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 in 6 months, if payment be delayed to the time of subscribing.

All letters and communications must be post paid or free to insure attention; to should be from the free subscribers, or their agents, or friends.

AGENTS.

Maine. John Winslow, Portland.

VERMONT.

John Rollins, Woodstock.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Eli Wright, Washington. Wm. Henderson, Hanover, Geo. Bowen, Groton. J. M. Wilder, Wm. Cooper, Northampton. Ira Ingersoll, Grafton. Wm. Southworth, Amesbury Mills, J. F. Nichols, Salem. Isaac Austin, Nantucket, Thos. Foster, Dedham. Francis Jackson, Boston. Elias Richards, Weymouth, Ezra Lincoln, Hingham. E. Kirk, Worcester. Chas. Shimmin, Springfield.

RHODE ISLAND.

Wm. Adams, Pawtucket.

CONNECTICUT.

Chas. W. Denison, Brooklyn, Thos. Kinne, Jr. Norwich.

NEW YORK.

J. Robert Chase, Rochester. B. G. Williams, N. Y. City, Geo. Mott, Thos. Van Rensselaer, Saml. Dutton, Cazenovia. Gerry Willis, Albany. Jas. C. Fuller, Skaneateles.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. P. Brown, Pittsburg. J. Hamilton, Russelville. R. H. Gibbons, Gettysburg. B. Kent, Andrew's Bridge. Jos. Bonsall, Pennsville. Wm. Evans, Westtown. West Grove.

OHIO.

C. P. Bolcombe, Cincinnati. Jos. Austin, Marlborough. J. Ewart, Salem. Lot Holmes, Columbiana.

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VIII. OUR WEAPONS IS THE WORLD, OUR COUNTERSIGN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 8.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS: FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1838.

COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

LETTER II.

HONORED FELLOW-CITIZEN:

Why are not our petitions read, referred, examined and reported upon in due form? The answer is obvious; no man in Congress will have the hardihood deliberately to proclaim before this country and the world, that the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia is compatible with the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the United States, and the fundamental principles of our Federal compact. They know that they would rather become the laughing stock of the world by their Jesuitical evasions or chicanery, or the detestation of mankind by openly justifying the most enormous atrocities and crimes—and so they hope to escape from the sentence of condemnation, by craftily transferring our petitions among the dark and impenetrable recesses of their Slave-Quarters.

We therefore tell them, that their wicked device shall not benefit or serve them. Our *petitions* shall be heard. To our *requisition* they shall respond. Our *cry* cannot be silenced. And our *prayer must and shall be granted*, in spite of all that Pro-Office Robbers can contrive, and Lynching Bible Stealers can execute, and destroyers of the printing press can threaten, and murderers of Ministers of the Gospel can accomplish. In the hands of the Samson of Truth, all their so goodly machinations are powerless as the two new cords which became as flax that was burnt with fire, when the Spirit of the Lord comes mightily for the deliverance of his servants, and the discomfiture of the unrighteous and Philistines.

As it is perfectly non-essential respecting the subject of the petition, so it is equally unimportant who and what may be the number of the petitioners. Much of the energy and vociferation of chivalry has been expended upon the multitude and character of the petitioners. At one time, it has been pronounced to be merely the temporary excitement of a few misguided 'fanatics;' but it is irrefragible, that they will assert that objection, cannot believe their own declaration, when they see a hundred, a thousand, and ten thousand, like the handwriting on the wall of the saloon that produced the change in impious Belshazzar's countenance, and 'troubled his thoughts, and loosened the joints of his loins, and made his knees smite one against another,' frighten those men who lift themselves up against the God of heaven. It is not the small army and the short roll of signatures which excite the alarm and wrath and fearful vengeance. It is the myriads of intercessions which they behold to the thunders of conscience, and the mandates of God. They there see the TEKEL, which is written upon themselves!

As you may not have time to analyze the *mile of names which lie under* your table, I would remind you that there are some hundreds of ministers of the Gospel of ten or twelve denominations, all of whom are bound by the most solemn obligations, to promulgate and maintain the doctrines of Christian truth and philanthropy, as far as they can discover it. To whom may be added thousands of church officers, who are animated by the same spirit, actuated by the same motives, and under similar responsibilities. After them are arrayed scores of thousands of Christians, banded together, in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace, all walking in 'the pathway of righteousness,' and 'holding forth the word of life.' You are also fully authorized to declare, that among all the scattered multitudinous hosts of petitioners, not one lyncher, or one mobbite, or one housebreaker, or one incendiary, or one murderer, can possibly be found; and more, not one of all that vast throng can be named, who does not unequivocally condemn all those lawless acts and felonies.

