillips; and truly does he say, that none but those who deny the right of any body of men ever to resort to the law of violence, have any pretext or excuse for the conduct of the Alton martyr. For ourselves, individually, we believe that as no occasion was found in which Jesus Christ himself authorized to resist his blood-thirsty persecutors, by force, so none can ever occur in which his disciples may lawfully use carnal weapons. While, therefore, we reprobate the act of the lamented Lovejoy in arming himself, even for the maintenance of the laws, as a transgression of the precept of Him whose kingdom is not of this world; we, at the same time, are filled with disgust and indignation at the hypocrisy and cool-blooded insensibility manifested by those editors, who, while they stand ready, on every occasion, to overturn the government of their country, are loudly condemning his loyal support of that government in the darkest hour of peril. To argue that, because the Christian Church ought not to have armed itself, and, in consequence, has proved to be no allegiance to the government, and therefore was not bound to obey its requisitions; or that a minister may not do what all other citizens are held to be obliged to perform, is to confound the idea of obedience to the civil power, and of a disregard of the claims of justice, patriotism and religion. It is worthy of special comment, that the very men who are loudest in their denunciations of the Alton rioters, are manifesting the like disregard of law, and even of order and decency, in their contempt of the sanction of the civil power, are the identical persons who are raising a hue-and-cry against certain abolitionists, for what is called their "contempt of the constitution." We, for one, feel, and are instinctively feel that the use of carnal weapons, under any circumstances, if it becomes a follower of Jesus; and the testimony to this fact, which they are now unwittingly giving, shall be made instrumental in the establishment of that kingdom which shall supplant all others, and fill the whole earth—a kingdom of peace and holiness. But even if Lovejoy had perished in self-defence, or in defence of his fellow-citizens, and not in endeavoring to sustain the government, those who hold to the right of self-defence should be dumb, at least should not utter a word of condemnation, respecting his conduct; nay, they should applaud it. *Mirabile dictu*—all at once, the violent, the sanguinary, the instigators of mobs, the advocates of war, men who wear epaulets, and those who mount a cockade, are converted to the valiant peace doctrine, profess to be gentle even to pusillanimity, depreciate all violence, and feel a shuddering sensation, in consequence of a minister's defending, in the last resort, the property, the lives, and the peace of our country. Verily, we do not understand the mystery of this inconsistency. The mere mention of it is enough to make it appear, that the most impudent of impostors!

The speech of Edmund Quincy is a chaste, impressive, eloquent production. It shall appear in our next. We are very felicitous, and its spirit throughout must commendable. Mr. Quincy, though lately enrolled in the anti-slavery ranks, speaks with the boldness of a veteran. He says, "I am not afraid of the opinion of any man, when I am determined to be no respecter of persons. The case he has imagined of a foreigner visiting these shores, enraptured at the thought of our republican institutions, and then suddenly shocked at the sight of traffic in 'slaves and the souls of men,' even in the capital of this republic, is not less humiliating than natural.

The manly sentiments of Mr. Brownson were responded to by a hearty response from the audience.

The affecting case of Mrs. Paul, in Albany, related by Mr. Chooke, ought to kindle a blush of shame on the cheek of every Christian. We know Mr. P. in England, and can testify that he is a humble, intelligent and pious woman, and highly respected in that country; yet she is treated as the offscouring of all things in republican, Christian America. Are there no sympathetic hearts, that will do her justice and respect to that excellent woman and her worthy husband?

STILL IN A CORNER.

We almost despair of getting any editorial room for ourselves, such is the overwhelming pressure of matter relating to the anti-slavery movements in the land; but our readers will not complain, we hope, that we occupy a little space, while we are assisted by such valuable correspondents, and furnish so much other matter that deserves to be chronicled. We cannot refrain from giving the following interesting letter. The proceedings of the meeting at the Marlboro' Chapel—the Letters of S. M. Grimke on the Rights of Women—those also from Samuel J. May, Lewis Tappan and Mr. Phelps, respecting the Lovejoy meeting—the review of Dr. Channing's Letter by our veteran coadjutor G. B. the earliest abolitionist in the field—and the proceedings of Congress, embracing the Massachusetts Resolutions, and the Speeches of Adams, Calhoun, (upon which we regret that we have not room to comment)—all will be read with very deep interest. We admire the earnest and Christ-like spirit of Mr. Phelps. We admire the spirit of Mr. Grimke, also, but regret that he should have signed the Declaration of Sentiments at Philadelphia, (however much the views of a few may have since altered,) because it seems to be understood as requiring the same profession of faith, in defence of which Mr. Lovejoy perished. We entirely dissent from Mr. May's opinion, that "it was especially incumbent upon the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, to publish the proceedings." Strangely, the course pursued by Mr. Lovejoy and his associates.' In their official capacity, they could properly do no such thing. Nor do we think, Mr. Green deserves any censure, for what he gave in his adherence to the doctrine, that no man ought to support the laws by physical force, even in obedience to the 'powers that be.' For the same reason, our esteemed friend S. M. G. is entirely justifiable in refusing to sign the Declaration, in what it is not empowered to do, as its present basis. Lovejoy was certainly a martyr; but, strictly speaking, he was not—at least in our opinion—a christian martyr. He died like Warren, not like Stephen.

Among the articles we have in type, for which we can find no room this week, are Mr. Garrison's letter to Dr. Channing and the Mass. A. S. Societies—an account of the fair in this city—a letter to the patrons of the Illuminator, from our unfeigned friend Joseph A. Whitmarsh, who is now suffering imprisonment in Leverett-street jail in Boston, for conscience sake—intelligence from Washington—list of Letters, Remittances, &c.

A meeting of the Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Boylston Hall, 20, Hanover St. on Wednesday evening next, at 7 o'clock.

Question for discussion—Will the agitation of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, by the Members and Representatives in Congress, dissolve the Union?

All interested are invited to attend.

DIED—On the 2d inst. Mr. Ezra Lunt, Jackson, aged 40.

APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE!

CITIZENS OF MASSACHUSETTS—

The deed is done. Below, you will find a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States, on the 21st ult. by a majority, that tried and honored defender of the right of petition, Hon. J. Q. Adams, attempted to remonstrate against its adoption, but was *gagged by the previous question!* As the only thing he could do, when this was carried, and, may we add, called, he rose in his place, and amid clamorous cries of 'order,' designed to silence him, or drown his voice, he exclaimed, "*I consider this resolution a violation of the Constitution of the United States—of the rights of my constituents and the people of the United States to petition—and of my right of freedom of speech as a member of this House.*" It was used for purposes, too, of such arrogance and dictation demanded it, and strictway the gag is applied, the right of petition virtually denied, the Constitution trampled under foot, and the sovereignty of the people contemned. Will you submit to be thus by the right of petition? Then circulate and sign the annexed memorials.

At the last session of Congress, the House of Representatives declared by solemn vote, that *there* have not the right of petition. By the resolution of December 21st, this body virtually declares that YOU have not this right. *Are you slaves?*

Again—this resolution is almost word for word the infamous resolution of January last. That resolution came immediately before the Legislature of this Commonwealth, the session, for the consideration and action, of this body, by a vote of 378 to 16, passed the following resolutions:—

"Resolved, That the resolution above named is an usurpation of power not delegated to congress by the Constitution and the intent of the Constitution of the United States, and injurious to the cause of freedom, and the constitutional rights, as it does violence to the inherent, absolute, and inalienable rights of man; and that it tends essentially to impair those fundamental principles of our government, which are made sacred by the express and antecedent to any written constitutions of government, independent of them all, and essential to the security of freedom in a State.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress, in maintaining and advocating the full right of petition, have entitled themselves to the cordial approbation of the people of this Commonwealth."

