

# THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND ISAAC KNAPP PUBLISHERS. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1833. NO. 45.

THE LIBERATOR IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT NO. 11, MERCANTILE HALL. WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS. Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance—two the end of six months, and the expiration of the year. All letters and communications must be post paid. The rate is imperative, in order to shield us from the frequent impositions of our enemies. Those, however, who wish their letters to be taken out of the Lib by us, will be careful to pay their postage. Agents who act for the Liberator are authorized to receive subscriptions for the Liberator. For every subscriber obtained by them for either public sale (payment being secured), a sixth copy will be allowed. Agents are desired not to remit less than \$5 per annum, unless they pay the postage. Yearly subscribers will be received for the Liberator—(terms \$1.00 in advance.)

- AGENTS.
- MAINE: Joseph C. Lovjoy, Bangor; Nabha Winslow, Portland.
  - NEW-HAMPSHIRE: Rufus C. Burdett, Dover; E. S. Gage, Acworth; E. S. Gage, Windham; Jonathan W. Peaslee, Lancaster.
  - MASSACHUSETTS: Charles Kimball, Newburyport; Harry Whipple, Newbury; Peter Little, Newbury; Benjamin Colman, Salem; Charles L. Remond, Lynn; Edward Johnson, Bedford; Edward J. Pompey, Nantucket; John F. Colman, Fall River.
  - VERMONT: John F. McCollam, Castleton.
  - CONNECTICUT: Henry F. Brown, Hartford; Alfred E. Cresson, Providence; Alford Nigier, New-Haven; Elizabeth T. Cresson, New-Haven.
  - NEW-YORK: Philip A. Bell, New-York City; Charles Marriott, Hudson; Nathaniel Mount, Poughkeepsie; William F. Griffin, Elmira; James W. Johnson, Buffalo; J. H. Hazard, Buffalo; Ervin Sackett, Watertown; John H. Thompson, Syracuse; Samuel M. Sweet, Geneva.
  - DELAWARE: Thomas M. Stinson, Wilmington.
  - NEW-JERSEY: Isaac Stiles, Newark; Joseph H. Francis, Trenton.
  - PENNSYLVANIA: Alexander H. French, Philadelphia.
  - OHIO: George Chester, Harrisburg; Robert C. Gordon, Jr., Carleisle; John Peck, Lewistown; Edward Rowley, Valley Mill; John Williams, Wilkesbarre.
  - INDIANA: George Cary, Cincinnati; James Hamilton, Spruce Vale; James H. Hamilton, Washington; William Hill, Hudson; Ezra Wright, Jr., Hutton; Orinias D. Heyd, Hutton.
  - KENTUCKY: Annals Shaw, New-Creek; Nathaniel Field, Jeffersonville.
  - ILLINOIS: Robert H. Stephenson, Greenville.
  - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Benjamin Lundy, Washington City.
  - UPPER CANADA: Austin Stewart, Wilberforce; Paula Brown, Colborneburg.
  - BRITISH DOMINIONS: Andrew Garrison, St. John, N. B.

est, of popularity, of human expediency, and of spiritual wickedness in high places. Yes, your paper is needed—it is needed, to arouse us from that stupidity to which we are so prone—it is needed to shed the light of moral truth upon our minds, dark by nature, darker by evil practice and evil maxims—it is needed to counteract the poison which is emitted by a thousand infidel presses—infidel presses? It is more needed to counteract the influence, the SLAVERY influence of the MILLIONS (!) PRESSSES!!