But you are daily scated among nominal legislators, who obstinately defend all those nefarious proceedings, as Christians, necessary and justifiable, if they are perpetrated to destroy the property, disgrace the reputation, torture the person, or extinguish the life of a citizen, who believes that a human being cannot be property; or, to use the slave-driver's '*odious and infamous*' phraseology, 'chattels to all intents and purposes whatever;' and that to attain such persons in the house of bondage, as the Presbyterian Confession of Faith affirms, renders the slaveholder a 'sinner of the first rank, and guilty of the highest kind of theft.'

But against no class of the petitioners have the chivalry of the South raged with such bitter virulence, as against the Christian women. Every epithet, expressive of ridicule and derisive contempt, which the slaveocracy and their ministerial hangers-on have incorporated in the envenomed harangues with which those woman-scourgers have insulted us, concerning our wives, and daughters, and mothers, and sisters.

That point admits of no illustrations. It is objected, in general, that women ought not to intermeddle with politics; and, in truth, it has been directly intimated, that women have no right to offer any petition to the legislature, except in reference to their own personal affairs as widows or single women, in cases where legislative interposition is requisite. In reply to that delusion, we contend that the subject of slavery is no more a political question than the subject of intemperance. It is a widely extended curse, fraught like Pandora's fabled box with multifarious evils, 'too numerous to mention;' and the same arguments against political slavery societies are equally valid against temperance associations; and there is no more reason why a woman should petition for relief from the miseries of drunkenness, than for redress for the agonies attendant upon unchastity. The attempt to persuade unthinking citizens that slavery is merely a political topic, is the cardinal deception, with which the slaveholders are striving to blind the eyes of the people. It is not a political question, any more than that it is an indescribably moral pestilence, which pervades all the ramifications of our confederacy, and which can only be extirpated by the same means through which all other moral evils are to be diminished and eradicated, by developing the iniquity of the transgression so evidently, that by the enlightenment of the public mind, and the enactment of suitable laws to abolish it, the direful effect may be prevented.

That slavery is not a political question, is self-evident from one fact; that your petitioners include men of all shades of merely political differences of opinion, which they will attach no importance to, when compared with the ineffably splendid inquiry—*Shall three millions of native American citizens be free?* In any case, the members who hold seats around you will find, that if their other discussions were noisy and incomprehensible as the confusion of tongues at Babel, yet upon this topic they all are 'of one language and of one speech,' and their voice is this—that their petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, *shall be received by Congress*, and more, THAT THEY SHALL BE GRANTED! It would be far preferable for them at once to assent with a good grace, to that which hereafter they will be obliged to transfer to their successors, who will derive double honor for consummating that glorious triumph of liberty, which the present race of slave-dealing chivalry, and their doughfaced competitors for public ignominy and the world's scorn, are apparently resolved not to complete.

Besides, among all the topics which can possibly be selected, to which American women are consistently devote their attention, and upon which they are bound to combine their energies, that of slavery is the most suitable. In the annals of the human family, it is believed, there is not the counterpart to the condition of female women in the United States. Several hundred thousand nearly of our female inhabitants are arrived at mature age, and as many more are hastening on to puberty, all of whom are doomed to the vilest debasement, ever the victims of ungovernable lust, and realizing the invariable dissolution of all the social relations, and the loss of all domestic privileges. In enormity, and extent, and continuance, that inordinate wickedness, the entire abrogation of the matrimonial covenant, and the consequent degradation of woman, are unparalleled in the history of mankind; for there is no tribe, however barbarous, who have lost all trace of that connubial obligation and bond, which the all-wise and all-merciful Creator himself instituted in the garden of Eden, when our race commenced its existence. But in this republic, the boasted land of freedom, law, intelligence, and christian morals and enjoyments—one fifth part of all our women are despoiled of all purity, and are subjected to every outrageous indignity.

To the brutal demand of any lawless white man, they are obliged to submit. By heart-rending tortures, they are coerced to their degradation, which, to every mind not regulated by Christian rule doom to be obliged to sacrifice their tenderest affections and conscientious purity. They are scourged, so that they are unable to conceal their inexpressible sensibilities. Or a husband's love, or a father's guardianship, a son's aid, and a brother's endearments, they are ever robbed. In short, they are merely human tools, to pander to the sensuality, and to gratify the impious lusts of human nature.

Hence the slave States are one vast arena of pollution, in which multiform fornication, incest, polygamy, adultery, with other uncleanness, and their inseparable crimes, are constantly perpetrated.

I shall not pause to inquire whether Mrs. Calhoun, or Mr. Preston, or Mr. King, or Mr. Hayne, or Mr. Patton, or Mr. Legare, or Mr. Wise, or Mr. Daughtery, or Mr. Bynum, or any other of the graphical delineation of slavery, as it now exists in the southern States, through all their bounds; with variations as to the enormity of the offences, but a perfect identity in the aggravated guilt.