Nobly spoken! A voice, worthy the free representatives of a free people! There was but one defect in it—it was not' spoken upon the house-tops.' *No resolution was passed in defence of the Executive of the Union against the above to Congress.* Four things, then, need now to be done:

1. That the people respond, promptly, 'universally, boldly, to the voice of their representatives—therefore sign the memorials.

2. That the response be uttered on the housetops—*in the ear of Congress*—therefore sign memorial No. 1.

3. That the response break on the ear of that body, at *one* time, as a voice of thunder, in *one* startling appeal. Therefore, circulate and sign the memorials at once, and on the 25th of January, mail them for Washington, directed to J. Q. Adams, or the member from your district. If the circulation be completed sooner, no matter: *on that day, not before*, put them in the mail. If it be not then completed, no matter, put what you have, and the remainder afterwards.

N. B. Let *adults* only sign the memorials. Let ladies and gentlemen sign *separate* memorials. Let the memorials be the sum in each place for all united in one memorial; and the signatures of the ladies in another. Let each of each memorial, and on the back of it, write, in large and legible characters, the name of the first signer, the number of signers, the date, and the place—thus—' Petition of A. B. and others for remonstrating against the resolution of December 21st, 1837.'

4. The fourth thing to be done is to make the United States aware, in the most emphatic manner, speak the same language, in regard to the resolution of December 21st, that it did, at its instance, in regard to the resolution of January 18th—and speak it, too, in the same way. Circulate and sign memorial No. 2, at once, and send it in your representatives in the State Legislature, without delay.

Men and women of Massachusetts, the work is before you—shall it be done? Or shall your sympathy and silence doom you to slaves? The answer is with you.

To the Honorable the House of Representatives of the United States.

The undersigned of in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, have learned with astonishment and alarm, that your honorable body did, on the 21st of December last, adopt a resolution in the words following, to wit:

Resolved, That all memorials, petitions, and papers, touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling, or transfer of human beings, shall be laid upon the table, without reading, or reference, or printing, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

Your memorialists regarding said resolution as a violent denial to the people of the right of petition for a redress of grievances, a violation of the true intent and meaning of the Constitution of the United States and Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and as an assumption of authority, at war with the fundamental principles of our republican government, destructive of the rights of the people, an insult to their sovereignty, and dangerous to the Union of the States: do, therefore, respectfully and earnestly request your honorable bodies to PROTEST, without delay, in the name of THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, and of THEIR SOVEREIGNTY, against said resolution,—and to invoke the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Senate of the United States, to RESCIND it. And your memorialists further ask that a copy of said protest and invocation may be sent, as soon as possible, to each of the Senators and Representatives of this Commonwealth in Congress, to be by them laid before that body.

ADELPHIC UNION.

Rev. Mr. Adam, of Newburyport, will lecture before the Adelphic Union on Tuesday evening next at the Sixth Church School-House, Belknap St. Subject—Slavery—Science commence at 7 o'clock.

NOTICE.

Providence permitting, the regular quarterly meeting of the Adelphic Union will be held at Marlboro' Chapel, on Wednesday next, Jan. 10, at 3 o'clock, at the Marlboro' Chapel, near of the Marlboro' Hotel, Washington St. Friends and attendance is expected.

By order of the Board,
Jan. 4, 1838. M. Y. HALL, *Rec. Sec.*

THE PROVINCE OF WOMAN.

NOW IN PRESS, and will soon be published, "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes, and the Condition of Woman." Addressed to Mary S. Parker, President of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, by S. M. Grimke.

Orders for this work are solicited, as not many more copies will be published, than are ordered by the 20th of January. Price, twenty-five cents single copy—$2.40 per dozen—$16 per hundred. Paper covers, 20 cents single copy—$2.00 per dozen—$14.00 per hundred.

---

in Bishop, indignation when he of Stephen, ecrated the by, carry to on earth, hold, they hates men, zeal, and ge victim of the spirit of as a Christ, waiting his d unshaken, implation of ted.' I am time of my ight a good have kept, up for me a

is of brotherhood, ing his life, fled the country." ty, then the prehended fed on the overted on ose personal, ilding, cruel, ever believed believe that t, and there, and cannot hen, human hold prop, ty give me ithout criminal ment; sore- cannot mean a mangled ' equal guilt, ' and, mean be inflexibly We carry ters, they are ness is with ately abhorrent ster sensibility ment. But high is said of great and flection will Principles persons may illy to defend to defend bnoxious, in raced thus e clearly unsuitable ressedly take thous, in my to a sacrifice man is pro- advocate of a martyr to ing, unrestrictedly principles, ly, for which is ht to under- ny man's life rod is Truth, 17th annual madness! and who are com- to them, but therefore of the Christian ith in the fun- which is ba- every human a rational ' is so strong, the most con- ed women in ts have been others would Our cause is can neither be

of Peace,
S. M. G.

---

n. 15, 1837.

---

remarks re- other Lovejoy suitable time peace question

---

n on the minds the meeting is adopted by American An- that a large at Convention y means,) lish the fact to elves solemnly resistance, as also true, that e convention, as to the anti- weapons, and ubscribe their n understand- , were permit- nding, that as ve embarked pons of death ch weapons to f the slaves re- independence, ny way, physi- legal way, as property. Now vention seem self constitute will never re- circumstances, ge character of have since un- Slavery Society. ciples are ob- the American is a mistake, ' was the act of , and of them afterward rel- ; and in that it would attack The Conven- Slavery Society, convention, ty of set forth the , in one sense, one afterwards, document asy de-resistance, ' The right then, as well as pledged in the Constitution is ate of the case, misapprehension the 'signers' to on that subject, hem have vio- to have be- informed of the the Declaration, at all recent in n, and, who sin- tic them, only ', and that such ', I feel anxious

---

this important subject should be fully discussed in your paper. It can be done without offence to any of the readers; and I believe abolitionists generally, on both sides the question, would be glad to know what they are at present on neither side, would require to see the arguments, for and against, on the Peace question.

Wah regard to the gagged to Lovejoy, I believe he offered himself a Peace man; and yet, when he apprehended that the destruction of his press a fourth time would be followed by the triumph of lawless violence, and the ruin of Illinois, and ultimately lead to the loss of thousands of lives, he considered that it would not be wrong to make a resistance, although he knew it might result in the death of few individuals. In this I think he was a great mistake, and the result appears to prove it. The brethren acted in neither the spirit nor the principle of Peace. The former would place war upon Christian ground, and the latter would have led them to resist, as they might have done, scores of the rioters. In my judgment, they acted as permitted violents. In my judgment, the latter gave up his principle to show such a fullness of the folly of their using carnal weapons. But, for be it from me to say aught in any way unkind or severe against brethren who are so sincerely and conscientiously in the matter, or to cast any reproach upon the brother Lovejoy, who died as martyr in the cause of human rights. Hallowed be his memory!