Sir, since recently awaking, more fully than heretofore, to the cause of human liberty, I am astonished to find the people of this part of this State, so generally in favor of slavery, of slavery as it is. But my wonder, as respects our citizens, in a measure ceases, since I hear them quoting the religious—not christian, in this respect—papers of our city and elsewhere. "Dear sir, will you assure the editors of those papers that their labors against emancipation are not in vain? Tell them that their readers, the christian community, from whom suffering humanity most reasonably looks for aid, are not succeeding in their sonnings of their editors—spiritual guides!—('if the blind lead the blind')—that slavery in the abstract is a bad thing—that is, they are contending that slavery, as it is, is evil; but slavery, as it is, is not, is right; their encouragement, remind them, that each rising sun which lights them to the selection and penning of arguments against emancipation, lights millions of our protesting brethren to their sufferings, in the field of toil and sweat, and scourging and bloodshed. Remind them, dear sir, that every day which brings to them and us so many comforts, brings to the millions of bondmen the degradation, and brings into an existence of bondage THOUSANDS more of our brethren—while, perhaps by our efforts against emancipation, one slave may each day be emancipated. Remind our editors, that each succeeding effort against the spirit of emancipation, which will succeed in keeping the present millions of enslaved in that brutalized state which makes the chief argument in support against their emancipation, and that on millions after millions yet unborn, their efforts may work their influence, and be successful in quenching the light of reason, in obliterating, as far as possible, the properties of the human soul, and in keeping them from coming to Him, who came a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in him may not abide in darkness, but have the light of life.

LETTER FROM DR. MACK. We recommend to our readers, and especially to editors of religious newspapers, a careful perusal of the following. They may be assured that it expresses a feeling by no means peculiar to the individual writer.

## LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

London, Sept. —, 1833.

MY DEAR GARRISON: You will readily allow, after the experience you have lately had in this country, that Englishmen are skilful adepts in the art of taxation. The fact is, it is in our bone; and we should as soon think of ceasing to be, as to cease taxing and being taxed. In conformity, then, with constitutional habits, it is my intention to levy a tax on you, nor shall the broad waters of the Atlantic, nor your republican institutions, nor your anti-taxation propensities, avail you against the payment in full of my demands. Be it known, then, by these Presents, and for the reasons which hereafter follow, that I begot you are declarable, and you are to consider yourself liable, to such demands on your time and patience, as we, the people of England may think fit to advance. My first levy will be for ten minutes' attention. The reasons for this you will please reduce to form from the following statement. On Friday, the 23d inst. I was in the good city of Ipswich, and was invited to spend the evening with a party of christian Friends, most of all of whom were favorable to Elliott Cresson and his scheme. The Party consisted of a number of one gentleman, containing Cresson's replies to your queries, and his answers appeared to be generally satisfactory to those who were present. Without knowing what were my opinions, I was asked by him what I thought of the American Colonization Society? My answer was prompt, and to the effect that it was one of the most infamous and iniquitous institutions ever raised to perpetuate one of the worst evils which ever afflicted the human race—slavery; and that some of the leading abolitionists of this country having now discovered its true character and tendency, had solemnly protested against it; and that every possible effort should consequently be made by the friends of humanity and religion here, to identify its progress, and to neutralize the efforts of its agents, if then, unexpectedly to my details, and recomme. Your reply to Cresson's Jesuitical statements. The discussion led to favorable results, and had scarcely been finished, when a gentleman, one E. Cresson, a medical officer, Commissioned, joined us, and pulling a letter out of his pocket, said, I have received this from our friend Cresson; he is at Bury St. Edmunds, and wishes a conveyance to be sent there for him; he is getting on well; he wishes when here to have a public meeting, and says that he intends after that to leave in a few days for the United States. This gentleman was then led into the secret that I had been opposing his hero, and, I discovered, little difficulty with this wealthy man; but after expressing his astonishment at some of my statements, appeared to regret that he had ever contributed any thing towards the American slavery perpetuation Society. The next stage in our evening's engagement, brought us to our communications from Cresson! In his impatience to enjoy the society of his good friends and coadjutors in Norwich, he had hastened forward that day, and was then at the Angel Hotel, anxiously expecting his friends, with whom he had before been in communion, to welcome him. Before that gentleman left, I urged him the importance of holding the public meeting, engaging myself to be present at it, without cost to the Norwich Friends, in order that I might have an opportunity of refuting the pretensions and mis-statements of Cresson. He, however, thought it would be inconvenient, if not impossible, to do so. Several gentlemen of the party then requested him to present their respects to E. C. and to request that he would send me a meeting notice from the remainder of the evening, when we could fairly discuss points of difference, to which I added my great desire for the interview, but although we waited until near midnight, he did not come; and from my own tardiness, I had not time to attend the meeting having been held for the *second last public affair* that individual in this country, I suppose he was again governed by his friends, and sheltered himself under the unmanly, unworthy and ridiculous pretext, that he would not let him. I left all the Tracts I had with my Norwich friends, among whom we shall hereafter have some who will exert themselves in the cause of outraged humanity and insulted religion. I have heard that E. Cresson stings on our shores; that he has been in London, and will be here in a few days; but the particulars of his movements will be given you hereafter.