Now, to pretend that our northern christian matrons and maidens have nothing to do with all that indescribable turpitude, is so absurd, that it requires no refutation; and it is alleged that they ought to have any opinion, or to express any objection respecting it, because it is a political topic, and women should have no connection with politics, may suit the latitude of a slave-driver's dominion, and the infected atmosphere which hovers over it; but it will not thrive among women who value the inestimable blessings of the nuptial relation, and who realize the purity and peacefulness of Jehovah's gracious appointment. Therefore, it is not only their privilege, but it is the hallowed duty of the women in the non-slaveholding States, to interpose their resolute claim for the emancipation of their sisters from the complex iniquities of slavery, which brutalizes the feelings, eradicates instinctive modesty and decorum, and exposes them to unceasing outrage and defilement. That women who will not plead for protection to Congress, which demands the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, is virtually an accessary to all the atrocities which are perpetrated upon the defenceless victims of lawless lust in the slaveholding States. It is hoped that they will continue to cry aloud and spare not, until the decree of impurity shall no more have its holocausts of virtuous female victims immolated upon its impious and death-dealing altar.

The grand cause, however, of all the scoffs and reproach which the slaveholders in Congress and their accomplices elsewhere upon the petitioning women, and the deeply realizing sympathy of the women of the northern women in the Christian churches is irresistible; and it is worthy of remembrance, that very few women sign those memorials, unless they are imbued with the spirit of the oppressed. In addition to which conviction, they are afraid of the effect which the pathetic remonstrances of the northern women may produce in exciting a resistable resistance, on the part of their male female associates, against the prolongation of that system of dissoluteness, which is equally loathsome and infamous, as it is ever exemplified around them. If the soft and sweet-toned complaints of our northern meek sisters fill the *rampant chivalry* of the South with dread, what would the trumpet-blast of their own thoughtful and conscientious domestic female relatives reverberate, did they dare to narrate their wretchedness, their disgust, and their forebodings?

That is the result which alarms the slaveocracy. They dread lest some of the more independent and magnanimous women, who reside in Virginia or Maryland, should copy the example of Sarah Grimke and Angelina Grimke, and openly unmask the secrets of that large jail for colored people, a slaveholder's plantation, and transform their exposure of its atrocities in open day, in the form of a petition to Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and fully aware that the spirit and act would be duly appreciated, and highly contagious, they know not but their wives and daughters would rise, in all feminine energy and demand, at least, that the natural rights of their sex should be respected, and the atrocious wrongs which they so long have endured, shall cease, henceforth and for ever. When this blessed morn arrives, there will be no more need of petitions to Congress. Mr. Patton will not be wanted as a cat's paw, to fulfil the treachery of others—our inherent privileges will no longer be trampled upon, and the scorn of the traitors to freedom—and your thrilling eloquence, on behalf of the rights of man and christian philanthropy, will not be silenced by the enemies of truth and of godliness.

With unfeigned respect, I am,

Your faithful fellow-soldier,

A PETITIONER.

From the Herald of Freedom.

TO THE HON. DANIEL WEBSTER.

Sir,—I perceive, by report of a discussion in your Senate on Mr. Calhoun's resolution; or rather an evasion of discussion; that Wm. C. Preston of S. Carolina threatened, if any abolitionist should come within the borders of that State, they would hang him. The reporter says, that 'every man who speaks, Webster and all, take care to disclaim all sympathy with the abolitionists, and generally denounce them in hearty terms.' This, sir, I could scarcely believe to be *all* true, but for the pregnant and significant fact, that Senator Preston dared to utter that felon threat in your presence, knowing, as *most likely* he did, where you came from, and amid what mountains you were born and bred. I have waited peradventure to hear in awful reproof of that miscreant threat, the indignant rebuke that spoke of 'home-bred rights and fire-side privileges, as undoubted as the right of breathing the air, or walking the earth.' I have waited, but hear nothing but the echo of that report that 'every man, who speaks, Webster and all,' &c.

Hem! quantum—ah illo! I forbear yet to pen the '*mutatus*,' although the indignant Preston uttered that sentiment within thunder reach of your reply. Once he would not have dared to do it. He would once as soon have laid his hand on the mane of a sleeping lion. You heard it, and the walls of that venerable Senate House sent forth an response to the indignation of the insulted north. Where was Vermont Prentiss! Have the Green Mountains too bowed their 'freedom breathing mountain' to the tyrant scourge? Hang the abolitionist! one of your constituents; one of the Phillipses, or Quincys, or Jacksons of your own proud city; for of *those* names you have surely heard. In your loftiest Bunker Hill! and that great granite monument foisted up upon it, in the face of insulted heaven, in mockery of departed liberty, and he, who helped old Lafayette lay its corner stone—ay, and he, who made a speech then, that broke the sleep of Warren, and heaved the ocean and the land; now sitting mute in the nation's Senate House, and tamely hearing a coward slaveholder threaten his own Massachusetts constituents, before mankind, with a felon's death, for daring, within border of the old bay State, to exercise liberty of speech!!