In justice to the brethren at Alton, the following facts, just received from one who being a militia company at Alton, a volunteer company of about seventy individuals, was found, shortly before the attack upon the press, to protect the peace of the city, and to guard the press, in case the menaced attack should be made. This corps was composed of abolitionists and other citizens. The *magazine, stationed the corps of guard, went with them, and served a gun of defence*, &c. One half of the company were to be in the store each night. On the fatal night of the 7th Nov., it was thought that about seven o'clock, the whole number would be a sufficient number to protect the press. Each of these had two loaded guns, at least, with ammunition to fire many times. Two guns were fired into the store before any firing took place from the store. Some thought firing took place from the store. Some thought four or five guns were fired by the mob first, but that was there, is no doubt. On consultation made, it was agreed that two or three guns should be discharged at the same time, on the mob. One took effect, and Bishop was mortally wounded. Who killed him, cannot, of course, be known, nor is it important. Illinois presented, at this exigency, the killing of a large number of the assailants.

After dragging the wounded man off, and waving a full hour, during which the mob were stimulated freely with ardent spirit, they renewed the attack, but kept on the side of the store, stoning, firing at the windows or doors, and they were only the reach of the guns of those within the store. They, however, placed guards at different points, while other set of firing was not made, there, to shoot down any one who might leave the store. The persons in the store were stationed at different places. Mr. Lovejoy and another were posted at the corner door on the south side of the building, ready either to recommitted, and in a moment or two, were shot at by persons concealed behind some boards, at a distance of fifty or sixty feet. Mr. Lovejoy received five shot wounds, one in breast, three in the thighs in his body. Three balls were found in a post near by. They were retained into the store. They were carried up a part of stairs into the counting-room, exclaiming, 'I am shot, I am dead,' and he died!' He fell on his face, while one of the brethren was trying to catch him in his arms. They turned him over quickly, but saw that he was dead.

Mrs Lovejoy was not at home that night, nor did she see the corpse of her husband. The funeral was conducted publicly from the house of the deceased, which is upwards of half a mile from the city, and a considerable number attended, abolitionists and others. The heartbroken widow, with her only child, Elijah Parson Lovejoy, nearly two years old, has gone to her parents, Rev. Daniel French, at St. Charles. May the Lord bless them!

Yours, very truly,
LEWIS TAPPAN.

From the Emancipator.

SENATE SCRUTATE, DEC. 11, 1837.

Mr. British Green:

DEAR BROTHER—I have just perused, in the Emancipator, an account of the great meeting at the Tremont Temple, in the city of Boston, of the honorable death of brother Lovejoy; and a certain of our discourse on that occasion. The second Lyceum, at Philadelphia, the President of the Convention at Philadelphia that formed that society—have acted so conspicuous a part, I feel constrained, from my conscience, to forcibly as it is, as not only as I may be permitted to, my deep disapprobation of the course pursued by my brethren, in the case of our brother, Elijah Lovejoy. And I address this rebuke to you, dear brother, because you have given the influence of your high personal and official name to sentiments and measures which I feel, I fear, to the eternal condemnation of that great enterprise which aims at the peaceful emancipation of millions in bondage, from the yoke of slavery, as has ever been offered upon any of the human family.

Yes, my dear brother, I understand what I shall say, from the depth of feeling and of caring subject, I suppose that I do not appreciate as highly as I ought, the great principles for which brother Lovejoy contended, and I do not still regard them as of vital importance to the salvation of our country, and to the well being of man. You will not suppose that I have, in my heart, any feeling of prejudice against the faithful and fearless advocacy of those principles, the bloody sufferings of which at persecution on their behalf. And I trust, my dear brother, that you will not suppose that I have any feeling of pride, or of bitterness against, or that I regard with less or less affection than you do the conscientious course of his brother, Elijah Lovejoy. The character of Lovejoy is not in the least affected by the character of Alton. They are murderers, although he did not die as a martyr.

In verse his angelic nature it may seem in me presumptuous to censure. I must upon the conduct of my brother. Our Saviour, in prescribing the rules of the terms and faults of any one who is dead, he must be ready then should we be, it may be thought, to draw the first stone. Yet we are to be as wise as the serpent, and harmless as the dove. We are to be, in this case, in endeavor to protect, not a piece of mere property, or even a house, or even a few hundred dollars; but to protect from the destruction a sacred instrument, dreaded by tyrants and oppressors, who have darkness rather than light, and upon the free use of which, the preservation of our civil and religious liberties, and the continuance of the Union, under God, depends. It is for the very reason that his sufferings in the holy cause of freedom and humanity seem to have led so many to sympathize with the mob spirit, that I am manifested, that I am impelled to speak. Oh, my dear, it is because the end for which he was contending is so important, that I feel that any means by which he resorted to attain the end, if it be especially important that the sufficiency of the means to be expended. Love is the spirit of a true christian. Love, sacrifice to the welfare of others, is the spirit of a true christian faith, requires one to bear, if need be, wound the feelings of some whose bodies he may, I would gladly bind up; but sure am I that he would not to see such a wound inflicted upon his Savior as has been inflicted at Alton, in the bodies of his friends, and keep silent. What is there distinctive in the religion of Jesus, if it be not, that it teaches us to love our enemies, to do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us? What is there peculiar in the example he has left us, if it be not that they never repelled injury by violence, but sought to overcome the evil dispositions of their enemies by forbearance and kindness? When they were reviled, they reviled not again; and when they suffered, they did not even threaten the persecutors. What is there especially admirable in the conduct of our Lord, if it be not that, even in the hour of his cruel and ignominious death, he showed no resentment, but prayed for the persecutors of his enemies? The object of Christ was, and, if we are truly his followers, our object will be, not to intimidate wicked men, so that they will not dare to do evil, but to win them, so as to change their hearts, so that they will no longer feel hatred, but love and obey it. How very different, in our view, is this conduct from the character of Jesus and of his religion, if he had died *fighting* in defence of his person, or of his doctrines! We recoil from the thought. And yet I would fain imagine, it may be justified, on christian principles, in making violent defence, if our master himself might not! He knew that his war just, and that his cause would be promotive of the happiness of mankind. He might easily have overthrown his prosecutors. He might have smitten them to the ground with a word of his mouth, or he might have summoned twelve legions of angels to his rescue. But he offered no physical resistance; thus, as it seems to me, settling the question for ever, that, in cause, however just and important, and no life, however valuable, may (on christian principles) be defended by force and arms. He answered I will under an ever-burning conviction of truth and duty, when I add, that brother Lovejoy, in the hour of his death, fearfully violated a distinctive principle of the Christian religion—a principle that ought to be assiduously incul ated upon all the injured and outraged slaves, and by which all who plead for their emancipation should impulsively govern themselves. If while laboring in his office, or walking in the street, or sitting in his house, he had been attacked by a mob, whether the sudden impulse of that dread of death or injury which is instinctive in man, he had seized the first thing he could lay his hand upon, and had inflicted a direct blow, he would have violated christianity might have justified us in classing his offence among the sins of infirmity. But when we hear of the preparation he made for the fatal blow, we must, I think, pronounce it a deliberate offence against the laws of that master he professed to serve. You have called him a martyr, and likened him to Stephen. But did Stephen throw stones at the mob that pelted him to death? You have called him a martyr; then were these men martyrs who were killed in the war of Independence.