My dear Garrison, go on in your work of Faith and labor of Love, though you have met with many of your great and the mighty, their influence on our shores; that he has been in London, and will be here in a few days; but the particulars of his movements will be given you hereafter.

MY DEAR GARRISON:—Allow me to congratulate you upon your safe return to the choral chair, not because it has not been well filled in your absence; in the contrary, it has been sustained with an ability, a devotion, and a sincerity, highly creditable to the worthy gentleman, whose name you have just mentioned; and which is a great extension of the cause of freedom in this country. Sir, the joy of your successful mission to me is twofold. Having been among those who advocated, to the utmost of my humble wisdom, human rights, and who I am not so much for the purpose of soliciting money

of the British people for the objects specified in your mission, as being there at a time when the great question of emancipation was under full consideration; I was led to believe that the example of the United States would, as it did, present a stumbling block to the execution of any plan, however well conceived or innocuous in practice, that might be brought forward by the combined efforts of the good and great philanthropists of that country.

## LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

London, Sept. —, 1833.

When the Emancipation Bill was presented to the House of Commons of Great Britain, among the most prominent objections urged against its passage were those that stand forth to the everlasting stigma of Sir Robert Peel, who stated that notwithstanding ALL THE CARE that the United States had bestowed upon their free colored population, to elevate them to the condition of men, and to a liberal participation in all public judgments, they had sunk to a degree of degradation far beyond redemption. This thing of place doubtless drew his inferences of kindness from the far famed meeting of New-Haven, at which the dignified Judges composed the dignity of their stations, and appeared to participate for the purpose of giving effect and character to its proceedings, that have not yet ceased to reflect disgrace upon the republic; or from a more recent version of republican kindness, from the E.P. Convention of a Pious female, for attempting to improve the minds of colored females. (See trial and conviction of Miss Prudence Crandall, Canterbury, Connecticut.)

The Bill, however, contrary to the hopes of his illustrious friends, and the prayer of the House of Lords, in which another creature of circumstance was to be operated upon. This thing, I suppose, was much better paid for his slender statements, in regard to our free colored population than the other; for Sir Robert's assertions seem to have ceased with the passage of the Bill, but the former continues to persecute us with his miserable "PROTEST." The ignominy manifested by the noble Duke, upon this occasion, may account for the manner of representing him, adopted by British caricaturists—which is, by placing the head of Jackson, sir, for shrouding you with a long veil. I only wished to tell you that I am glad you have got home safely, and to inform you that we had a great meeting, last evening, 18th inst., for the mission to take leave of the good people of our city before they departed for Africa, with their "credentials for civilizing and christianizing" that continent, which he desired the prayers of the praying people of this beloved country. The other, who followed, said that the brother who had preceded him, having secured the prayers of the church, he was himself induced to ask a little more, which was a little more, (which, truly, is so in the estimation of such a tedious jaunt,) in redeeming Africa from her thraldom of ignorance and stone-worship. LEO. Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1833.