'Hem! quantum MUTATUS ab illo!' Preston ventured slowly. He saw that the northern lion was in the toils. He no longer feared to trifle with the sacred terrors of his mane. He touched it, in sacrilegious triumph, and the dethroned monarch of the wood submitted with the abject silence of the ass. It is no apology to us, sir, that you are situated delicately. So is Preston. It is nothing to you that we do long care for that threat, or dread its literal execution, south of Dixon's line or north of it. Our lives are murderously threatened, and you tacitly endorse the threats. Our rights are openly trampled under foot, and you are silent. is an approval of the violation, and you are silent. Massachusetts freedom of speech, New-England liberty of the press, menaced with the death of the felon in the very mouth of their chosen champions, and in the very arena of the strife of freedom, and not a tongue moved in their vindication! 'Hung be the heavens in black, and shrouded in midnight be the height of Bunker,' exclaimed the *Engishman* George Thompson, in noble shame at the degeneracy of the sons of his nation's ancient foe. Sunk to the *unfinished* summit in the ground where New-England freedom lies buried, he that mouthed of insensate granite! and down the top of that old smoke-crowned hill to a level with the murmuring ocean.

Sir, you and your haughty peers, in that ungodly Senate, may lightly esteem the rights and the lives of the abolitionists. You may sit calmly by, when death is threatened them, for exercising not merely their rights, but performing their solemn duty to God and man. But remember, sir, that you, that a host of anti-slavery spirits are gathering; a generation of asserters of just and equal liberty is rising on the scene; surely, steadily, advancing and irresistible, in the strength of God, as the ocean tide. The wave of them will cover your dishonored names with oblivion, or cast them high astraid to rot in 'everlasting contempt.' The Reformation is spreading with marvellous power and rapidity among the people. A mighty millenial revolution is at hand. The signs of its approach, the lofty-eyed statesman does not discern. I had hoped it would be your felicity to bear an honored and leading part in this ABOLITION OF SLAVERY. But you have chosen otherwise, and God has chosen humbler instruments. So are His ways. Your wonderful powers are exhausted in more unmeaning labors. You have your reward. I feel no envy for your fading laurels. I could even fondly have wished them ever green and perennial but I cast all such wish to the winds, when I see you sit mutely by and hear a slaveholder threaten death to your own constituents, New-Englanders, for asserting, here at their mountain homes, the inalienable prerogative of free speech.

HAMPDEN.

From the Emancipator Republican.

LETTER TO THE REV. DR. CHANNING.

NORTHAMPTON, Feb. 1, 1838.

Dear Sir:

A Letter addressed to Abolitionists, under date of Dec. 14, 1837, bearing the impress of your name, has just fallen into my hands. It is from that your opinions on subjects of moral duty call up from my mind any other emotions, than the profoundest admiration for your liberal investigation and discriminating judgment.

But it seems to me that the remarks in this letter are predicated upon wrong assumptions; and that their tendency is to lead to important errors.

You condemn Mr. Lovejoy for resorting to arms in defence of law and liberty. And you regret that the abolitionists do not, as a body, express a decided disapproval of this act.

You observe,

'I do not say, that a man may in no case defend himself by force. But it may be laid down as a rule, hardly admitting an exception, that an enterprise of christian philanthropy is not to be pursued on by force; that it is time for philanthropy to stop, when it can only advance by wading through blood. Is it asked how such a case, if needed, is to be advanced? I answer, by appeals to the moral sentiments and the moral sympathies of the community. What! shall men, whose distinct point is the love of every human being, hope to make their way by slaughter? Shall a cause, which relies on the inspiration of the disinterested spirit of christianity as its main instrument, seek aid in deadly weapons? What fellowship has moral suasion with brute force?'

It is manifest from the above quotation, as also from the entire argument of your letter, that you make no discrimination between Mr. Lovejoy's incipient acts, as an abolitionist, wielding the peaceful instruments of argument and moral suasion, and his ultimate act of defending the government of Illinois from being prostrated by the murderous violence of lawless men. As a christian, he did not attempt to make his way by slaughter. As a philanthropist, he sought no aid from deadly weapons. He did not take his rifle for the purpose of teaching philanthropy. It was only when the lawless assassin sought to destroy the government of the country and his own life, that he sought aid from deadly weapons.

A moment's consideration will satisfy you of the importance of a clear discrimination between specific and general objects; and that without it the conduct of any man may be made to appear not only wrong, but extremely ridiculous.

A rifle for the specific object of teaching men the gospel is indeed an inappropriate instrument; so is an axe; a plough; a purse of money. But an axe is a useful instrument to prepare timber for a meeting-house; a plough for making a road to it; and a purse of money to hire a priest. Thus then strange instruments all subserve the general object of teaching the gospel.

The general object of the mission of Jesus Christ was to exhibit to man the love of his Father toward sinners; and to show all his sin-stained instruments were specifically aimed to this object. But when he entered the temple, and drove out those that sold and bought therein, he laid aside the symbols of compassion and forbearance, and employed himself with instruments most appropriate for expressing his indignation at the insult and desecration offered towards the house of prayer.