It was especially incumbent upon the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, to publish the proceedings of the meeting at Boston, issued by our ill-advised brother Lovejoy and his associates. In the third article of the constitution of the society, where it is declared that we will never, *in any way*, countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force. Now, in what other way can we, with any fully countenance and encourage them in resorting to force, as by resorting to it ourselves? And have not the Executive Committee, by their silence, countenanced such a deed, and the style in which they have spoken of it in the Emancipator, virtually sanctioned brother Lovejoy's procedure, and thus made themselves responsible for it?

But that you, dear brother, the President of the Convention at Philadelphia, should so far forget yourself as the eulogist of our misguided fellow-laborer, and not have uttered one word of censure upon his conduct in opposing force, like to the most alarming inconsistency of which we have any of us been guilty. Your name, and mine, and many others, some of the members of the Executive Committee, are appended to that Declaration of Sentiments, which commences with a contrast between the principles and conduct of the American Revolutionists, and of the enterprise in which we had embarked; and closes with a solemn pledge of our selves to resume the peaceful abolition of slavery. Some who are the most interested in our interests, our reputations—whether we live to witness the triumph of liberty, Justice and Humanity, or perish unnoticed in the struggle, are looking to us for sympathy and by cause.' When we signed that Declaration, did we mean by pursuing as martyrs, persisting as Brutus, in the use of carnal weapons in our own hands? You know we did not. Are we willing that hence forth our countrymen should understand that we mean by our pledge, to resume the liberty of speech, and the freedom of the press? to *fight* in the cause of the oppressed? Such is the construction, which, if we mean to be true to our pledge, is too much property, upon the manner in which you and others have treated the Alton battle. Pause, dear brother, and reflect what would have been the effect, if Executive Committee to read some of their works, before it be too late, and avert the disastrous effects of their seemingly unpolished commendation of the conduct of the murderers of Lovejoy! If they do not approve and mean to sanction his course, let them say so, speedily, emphatically, that the cause of civil war may not in any wise be laid to their charge.

They and you profess to be christians. They and you stand at the head of anti-slavery, which we have solemnly declared should be prosecuted on christian principles; which be accomplished only by the potency of truth; which those spirit will prevail, *not by might, through God*, to the pulling down of strong holds. Are muskets spiritual weapons? Are powder and ball the instruments that God has ordained to the overthrow of error, the correction of sin, the establishment of righteousness? I am sure you do not so regard them. I have not forgotten, I shall never forget your impressive, prophetic speech at the close of the Convention at Philadelphia. How distinctly you foretold the calamities, the deplorable results, of precipitate, perhaps even the cruel deaths, we were going to encounter in the prosecution of the undertaking to which we had pledged ourselves. Not a intimation fell from your lips, that in the last extremity we were to resort to physical force—they were to be mighty, *

LITERARY.

For the Liberator.

THE FUGITIVE.

'Ye shall torture no more with the scourge and the chain,
For the fetter that bound and galled shall be rent in twain;
And I bring you the links with the blood-rust thereon,
A witness of deeds that the despot hath done.

'Away—and forever!—I spurn the control
That hath fettered my body, and seared my soul—
With the pride of a freeman I trample in scorn
The yoke that my neck hath too patiently borne!

'Ye may follow my track where the herbage is red,
For my foot have been bathed in the life-stream your dead—
Ye may follow my footsteps—but we for the hour
For your Gods and your Gospels are gift by a perilous power!

He spoke—and the triumph of vengeance was seen
In the flash of his eye and the pride of his mien,
And he muttered a curse on the land of the South,
While a smile of derision still played round his mouth.

One look on the spot which his hatred hath cursed,
And away, like a steed of the wild, he hath burst!
Exultant, he bounds over hill-top and plain,
And his foot spurns the earth with the pride of disdain.

No more shall the blood of the fugitive drip
All warmly and red from the overseer's whip—
No longer shall thrill on the fugitive's ear,
The threat of the master, the taunt, and the jeer.

Away to the land of the North!—for her star
Shall beacon thy course from its blue home afar—
Away, like the wind—pausing not to look back,
For the seeker of blood shall be quick on thy track!

Where the home of the planter magnificent stood,
There are desolatory ruins and desolate
The tone of the viol cross soft on the air,
Is the voice of the mourner—the wail of despair!

Wo! wo! for the lonely, the good and the brave,
By the wrinkled of vengeance swept down to the grave!
For the spoiler sweeps on like a demon of wrath,
And Massacre yelled in his hyena-strown path!

On the still air of midnight, a terrible cry,
Like the trumpet of Doom, called the sleepers—to die!
They awoke—but the prayer of their anguish was vain,
For the sabre is red with the blood of the slain!

When the Morning looked out from the East, with its ness,
The work of destruction and vengeance was done—
And the smoke, like a pall, wrapt the desolate scene,
Where the sunbeam darkly where Beauty had been!

Survival! Yet weep for the true and the flower
Swept down to the dust in a terrible hour!
For the strength that hath passed from the place where it stood!
For the light that was quenched in a tempest of blood!

Oh, this was the offspring of revenge and despotism?
When the father and yoke were too galling to bear—
For the iron had entered the fugitive's soul,
Till he spurned in his hatred the tyrant's scoul.

From his wife and his child they had torn him apart,
Unheeding the anguish that gnawed at his heart!
And he heard that the daughter he idolized, must
Be doomed to a life of pollution and lust.

Then the demon awoke—and he vowed in his wrath,
That the blood of the master should crimson his path,
And that Ruth would be avenged, the their desolate hearth,
Who had scoffed at his woe in the madness of mirth.

And dark was the hatred he nursed in his breast,
Till the thirst for revenge robbed his spirit of rest—
Then he swept o'er their home like a whirlwind of fire,
And Destruction trod close in the path of his ire!

Flow darkly, St. Ilis! for mixed with thy flood,
There are tears in the track of the Shedder of blood!
And thy waves have a tone like a funeral wail,
As they fling their low voice to the answering gale!

From his death-work the Slayer in triumph hath gone—
Weep, Land of the South! for his deed is done now!
Ay, weep! till thine eyeballs in agony swim,
For the cup of thy trembling is filled to the brim!

Dec. 8th, 1837. W. H. BURLEIGH.

From the Herald of Freedom.

LINES
TO THE MEMORY OF REV. ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY,

Who was slain at Alton, (Ill.) Nov. 7, 1837, while endeavoring to re-establish a FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, *which had been twice before destroyed.*

We mourn for thee, O brother,
Not as the mother may,
Who bereaved of her beloved
Hath cast down her head to weep in twain;
And I know not the links with the blood-rust thereon,
A witness of deeds that the despot hath done.

'Away—and forever!—I spurn the control
That hath fettered my body, and seared my soul—
With the pride of a freeman I trample in scorn
The yoke that my neck hath too patiently borne!

'Ye may follow my track where the herbage is red,
For my foot have been bathed in the life-stream your dead—
Ye may follow my footsteps—but we for the hour
For your Gods and your Gospels are gift by a perilous power!

He spoke—and the triumph of vengeance was seen
In the flash of his eye and the pride of his mien,
And he muttered a curse on the land of the South,
While a smile of derision still played round his mouth.

One look on the spot which his hatred hath cursed,
And away, like a steed of the wild, he hath burst!
Exultant, he bounds over hill-top and plain,
And his foot spurns the earth with the pride of disdain.

No more shall the blood of the fugitive drip
All warmly and red from the overseer's whip—
No longer shall thrill on the fugitive's ear,
The threat of the master, the taunt, and the jeer.