## ['FANATICS AND INCENDIARIES']

One of the most conclusive and convincing arguments wielded by our opponents against abolitionists, is the use of *nicknames*. It is a name, which is not only calculated to excite an antagonist, and one which is usually resorted to by angry children and silly disputants. The temptation to call names is so strong to resist, when passion rules and reason is banished, that it is not uncommon for abolitionists for the apostles of slavery and the advocates of African colonization, to apply the epithets '*fanatics*' and '*incendiaries*' to those who defend the precepts of the gospel, and the principles of the declaration of independence. If the apostle Paul were now to appear in his proper character, in republican America, and preach the truth with his wonted boldness, would he not be denounced as the worst of fanatics? If he spoke of practical abolitionism, of doing to others as we would wish others to do unto us—of undoing the heavy burden and letting the oppressed go free; and of not opposing to the evil a good, but of doing good to the evil; would he not be called a *'fanatic'* and a *'disturber of the union of the States'*? Such a '*patient fellow*' ought surely to be put down.

And what have abolitionists said or written inconsistent with what Paul preached and the Apostles practiced? Or is it more dangerous now to open our mouths for the dumb, and plead the cause of the widow and the fatherless, and those that have none to help them, than it was in olden time? Also for my countrymen to denounce the precepts of the Christian religion, and the plainest principles of natural right, are denounced as fanatic and incendiary! A country, too, loudly boasting of civil liberty and gospel light. The judicial blindness of a *'Egyptian darkness'*, that prevents a just view of the facts, is a more dangerous and all-important subject of slavery, are ominous of coming judgments. 'I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just, and which I apprehend will not sleep for ever.' It is for my country I mourn, when I see a deaf ear turned to the voice of truth, of justice, and humanity, and the admonitions of philanthropy, by the denunciations and opprobrious epithets. We do not fear for

## LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

London, Sept. —, 1833.

of the British people for the objects specified in your mission, as being there at a time when the great question of emancipation was under full consideration; I was led to believe that the example of the United States would, as it did, present a stumbling block to the execution of any plan, however well conceived or innocuous in practice, that might be brought forward by the combined efforts of the good and great philanthropists of that country.

When the Emancipation Bill was presented to the House of Commons of Great Britain, among the most prominent objections urged against its passage were those that stand forth to the everlasting stigma of Sir Robert Peel, who stated that notwithstanding ALL THE CARE that the United States had bestowed upon their free colored population, to elevate them to the condition of men, and to a liberal participation in all public judgments, they had sunk to a degree of degradation far beyond redemption. This thing of place doubtless drew his inferences of kindness from the far famed meeting of New-Haven, at which the dignified Judges composed the dignity of their stations, and appeared to participate for the purpose of giving effect and character to its proceedings, that have not yet ceased to reflect disgrace upon the republic; or from a more recent version of republican kindness, from the E.P. Convention of a Pious female, for attempting to improve the minds of colored females. (See trial and conviction of Miss Prudence Crandall, Canterbury, Connecticut.)

## ['FANATICS AND INCENDIARIES']

One of the most conclusive and convincing arguments wielded by our opponents against abolitionists, is the use of *nicknames*. It is a name, which is not only calculated to excite an antagonist, and one which is usually resorted to by angry children and silly disputants. The temptation to call names is so strong to resist, when passion rules and reason is banished, that it is not uncommon for abolitionists for the apostles of slavery and the advocates of African colonization, to apply the epithets '*fanatics*' and '*incendiaries*' to those who defend the precepts of the gospel, and the principles of the declaration of independence. If the apostle Paul were now to appear in his proper character, in republican America, and preach the truth with his wonted boldness, would he not be denounced as the worst of fanatics? If he spoke of practical abolitionism, of doing to others as we would wish others to do unto us—of undoing the heavy burden and letting the oppressed go free; and of not opposing to the evil a good, but of doing good to the evil; would he not be called a *'fanatic'* and a *'disturber of the union of the States'*? Such a '*patient fellow*' ought surely to be put down.