The example of Christ in denouncing the hypocrisy and selfishness of the pharisees, of Peter in rebuking Annanias and Saphira, are instances where the means employed for the general object of preaching the gospel are strangely discordant with those employed by these benevolent men, when engaged in the direct and specific exemplification of God's mercy. And Paul, with his two hundred soldiers and seventy horsemen, appears somewhat like Mr. Lovejoy with his rifle. Both are armed with instruments inappropriate for converting the hearts of men to the love of God. But why charge them with inconsistency; or why condemn their instruments as unfit for the specific purpose in view? —It is because you confound the specific with the general object.

Paul did not take his soldiers to make proselytes to christianity by brute force. Nor did Mr. Lovejoy take his rifle to shoot philanthropy into the hearts of men.

Both these men set out with the general object of persuading men to be just and holy.

They wielded no other instruments for this specific purpose than moral suasion.—But the murderer had threatened to cut them off by brute force, and thus defeat them in their general object. For the specific purpose of preventing the designs of the brutal assassins, they armed themselves with rifles and swords. And who can say that, for such a purpose, the rifle and the sword are not fit instruments?

The powers that be, are ordained of God. The governments of this world were established to preserve the lives and liberties of men from the lawless destruction of the cruel. The sword is the symbol of the ruler. Reason and the common sense of men acknowledge the appropriateness. God has recognized it as a fit instrument for the purpose for which he has appointed him to be a terror to evil doers. And Christ himself, by obvious implication, allows the sword to be a proper instrument for the kingdoms of this world; when speaking of his own kingdom he says, '*If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.*'

But Christ came to establish a kingdom differing in many respects from the kingdoms of this world. His kingdom was to be an enduring one. All those established by the sword would perish with the sword. His kingdom was to subdue by love; the sword conquered by brute force. His kingdom was to rule the heart; the sword could only direct the outward act. Christ's kingdom admitted no man under its protection without holiness; the kingdoms of this world were established to hold in check the lawless and disobedient.

It was the object of Christ in his example and precepts to exemplify the distinctive features of his kingdom, as compared with the kingdoms of this world. Hence in the introduction of his gospel, his own life and the lives of his immediate disciples appeared to be protected by a great measure by miraculous interposition. The man government was not called to give the aid of its protection for several ages.

And when at length Constantine became a christian; and the church protected by Imperial power, the effect seemed destructive of christian principle. These things, in connection with the obvious fact, that the nature of Christianity forbids its inculcations by brute force, have begotten a vague idea that human government is incapable of subserving in any way the kingdom of Christ; and that the use of the sword in instrumentalities is incompatible with Christian duty.

The idea is certainly a mistaken one; and is maintained contrary to the express words of Christ himself. Addressing his Father says, 'All thine are mine.' And again he says, 'All power in heaven and earth is given to me.' He has on his vesture a name written, 'King of kings.'

Every thing in this world and in man, and whatever of moral or physical power is entrusted to the keeping of man, is required to be used for the promotion of his kingdom. The bishops of Rome may have perverted to selfish purposes the forces subsidized by the Emperor. The fault is theirs. Constantine did right in protecting them. Those Emperors of Rome who murdered the Christian, persecuted the Christian's Lord. When Constantine, instead of murdering, showed kindness to the disciple of Christ, he honored the Son of God; and for this he will receive a reward. It was cruel and unphilosophical to use the sword for converting his heathen subjects to christianity; but to compel them to cease from the slaughter of Christians, was both wise and righteous.

The sword then is an appropriate instrument of human government, and a resort to the instrumentalities of human government for protection, is compatible with Christian duty; as much so as to resort to any human means whatever.

So long as there are lawless men upon the earth, so long will human government be necessary. And so long as government exists, it cannot, without impious contempt against the King of kings, withhold from it what aid it is capable of giving to the cause of Christ. It cannot compel men to be philanthropists; but it can protect the liberty and life of philanthropists from lawless violence. If it fail to do this, it is a cruel government; and guilt of the blackest dye will rest upon those concerned in its administration.

The government of this country is republican. Its power is in the people. With the people are its responsibilities. Guilt cannot rest upon the government of the United States, without implicating in some degree every one of its citizens.

Had Mr. Lovejoy been preaching philanthropy in a land of barbarians, or in a land whose laws forbid the preaching of christianity, he should have fled from one city to another. Had he been preaching in a land where murderers and robbers exercised a power above the law, he should have obeyed their mandates. Had he been preaching in a foreign land with the administration of whose government he felt no responsibility, he should have secured himself by flight.

But he was in his own land, its government was his government; and if guilt rested upon it, he was interested in washing it off. He was in a land where murderers did not rule; but where property was fully protected by law, and the mob was subject to the 'will of the brotherhood,' and could be restrained. He was in a land of liberty, whose laws guaranteed the freedom of speech and the press.