Away to the land of the North!—for her star
Shall beacon thy course from its blue home afar—
Away, like the wind—pausing not to look back,
For the seeker of blood shall be quick on thy track!

Where the home of the planter magnificent stood,
There are desolatory ruins and desolate
The tone of the viol cross soft on the air,
Is the voice of the mourner—the wail of despair!

Wo! wo! for the lonely, the good and the brave,
By the wrinkled of vengeance swept down to the grave!
For the spoiler sweeps on like a demon of wrath,
And Massacre yelled in his hyena-strown path!

On the still air of midnight, a terrible cry,
Like the trumpet of Doom, called the sleepers—to die!
They awoke—but the prayer of their anguish was vain,
For the sabre is red with the blood of the slain!

When the Morning looked out from the East, with its ness,
The work of destruction and vengeance was done—
And the smoke, like a pall, wrapt the desolate scene,
Where the sunbeam darkly where Beauty had been!

Survival! Yet weep for the true and the flower
Swept down to the dust in a terrible hour!
For the strength that hath passed from the place where it stood!
For the light that was quenched in a tempest of blood!

Oh, this was the offspring of revenge and despotism?
When the father and yoke were too galling to bear—
For the iron had entered the fugitive's soul,
Till he spurned in his hatred the tyrant's scoul.

From his wife and his child they had torn him apart,
Unheeding the anguish that gnawed at his heart!
And he heard that the daughter he idolized, must
Be doomed to a life of pollution and lust.

Then the demon awoke—and he vowed in his wrath,
That the blood of the master should crimson his path,
And that Ruth would be avenged, the their desolate hearth,
Who had scoffed at his woe in the madness of mirth.

And dark was the hatred he nursed in his breast,
Till the thirst for revenge robbed his spirit of rest—
Then he swept o'er their home like a whirlwind of fire,
And Destruction trod close in the path of his ire!

Flow darkly, St. Ilis! for mixed with thy flood,
There are tears in the track of the Shedder of blood!
And thy waves have a tone like a funeral wail,
As they fling their low voice to the answering gale!

From his death-work the Slayer in triumph hath gone—
Weep, Land of the South! for his deed is done now!
Ay, weep! till thine eyeballs in agony swim,
For the cup of thy trembling is filled to the brim!

Dec. 8th, 1837. W. H. BURLEIGH.

From the Herald of Freedom.

LINES
TO THE MEMORY OF REV. ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY,

Who was slain at Alton, (Ill.) Nov. 7, 1837, while endeavoring to re-establish a FREE RELIGIOUS PRESS, *which had been twice before destroyed.*

We mourn for thee, O brother,
Not as the mother may,
Who bereaved of her beloved
Hath cast down her head to weep in twain;
Or the children of her bosom
By the sword are swept away,—
Not as a nation mourneth
When her strong and mighty die,
And her banners torn and trodden
On the field of battle lie.

O we mourn as when the lily
Hath cast down its head in holy light,
And the angel's wings are sweeping
For his departing flight.
We mourn as when the Dove
Of a WORLD has been betrayed,
And at the feet of Violence
A PEOPLE'S RIGHTS are laid.

Fallen! a thousand voices
From by blood cries out to Heaven,
And in judgment and in terror
Shall an answer back be given.
The right arm of JEHOVAH
Shall be stretched forward in wrath.
And hail stones and coals of fire
Smite and burn along His path.

Through the deep glades of the forest,
Where the woodman's axe is heard,
Where the thick grass of the prairie
By a human foot is stirred,—
From the valleys to the hill-tops
Shall a thrilling cry go out,
And a thousand torrent water
Swell and render back the shout.

From the free land of the Pilgrims,
Sea-girt and mountain-girded,
From the mighty nation rises
Round thy sepulchre, O Penn,—
From the ocean lakes rock-girded,
As when a storm is nigh,
And the deep roar of its waters
Is gathered in the sky:—

Swift from the Western Highlands,
Where the red sun sinks behind,—
A strong sound, like the rushing
Of a great and mighty wind,
O'er the Alleghany sweeping
When the Manitou is near,
Shall be heard through all the regions
Where MAN is held a SLAVE!

A stern rebuke shall thunder
As if the heavens spake—
The voice which JEHOVAH uttered
In her indignation wake,
For Truth and Right the PULPIT
Shall raise its trumpet plea,
Said, blood inexpiable! Brother,
The PRESS shall still be free!

On the fresh mound heaped above thee,
Laying bow and bosom bare,
Kneeling, with no mockery,
Kneeling unto God in prayer,—
In reverence of purpose,
In the strength of Love and Faith,
We will bind ourselves together
Unto triumph or to death.

The spirit of our fathers
Is in our bosoms yet,
Our hearts are as unfaltering,
And our sinews as firmly set,
We will speak as we have spoken,
With our words uttered stilly,
With the INTELLECT forever
FREE FROM THE DESPOT'S WILL!

J. H. K.

SLAVERY TRIUMPHANT!

WELL, Land of Freedom! your honor is low;
'Tis bleeding in Liberty's desolate fane!
They whom ye trusted have bowed to the foe!
Oppression's proud banners are proudly again!

Wake, sons of Freedom! your watchfulness is stained!
The land of the free has been basely profaned;
Again hath the tyrant prevailed on her shores!

Hasta! sons of Freedom! the tocsin sound!
Rouse! rouse! ye true hearts! your banners unfold!
Ye fight shall break forth as the morning sun!—
Your cause 'like a river' that flows to the sea.

EQUAL RIGHTS.

ON THE PROVINCE OF WOMAN.

LETTER I.

Amesbury, 7th Mo. 11th, 1837.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—In attempting to comply with thy request, to give my views on the Province of Woman, I feel that I am venturing on nearly untrodden ground, and that I shall advance arguments in opposition to a corrupt public opinion, and to the perverted interpretation of Holy Writ, which has so universally obtained. But I am in search of truth; and no obstacle shall prevent my prosecuting that search, because I believe the welfare of the world will be materially advanced by every new discovery we make of the designs of Jehovah in the creation of woman. It is impossible that we can answer the purposes of our being, unless we understand that purpose. It is impossible that we should fulfil our duties, unless we comprehend them; or live up to our privileges, unless we know what they are.

In examining this important subject, I shall depend solely on the Bible to designate the sphere of woman, because I believe almost every thing that has been written on this subject, has resulted from a misincorporation of the simple truths revealed in the Scriptures, in consequence of the false translation of many passages of Holy Writ. My mind is entirely delivered from the superstitious reverence which is attached to the English version of the Bible. King James's translators certainly were not inspired. I therefore claim the original as my standard, *believing that to have been inspired*, and I also claim the right to judge for myself in the meaning of the inspired writers, because I believe it to be the solemn duty of every individual to search the Scriptures for themselves, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, and not be governed by the views of any man, or set of men.

We must first view woman at the period of her creation. 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them.' In all this sublime description of the creation of man, (which is a generic term including man and woman,) there is no one particle of difference intimated as existing between them. They were both made in the image of God; dominion was given to both over every other creature, but not over each other. Created in perfect equality, they were expected to exercise the vicegerence intrusted to them by their Maker, in harmony and love.