And what have abolitionists said or written inconsistent with what Paul preached and the Apostles practiced? Or is it more dangerous now to open our mouths for the dumb, and plead the cause of the widow and the fatherless, and those that have none to help them, than it was in olden time? Also for my countrymen to denounce the precepts of the Christian religion, and the plainest principles of natural right, are denounced as fanatic and incendiary! A country, too, loudly boasting of civil liberty and gospel light. The judicial blindness of a *'Egyptian darkness'*, that prevents a just view of the facts, is a more dangerous and all-important subject of slavery, are ominous of coming judgments. 'I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just, and which I apprehend will not sleep for ever.' It is for my country I mourn, when I see a deaf ear turned to the voice of truth, of justice, and humanity, and the admonitions of philanthropy, by the denunciations and opprobrious epithets. We do not fear for

## LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

London, Sept. —, 1833.

of the British people for the objects specified in your mission, as being there at a time when the great question of emancipation was under full consideration; I was led to believe that the example of the United States would, as it did, present a stumbling block to the execution of any plan, however well conceived or innocuous in practice, that might be brought forward by the combined efforts of the good and great philanthropists of that country.

When the Emancipation Bill was presented to the House of Commons of Great Britain, among the most prominent objections urged against its passage were those that stand forth to the everlasting stigma of Sir Robert Peel, who stated that notwithstanding ALL THE CARE that the United States had bestowed upon their free colored population, to elevate them to the condition of men, and to a liberal participation in all public judgments, they had sunk to a degree of degradation far beyond redemption. This thing of place doubtless drew his inferences of kindness from the far famed meeting of New-Haven, at which the dignified Judges composed the dignity of their stations, and appeared to participate for the purpose of giving effect and character to its proceedings, that have not yet ceased to reflect disgrace upon the republic; or from a more recent version of republican kindness, from the E.P. Convention of a Pious female, for attempting to improve the minds of colored females. (See trial and conviction of Miss Prudence Crandall, Canterbury, Connecticut.)

## ['FANATICS AND INCENDIARIES']

One of the most conclusive and convincing arguments wielded by our opponents against abolitionists, is the use of *nicknames*. It is a name, which is not only calculated to excite an antagonist, and one which is usually resorted to by angry children and silly disputants. The temptation to call names is so strong to resist, when passion rules and reason is banished, that it is not uncommon for abolitionists for the apostles of slavery and the advocates of African colonization, to apply the epithets '*fanatics*' and '*incendiaries*' to those who defend the precepts of the gospel, and the principles of the declaration of independence. If the apostle Paul were now to appear in his proper character, in republican America, and preach the truth with his wonted boldness, would he not be denounced as the worst of fanatics? If he spoke of practical abolitionism, of doing to others as we would wish others to do unto us—of undoing the heavy burden and letting the oppressed go free; and of not opposing to the evil a good, but of doing good to the evil; would he not be called a *'fanatic'* and a *'disturber of the union of the States'*? Such a '*patient fellow*' ought surely to be put down.

And what have abolitionists said or written inconsistent with what Paul preached and the Apostles practiced? Or is it more dangerous now to open our mouths for the dumb, and plead the cause of the widow and the fatherless, and those that have none to help them, than it was in olden time? Also for my countrymen to denounce the precepts of the Christian religion, and the plainest principles of natural right, are denounced as fanatic and incendiary! A country, too, loudly boasting of civil liberty and gospel light. The judicial blindness of a *'Egyptian darkness'*, that prevents a just view of the facts, is a more dangerous and all-important subject of slavery, are ominous of coming judgments. 'I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just, and which I apprehend will not sleep for ever.' It is for my country I mourn, when I see a deaf ear turned to the voice of truth, of justice, and humanity, and the admonitions of philanthropy, by the denunciations and opprobrious epithets. We do not fear for

STUART'S LETTER. It is hardly necessary to say that the situation of our readers to this production, which we have taken from the columns of the Liberator. The name of STUART, is a name of great repute, and is associated with the cause of philanthropy, both in Europe and America, and the productions of his pen are sought after by the friends of humanity, with feelings of no ordinary interest.