The liberty of this land was threatened, and with it was threatened all that is valuable in christianity,—all that is dear to man. It was threatened not by the recklessness of the ribald; for he wicked were in power and sustained by other powers. It was threatened by the strange infatuation of good men.

The editor, the politician, the merchant, the minister, had conspired together to quiet the agitators, and were calling into action and power a class of agents whose character and ultimate operations these good men seemed not to comprehend.

To the radical hating minister and politician, the mobber seemed like a man of straw. And so long as the abolitionists could be made to flee from his grimaces, the mobber would still be deemed a necessary agent.

It became necessary that his character should be developed. Lovejoy has made that development. He has shown that mobbers will become murderers; and that those who sustain them will be ranked by the enemies of abolitionists, but the enemies of liberty, of man, and of God. In this he has performed a needful duty; and I believe that when the secret springs shall have passed from sight, and all the bearings of the act revealed, the sacrifice he has made will be viewed with admiration and gratitude.

You request me to express my condemnation of the act. I feel from my own earth such a request could be respected by me, that man is your fellow. But neither my respect for the purpose of your spirit, nor for the clearness of your judgement, can satisfy me that it is right for me to condemn Mr. Lovejoy.

The reasons with which you urge this request I have not time here to consider; and can only say the weighty as they may be, reasons more weighty and clear urge me to a different result.

The force of your reasoning is, that the example of Mr. Lovejoy is liable to serious imitation and misconstruction. There can be no doubt of the fact. But such liability can never be avoided. The holiest things are misunderstood, and often wrested to the destruction of the perverse.

The consequences of such liabilities can only be estimated by the Infinite mind. All human enquiries of duty in moral action lie far within the circle of finite comprehension. It was not given to man to calculate the consequences of the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. All advances of knowledge in this matter is gained by first exercising faith in the wisdom of God concerning it. Did Christ lay down his life at the command of God? Then it was wise to do it, though to man it might appear foolish.

Was Mr. Lovejoy's conduct dictated by the spirit and the prudence of God? I think so; and therefore I dare not condemn it.

I have occasionally seen the paper that headed with an inhabitant of Missouri. He was at that time peculiarly prejudiced against the friends of free the abolitionists, and his course against slavery cannot be attributed to party feelings or self-will. The circumstances in which he was placed strongly confirm me in the assurance that his abhorrence of slavery was dictated by a deep reverence for the justice of God. The whole tone of his paper was that of deep conviction of the holiness of God's law. No man evinced more enlargedness of mind, or more purity of motive.

I think the providence of God called for the act. He acted according to his own judgement alone. He was sustained by the holiest men around him. He begun for the liberty of the black man; but the violence of his opponents had brought him into a position where the liberty of the white man was in jeopardy. The free institutions of America, seemed to be thrown upon his protection.

The freedom of the free was in imminent danger. He saw it; and felt that on him lay devolved the duty of declaring it. He spoke indeed by awful emblems. But was not the bloody symbol meet for the occasion? In what other way could danger so appalling be uttered? What voice less terrible could have aroused this stupid nation? Shall I soften down this voice? I dare not do it. The interests of humanity, the terrors of God's justice forbid it. And, Sir, much as I respect you, I cannot, I dare not condemn it.

To consider the act as a defence of legal or natural rights, or as a mere effort to continue an abolition press at Alton, is a narrow view of the subject. There were the forms of the victims which the mob sought to destroy. But it was not Lovejoy's person, nor press, nor rights,

they hated. It was the exercise of those rights, it was the liberty he breathed, he sought to stifle. For this purpose of destroying this liberty, they break his press and require him to be silent or flee from Alton. He might have saved his life but at the expense of that which is dearer than life.

The contest was for the liberty of the nation, for the rights of Christianity. Was it a successful one? The death of Lovejoy does not prove it otherwise. If the red blood which that death has sent through the land shall have the effect it ought to have, it will prove a profitable sacrifice. God forbid that any act of mine should hinder it. But whether this nation is aroused to repentance or not, the warning prophet of God has cleansed his skirts from our blood by shedding his own.

I agree with you, Sir, that the truth is to be vindicated rather than the character of man; that no esteem for Mr. Lovejoy is to induce us to maintain error. I should also deprecate the use of violence in the cause of abolition. Love to the slave and his master urge us to the use of pacific measure in all direct efforts at emancipation. But the love of truth forbids me to condemn Mr. Lovejoy. The positions upon which I predicate his defence are, that human governments, by protecting power, is capable of subserving the cause of philanthropy; that the sword is an appropriate instrument for human government. That the power, as well as burning or wealth of this world, belongs to Christ, and that the man with whose care it is intrusted, cannot innocently withhold its protecting aid to the cause of christian liberty and truth; and finally, that it was not as an abolitionist, that Lovejoy took arms; but as one entrusted with the power of government, and under obligations to use that power to protect the servant and rights of his heavenly master from violent destruction.