Let us pass on now to the recapitulation of the creation of man—'The Lord God formed man of dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. And the Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone, I will make him an help meet for him.' Heaven and earth swarmed with animated beings capable of natural affection, as we know they still are; it was not, therefore, merely to give man a creature susceptible of living, obeying, and loving him, for all this the animals could do and did do. It was to give him a companion, *in all respects* his equal; one who was like himself a *free agent*, gifted with intellect and endowed with immortality; not a mere bundle of his animal gratifications, but able to enter into all his feelings as a moral and responsible being. If this had not been the case, how could she have been an help meet for him? I understand this as applying not only to the parties entering into the marriage contract, but to all men and women, because I believe God designed woman to be an help meet for man in a general and perfect work. She was a part of himself, as if Jehovah designed to make the oneness and identity of man and woman perfect and complete; and when the glorious work of their creation was finished, 'the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.'

This blissful condition was not long enjoyed by our first parents. Eve, it would seem from their history, was wandering alone amid the bowers of Paradise, when the serpent met with her. From her reply to Satan, it is evident that the command not to eat 'of the tree that is in the midst of the garden,' was given to both, although the term man was used when the prohibition was issued by God. 'And the woman said unto the serpent, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.' Here the woman was exposed to temptation from being with whom she was unacquainted. She had been accustomed to associate with her beloved partner, and to hold communion with God and with angels; but of satanic intelligence, she was in all probability entirely ignorant. Through the subtlety of the serpent, she was beguiled. And 'when she saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat.'

We next find Adam involved in the same sin, not through the instrumentality of a supernatural agent, but through that of his equal, a being whom he must have known was liable to transgress the divine command, because he must have felt that he was himself a free agent, and that he was restrained from disobedience only by the exercise of faith and love towards his Creator. Had Adam tenderly reproved his wife, and endeavored to lead her to repentance instead of sharing in her guilt, I should be much more ready to accord to man that superiority which he claims; but as the facts stand disclosed by the sacred historian, it appears to me that to say the least, there was as much weakness exhibited by Adam as by Eve. They both fell from innocence, and consequently from happiness, and from purity.

Let us next examine the conduct of this fallen pair, when Jehovah interrogated them respecting their fault. They both frankly confessed their guilt. 'The man said, the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat. And the woman said, the serpent beguiled me and I did eat.' And the Lord God said unto the woman, 'Thou will be subject to thy husband, and he will rule over thee.' That this did not allude to the subjection of woman to man is manifest, because the same mode of expression is used in speaking of the death of Abel. The truth is that the curse, as it is termed, which was pronounced by Jehovah upon woman, is a simple prophecy. The Hebrew, like the French language, uses the same word to express shall and will. Our translators having been accustomed to exercise lordship over their wives, and seeing only through the medium of a perverted judgment, very naturally, though I think not very learnedly, very kindly, translated it *shall* instead of *will*, and thus converted a prediction to Eve into a command to Adam; for observe, it is addressed to the woman and not to the man. The consequence of the fall has been immediate struggle for dominion, and Jehovah foretold which would gain the ascendency; but as he created them in his image, as that image manifestly was not lost by the fall, because it is urged in Gen. 9:6, as an argument why the life of man should not be taken by his fellow man, there is no reason to suppose that sin produced any distinction between them as moral, intellectual and responsible beings. Man might just as well have endeavored by hard labor to fulfill the prophecy, thorns and thistles will the earth bring forth to thee, as to pretend to accomplish the other part of it, 'and thy desire shall be to your husband.' Man has been asserting dominion over his wife,

> 'Authority usurped from God, not given.
> He gave him only over beast, fish, fowl
> Dominion absolute; that right he holds
> By God's donation; but man is no woman,
> He made not her, made so adorn for man,
> Reserving human left from human free.'

Here then I plant myself. God created us equal;—he created us free agents;—he is our Lawgiver; our Judge; our Redeemer. In him woman is human bound to be in subjection, and to him alone is she accountable for the use of those talents with which her Heavenly Father has entrusted her. One is her Master even Christ.

Thine for the oppressed in the bonds of womanhood,

SARAH M. GRIMKÉ.

WOMAN SUBJECT ONLY TO GOD.

LETTER II.

Newburyport, 7th mo. 17, 1837.

MY DEAR SISTER,—In my last, I traced the creation and the fall of man and woman from that state of purity and happiness which their beneficent Creator designed them to enjoy. As they were one in innocence, their chastisement was the same. 'So God drove out *the man*, and he placed at the East of the garden of Eden a cherubim and a flaming sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life.' We now behold them expelled from Paradise, fallen from their original loveliness, but still bearing on their foreheads the image and superscription of Jehovah; still invested with the moral responsibility, the intellectual powers, and immortal souls. They had incurred the penalty of sin, they were shorn of their innocence, but they stood on the same platform side by side, acknowledging no superior but their God. Notwithstanding what has been urged, woman I am aware stands charged to the present day with having brought sin into the world. I shall not repel the charge by any counter assertion, although, as I have before hinted, Adam's ready acquiescence with his wife's proposal, does not savor much of that superiority *in strength of mind*, which is arrogated by man. Even admitting that Eve was the greater sinner, it seems to me man might be satisfied with the dominion he has claimed and exercised for nearly six thousand years, and that more true nobility would be manifested by acknowledging one particle of difference intimated as existing between them. They were both made in the image of God; dominion was given to both over every other creature, but not over each other. Created in perfect equality, they were expected to exercise the vicegerence intrusted to them by their Maker, in harmony and love.

Let us pass on now to the recapitulation of the creation of man—'The Lord God formed man of dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. And the Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone, I will make him an help meet for him.' Heaven and earth swarmed with animated beings capable of natural affection, as we know they still are; it was not, therefore, merely to give man a creature susceptible of living, obeying, and loving him, for all this the animals could do and did do. It was to give him a companion, *in all respects* his equal; one who was like himself a *free agent*, gifted with intellect and endowed with immortality; not a mere bundle of his animal gratifications, but able to enter into all his feelings as a moral and responsible being. If this had not been the case, how could she have been an help meet for him? I understand this as applying not only to the parties entering into the marriage contract, but to all men and women, because I believe God designed woman to be an help meet for man in a general and perfect work. She was a part of himself, as if Jehovah designed to make the oneness and identity of man and woman perfect and complete; and when the glorious work of their creation was finished, 'the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.'

This blissful condition was not long enjoyed by our first parents. Eve, it would seem from their history, was wandering alone amid the bowers of Paradise, when the serpent met with her. From her reply to Satan, it is evident that the command not to eat 'of the tree that is in the midst of the garden,' was given to both, although the term man was used when the prohibition was issued by God. 'And the woman said unto the serpent, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.' Here the woman was exposed to temptation from being with whom she was unacquainted. She had been accustomed to associate with her beloved partner, and to hold communion with God and with angels; but of satanic intelligence, she was in all probability entirely ignorant. Through the subtlety of the serpent, she was beguiled. And 'when she saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat.'

We next find Adam involved in the same sin, not through the instrumentality of a supernatural agent, but through that of his equal, a being whom he must have known was liable to transgress the divine command, because he must have felt that he was himself a free agent, and that he was restrained from disobedience only by the exercise of faith and love towards his Creator. Had Adam tenderly reproved his wife, and endeavored to lead her to repentance instead of sharing in her guilt, I should be much more ready to accord to man that superiority which he claims; but as the facts stand disclosed by the sacred historian, it appears to me that to say the least, there was as much weakness exhibited by Adam as by Eve. They both fell from innocence, and consequently from happiness, and from purity.

Let us next examine the conduct of this fallen pair, when Jehovah interrogated them respecting their fault. They both frankly confessed their guilt. 'The man said, the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat. And the woman said, the serpent beguiled me and I did eat.' And the Lord God said unto the woman, 'Thou will be subject to thy husband, and he will rule over thee.' That this did not allude to the subjection of woman to man is manifest, because the same mode of expression is used in speaking of the death of Abel. The truth is that the curse, as it is termed, which was pronounced by Jehovah upon woman, is a simple prophecy. The Hebrew, like the French language, uses the same word to express shall and will. Our translators having been accustomed to exercise lordship over their wives, and seeing only through the medium of a perverted judgment, very naturally, though I think not very learnedly, very kindly, translated it *shall* instead of *will*, and thus converted a prediction to Eve into a command to Adam; for observe, it is addressed to the woman and not to the man. The consequence of the fall has been immediate struggle for dominion, and Jehovah foretold which would gain the ascendency; but as he created them in his image, as that image manifestly was not lost by the fall, because it is urged in Gen. 9:6, as an argument why the life of man should not be taken by his fellow man, there is no reason to suppose that sin produced any distinction between them as moral, intellectual and responsible beings. Man might just as well have endeavored by hard labor to fulfill the prophecy, thorns and thistles will the earth bring forth to thee, as to pretend to accomplish the other part of it, 'and thy desire shall be to your husband.' Man has been asserting dominion over his wife,

> 'Authority usurped from God, not given.
> He gave him only over beast, fish, fowl
> Dominion absolute; that right he holds
> By God's donation; but man is no woman,
> He made not her, made so adorn for man,
> Reserving human left from human free.'

Here then I plant myself. God created us equal;—he created us free agents;—he is our Lawgiver; our Judge; our Redeemer. In him woman is human bound to be in subjection, and to him alone is she accountable for the use of those talents with which her Heavenly Father has entrusted her. One is her Master even Christ.

Thine in the oppressed in the bonds of womanhood,

SARAH M. GRIMKÉ.

ADMONITORY.

A meeting in favor of the Patriots in Canada was held in New York on Wednesday evening. The next morning the following handbill was circulated about the city:

MEETING IN BEHALF OF CANADA! The essence of Liberty consists in the Freedom of Discussion.

'Those who in quarrels interfere,
Must often wipe a bloody nose.'

A few facts from modern history for thinking and calculating Americans.

The King of France interfered in the American Revolution, not from the love of Liberty, but his hatred to England. Result—He revolutionized his own dominions, and lost his Crown and head.

Austria and Prussia interfered in the French Revolution. Result—Vienna and Berlin, their Capitals, were entered by victorious French armies.

Napoleon interfered with Russia, and marched a victorious army of half a million of men to Moscow. Result—Paris captured twice by invading armies.

Napoleon bent all his powers and all his energies to the subjugation of England. Result—He died a prisoner on England on the Rock of St. Helena. So much for the past.

PROPHECY!!!

Americans will interfere in the revolt in Canada. Results—A declaration of war against America by England.

An Alliance offensive and defensive between England and Mexico.

The Ocean swarming with British and Mexican Privateers.

British steam Frigates and Privateers on the great lakes, where they have little to lose and much to gain.

The Ports of Mexico defended by British Fleets and Garrisons.

An Army of Mexican Fleet and Army hovering on the South.

An expedition fitted out in the West Indies with an army of Free Blacks, to sympathize and take part with the two millions of Slaves in the Southern States, to conquer and free the abolitionists of the North.

The Indians in the West, removed from their native soil by force, raising the tomahawk and scalping knife on all their borders, and brought into the Western States on a frontier of a thousand miles,—and finally a dissolution of the Union!

So much for the interference in the quarrels of others; even if on understanding the question thoroughly you take the right side.

If you set your neighbor's house on fire, a change of wind may bring the flames you have kindled to your own dwellings.

England, at Peace with all the World, cannot, and will not, be treated in Canada, as Mexico was in Texas.

A treaty between nations is virtually a contract between all the individuals of each nation.—Americans, be honest, and fulfil your contract in the face of the whole world! You cannot honestly assist the enemies of England, even by words.

A FRIEND OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL.

New York, Dec. 27, 1837.

RANTING OF SLAVEHOLDERS.

The southern delegation which left the House on Wednesday afternoon, it is stated by the correspondent of the Boston Atlas, left it on the ex cit of Mr. Campbell, of South Carolina, after the vote to allow Mr. Slade to go on had been passed. Mr. Campbell stated in his place, that they had to retire to mature rooms, 'to devise ways and means for the emergency, and to take such steps as might be necessary to secure the safety of their rights.' The correspondent of the Boston Atlas says of this withdrawal:—

'J. Q. Adams was in high glee all the time. He is a sort of Napoleon in the House of Columbia, in the tent. Before Wise made the call, the thing had been arranged. Preston, of the Senate, was observed going about among the members of Congress (contrary to all rule) conversing and drilling.

'The Southern Convention, assembled in the room of the committee of Ways and Means, (which is a matter of jest with the Northern members. If is a mere re-enactment of the farce which took place last winter, when they plotted for a fortnight for more to escape from the Northern Hall.) In ranting and roaring of these southern chevaliers, deprives their doings of any dignity or weight. It is impossible for them to retire on the dignity. It is, at least it appears to be, the merest acting in the world; and very bad acting too. The passion is torn to tatters, and there is certainly a lack of sense and accomplishments, beat his breast and tore his hair like a madman. And all for what? He declared that he would commit Mr. Slade's project to be ridiculous and absurd, and he must needs get into this big passion because Slade invited him to go into the discussion! In the year 1830, Mr. Hayne, as the champion of the nullifiers, and the representative of the south, valiantly threw down the glove as follows:—'The Impression which is gone abroad of the weakness of the south, as connected with the slave question, exposes us to such contempt, that we have done no much injury, and is calculated to produce such infinite mischief, that I embrace the occasion presented by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts to declare, that we are ready to meet the question promptly and fearlessly: it is one from which we are not disposed to shrink in whatever form, or under whatever circumstances it may be pressed upon us. We are ready to make up the issue as to the influence of slavery on individual and national prosperity, and to maintain our rights as citizens either of particular States or of the United States. Sir, when arraigned at the bar of public opinion on this question, we are ready to stand up with conscious rectitude, plead not guilty, and put ourselves upon God and our country.' Such was the boast. Now he complains, (Preston,) that Slade quotes the declaration of independence, and argues in the House that all men are born free and equal, that God made a man and a woman, and a wife for the former, for the purpose of solemn deliberation!'

The following is an extract from the correspondence of the *Baltimore American*, dated Washington, December 18th.

PETITIONS.

In the House more than a thousand were presented, praying, among other things, for an act of Congress refusing hereafter to admit any state into the Union as a slave state, for the prohibition of the slave trade in the several states; for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the several territories of the Union. These petitions, in all numbering *four hundred and more*, were laid upon the table without discussion. The petitions were from the western states, and from the free states of the north.

Massachusetts sent in a hundred petitions praying all her members to vote against the gag, half a hundred more. Pennsylvania with another fifty. Half of them were from the women and children in the free states; and the fact is worth mentioning, that in almost all cases, a majority of the petitions for the abolition of slavery, &c. are from mothers and daughters, wives and children, of the free states.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

LIBERATOR.