I have thought that the gathering providences of God indicated the necessity of the act, and declare it to have been drawn from love of truth, and reverence for the command of heaven.

Circumstances forbid my illustrating these positions with the clearness and force of which they are susceptible. But they seem to me entitled to serious consideration, and to justify me in making such suggestions of them to your notice as I have been able to do. I trust you will excuse the freedom with which they are presented; and be assured that they are uttered with the kindest feelings towards yourself; and with entire consciousness of the reverence due to my venerable antagonist and friend.

AN ABOLITIONIST.

AMERICAN REPUBLICANISM IN EUROPE.

The following instructive and highly interesting letter from our esteemed friend, DAVID LEE CHILD, *who has recently returned from Europe, was read at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and ordered to be printed in the Liberator.*

BOSTON, Jan. 23, 1838.

To Messrs. Garrison and Phelps, Committee of Arrangements, &c.

DEAR BROTHERS:

I regret that it will not be convenient for me to attend the anniversary meeting of our Society, for the purpose of taking a part in its proceedings. Do not suppose that this is owing to any abatement of interest or trust in our great cause; on the contrary, the cause seems to me to have so much more life within the last fifteen months, that you are in no small danger of receiving aid and countenance from the prudent and timid. You are now, and perhaps have been for some time, more likely to be joined by false brethren, than to be deserted by the true.

It has been my lot, during the period above mentioned, to see much of the change which has taken place in the estimation in which we are held, as a nation, by enlightened and good men in Europe. Having formerly passed two years there, I was prepared to appreciate this change. At that time, the feeling of a liberal European would brighten at the name of 'America,' and he would seize the first moment of conversation, to express his admiration and his hopes of our country. Coming, my recent sojourn, I have heard very little interest expressed in us, except to have explanations and arguments suggested, by which it could be shown to Europe, that our conduct is not the consequence of our principles.

The leading causes of the change to which I refer, are,

1st. Our mobs.

2dly. The wider knowledge which, chiefly through their instrumentality, has been diffused in Europe, of the existence and horrors of American slavery.

3dly. Our treatment of the Aborigines.

In Great Britain, France, and Germany, we are regarded as the most cruel and rapacious people, since the times of Cortez and Pizarro.

Our treatment of the Aborigines appears the more odious, from the striking contrast which it exhibits with the present policy of other civilized and Christian nations.

The king of France has lately recalled the governor of French Guiana, and directed him to be brought to trial, for having issued orders to invade a settlement of runaway slaves, on the Isabella River, in Guiana. The military commander is also ordered for trial by Court martial, for having executed those ordered, and put to death some of those poor people.

A quarrel lately arose between the Caffres and the British colonists of the Cape of Good Hope. The governor of the Cape, at the head of the British forces, invaded the Caffre country, slaughtered many of the inhabitants, and overran the territory of a native chief, and annexed it to the Province. Dr. Phillip, the father of the christian missions to that quarter, left the Cape in company with the deposed chief, and arrived last summer in England. At that time, a society had just been formed, called 'the Aborigines Protection Society,' of which the British Anti-Slavery leader in the House of Commons, Mr. Fowell Buxton, is President. This society examined the case, and having satisfied themselves that the colonists were the aggressors, and that the injuries for which the British arms had been carried into the Caffre country, were committed in retaliation for manifold and unprovoked wrongs, done to the natives by their Christian neighbors, they joined their representations to those of Dr. Phillip. These were so effectual with the government of the young and virtuous queen, that orders were immediately issued for restoring the conquered territory to its native sovereign and lawful proprietors, and a humane and upright man was sent out to superintend the Government.

These bright examples, while they illustrate the justice and magnanimity of the people and rulers who have given them, react with a withering effect upon a people who have expended $20,000,000, and are rapidly expending more, in slaughtering red men, and kidnapping them under the sacred form of a *flag of truce*, in order to rob them not of their lands only, but also of their children.

At the request of a French literary gentleman, and of a member of the Chamber of Deputies, I reduced to writing some considerations, previously stated in conversation, tending to show, that, whatever might be the apparent, there was no real foundation for the scoffs and exultation of European despots and sycophants over the wound which our country has received in the house of her friends in America. I submit the following extract:

'By what I have heard from you, and from others since I arrived in Europe, I see that the disorders, which have occurred in the United States, and which have most grievously disheartened the friends of civil and religious liberty, and encouraged its foes. You have not, you say, wherewith to reply to those who cite these disorders in answer to the history of human rights. This complaint will wring the hearts of many. Americans, and perhaps it may shame some.

I can only say, on this subject, as I did at the house of M. Garnier Pages [the republican leader in the Chamber of Deputies,] that though I must confess the existence of great evils and crimes, and that they are of a nature to be peculiarly dangerous to a republic, yet that in only in a republic, with a perfectly free press, freedom of speech, and freedom of *association*, that such potent means could have been so rapidly and extensively organized, and employed by a few of the comparatively weak to expose the corruption and oppression of the strong, to rebuke them openly, and to call upon them to forsake iniquity, and, what is more irritating, upon the people to forsake them.