VOLUME VIII.

The termination of the present year will complete the seventh volume of the Liberator; we have served, therefore, a regular apprenticeship in the cause of LIBERTY, and are now prepared to advance upon a more extended scale.

In commencing this publication, we had but a single object in view—the total abolition of American slavery, and, as a just consequence, the complete enfranchisement of our colored countrymen. We have, so far, adhered to that sublime result, we found the overthrow of the American Colonization Society to be indispensable,—containing, as it did, in its organization, all the elements of prejudice, caste and slavery.

In entering upon our eighth volume, the abolition of slavery will still be the grand object of our labors, though we shall not be confined to it, exclusively. There are other topics, which, in our opinion, are intimately connected with the great doctrine of inalienable human rights; and which, while they conflict with its immediate success, yet, ultimately, will prove favorable, with momentous consequences to the freedom, equality and happiness of mankind. There we shall discuss as time and opportunity may permit.

The main purpose of the Liberator, from the commencement of our moral warfare, 'OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.' We trust that it will be our only epitaph. In another motto we have chosen it, UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION. Up to this time, we have limited its application to those who are held in this country, by southern slaveholders, as marketable commodities, goods and chattels, and degraded accordingly. Henceforth, we shall use it in its widest latitude: the emancipation of our whole race from the dominion of man, from the thraldom of self, from the government of brute force, from the bondage of sin—and bringing them under the dominion of God, the control of an inward spirit, the government of the law of love, and into the obedience and liberty of Christ, who is 'the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever.'

We have seen, from our design, in conducting the Liberator, to require of the friends of emancipation, any political or sectarian shibboleth; though, in consequence of the general corruption of all political institutions and religious sects, and of the obstacles which they have thrown into the path of emancipation, we have been necessitated to reprove them all. Nor have we any intention,—at least, not while our prospects to be so unpopular and obnoxious, ultimately and immediately,—to assail or give the preference to any sect or party. We are bound by no denominational trammels; we are not of any political party; we have taken upon our lips no human creed; we are guided by no human authority; we cannot consent to wear the livery of any fallible body. The abolition of American slavery we hold to be COMMON GROUND, upon which we can all meet, whatever opinions and notions, if they have true humanity in their hearts, may meet on amicable and equal terms to effect a common object; but whoever marches on to that ground, loving his creed, or sect, or party, or any brother man, more than the emancipation of property, or friends, or wife, or children, or life itself, more than the cause of bleeding humanity,—or expecting to promote his political designs, or to receive his sectarian dogmas, or to drive others from the ranks on account of their modes of faith,—will assuredly prove himself to be unworthy of his abolition profession, and his real character will be made manifest in the end—for such principles and tests will be applied frequently: it will not be possible for him to make those sacrifices, or to endure those trials, which unbending integrity to the cause will require. For ourselves, we care not who is found upon this broad platform of our common nature: if he will join hands with us, in good faith, to undo the heavy burdens and break the yokes of our enslaved countrymen, we shall not stop to inquire, whether he is a Trinitarian or Unitarian, Baptist or Methodist, Catholic or Covenanter, Presbyterian or Quaker, Swedenborgian or Perfectionist. However widely we may differ in our views on other subjects, we will stand upon the platform of Mercy, the present palmy state of the anti-slavery enterprise, shall find support adequate to the expenses of our publication, and our subscribers be served. Of the seven years of warfare, six have been passed in struggling with pecuniary embarrassments, arising from the inadequacy of our subscription list, and from the oblivion which was attached to the Liberator in its infancy. These embarrassments have been aggravated by those delinquencies on the part of our subscribers, so common in all newspaper establishments—the sin of postponing more to the morrow, than is right, is a sin of most of the additional fifty cents. The Emancipator has sustained by the Parent Society, and the Friend of Man the New-York State Society, are afforded at a lower rate, consequently, they are better supported, and deserve all respect, and should be glad were we in a situation to do so generously by our subscribers. If ever we felt a conviction of the existence of the Liberator was needed to preserve the abolition cause from ruin, we believe it now. Our friends of any other anti slavery journal in this country; and it gives us great satisfaction to state, (and we presume the information will not be less gratifying to our enemies,) that, notwithstanding the unfavorable circumstances of other abolition papers, and the semi-abolition character which, we reject as many of the political and some of the religious newspapers are assuming—notwithstanding the ungenerous opposition, on the part of certain professed abolitionists, to prove if they could not suppress the Liberator, by making unprovoked and acrimonious sectarian quarrels and withdrawing subscription lists—notwithstanding the great pressure of the times, and particularly for the last six months, with unwary subscribers.

The pecuniary liabilities of the Liberator, as in the preceding departments, will hereafter be assumed by the publisher; and as it is doubtful whether (aside from the editor's expenses) he will be enabled to meet more than his current expenses, we hope that the friends of emancipation will be prompt and liberally to other, though as yet unknown sources. The cause good Providence which has thus far sustained him will still supply his necessities, if he fall not by the wayside.

Our motto, in the Revolutionary period of our country, from the first moment they saw the standard of the Liberator floating in the breeze of heaven, rallied around it—we have stood by it unflinchingly, though it has been carried into the hottest of the battle; to those kind benefactors, both colored and white, who, from time to time during seven years' strife for liberty and equal rights, have aided us, among a very, very exigent to publish our publication by reasonable donations, without which it must have long discontinued, to the joy and rejoicing of every southern slaveholder and northern abolitionist, we would tender our thanks, and not to be trumpeted in the car of the world, but to be repeaded by us in good faith, that God's rewards, for the advancement of the common cause; to those who have free discussions and free publication, we would say, we will be fearless, and we secret intimidate; to those who are willing renew with us another campaign against the giant Sin, we say, we will be faithful to our trust; to those who have cow-hearted, tender-hearted colored friends and acquaintances, in the good work of breaking human yokes and fetters, we have given to us their confidence, affection, prayers, the right hand of fellowship, and the blessings of many ready to perish,—who have never once faltered in their attachment to our support, no, not even when the standard of the Liberator first emblazoned, have turned against us, and have sometimes endeavored, both of soul and body, for time and eternity, to deserve to us than reputation, property, or life—to such we, will, we return our thanks for our long continued, and, we trust, mutual attachment, and we hope to be faithful unto death—knowing full well that He who is for us, is more than they who are against us—that the battle is the race, not the victory, and, that God, who is rich in mercy, is honor the glorious day when the song of the heavenly host, at the birth of Jesus, shall rise in a chorus to heaven, like the roll of many waters, from the lips of people of every tribe and tongue and nation, that the universal conquest and reign of that same JESUS, THE CRUCIFIED—*Glory to God in the highest; on earth, peace, good will toward men!*

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *Editor.*

ISAAC KNAPP, *Publisher.*

Boston, Dec. 1837.

ALMANACS.

THOSE who intend to obtain a supply of the Liberator Almanac for 1838, must send their orders soon. The season having so far advanced, a small quantity only will be left on hand. Orders for all orders, that may be received, will be filled immediately on their receipt. Price $20 per 100 only—or can be printed. Price $20 per 100 $1.50 per 100, 50 cents per dozen. Orders for any quantity, will be supplied by Isaac Knapp, 25, Cornhill.

Nov. 17.