The difference between republics and other forms of society where there is a free press, and monarchies where the press is trammelled, in principal by this, and in the time they have lived, and abuses incident to human nature may exist, and gather strength for a time, yet there is a remedy in a free press and an enlightened public sentiment which is sure to overtake them sooner or later, and to deal with them according to their nature and aggravation; whereas in other governments the evils are the same or worse, but without any remedy. It is true that the extreme publicity which vice and misrule obtain in America through its free press, presents them in such bold relief, and under such odious aspects, that many good and liberal men are startled, and ready to exclaim, despairingly, that are 'sinners above all other men.' Yet if the freedom of the press, of speech, and of *association*, (for without the last, reformers will always lack the means of employing the first,) had been great under other governments, it would only be found in the upshot, that among our American evils, we have not that master one, of losing the right to resist evil.'

Was it ever seen before in the whole history of the human race, that comparatively few persons, most of them young men and weak women, were carrying on in the midst of a powerful and high-spirited nation, the work of the foundation of their social organization, and opposed to the vehement wishes and supposed interests of ninety-nine hundredths of that nation, including governors, legislators, judges, priests, lawyers, doctors, brokers, merchants, manufacturers, office-seekers, office-holders, editors, demagogues, and the lowest rabble; and yet the aegis of good laws was so far sacred that, as a general thing, it preserved their lives and protected their labors?

Let those who take occasion from our American mobs to calumniate our American principles, shew another nation in which this specific could have been witnessed. What would have been the fate of the missionaries and friends of man in the British West India Islands, if those colonies had been independent? In any other country but our American republic, we abolitionists should have been massacred or burned alive like John Huss and Jerome of Prague, Savanarola, the Albigenses and the eight thousand victims of St. Bartholomew's. Luther had a powerful prince, as a constant protector. What if that prince had been as much against him, as the American people under a strong distrust of the Union against us?

I would further observe that those men, who trade in the flesh of their fellow-men, who buy and keep it, are tyrants and enemies of the human race; that republicanism is not in them, but that they hate it as their greatest foes; so that American slavery is in reality to be charged to the account of *despotism*, instead of *republicanism*. Republicanism must not be held to find offspring in the slaveholding and slave-trading of those men. Slaveholding and slave-trading Americans are a pretty fair copy of the ancient feudal masters of the people of Europe, not genius to genius and their progenitors, but all the worse for that, as their superior intelligence is employed in framing with ingenious cruelty worse laws than ever disgraced Goths and Vandals.

We have had frightful and fatal mobs, and what is still more mortifying, mobs excited to extinguish light and uphold slavery; but remember, that fanaticism has had its periods in all nations, and that it is not surprising that extravagant in the forms which it takes as in the deeds that it does. In France, a monarch, 'father of the people,' could burn at one time fifteen hundred of his children in a religious fire; his brutal barons burned three hundred more in a castle at another; and these merely because they persisted in worshipping God according to what they believed to be his will. In the United States, a slaveholder of my acquaintance declared that sooner than emancipate, he would lock his hundred and fifty slaves in his house, and set fire to it! Who does not see that despotism is every where the same, whether exercised by such monsters as Louis, le Gros, and Simon de Moufort, or by an American republican slaveholder!

With best wishes,

Your friend and fellow servt.

D. LEE CHILD.

LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

PROVIDENCE, Feb. 11, 1838.

MY DEAR FRIEND GARRISON:

Among the distinguished friends of the anti-slavery cause, who were invited to attend the last annual meeting of the Rhode Island A. S. Society, was GERRIT SMITH. My letter of invitation was written at Scituate, and as I carelessly omitted to request him to direct his reply, if he should make one, to Providence, he very naturally concluded that it would reach me at the former place. Consequently, I received his missive, the following letter was not received until the 9th inst. But, although it comes at this late period, the suggestions it contains are too good to be lost; and the high respect which the abolitionists of New England entertain for brother Smith's opinions and judgment will lead you to copy it for publication. I omit, however, as unimportant, that portion of it which contains his apology for not attending our meeting.

Yours sincerely,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

PETERBORO, Oct. 26, 1837.

MY DEAR SIR:—* * * * * I have not failed to notice the late conspicuous movements in New England, which affect the anti-slavery cause. Some of the prominent actors are defended at the public advocacy, by Sarah M. and Angelina E. Grimke, of the claims of impartial and universal liberty. Now, if these pastors wish our beloved sisters to be silent, that they may be free to labor better heard in behalf of the enslaved poor:—if they would have them retire, only that greater room may be thus afforded for their own masculine and more powerful efforts in the cause of emancipation, then it is at the most, nothing worse than a little egotism and vanity in which their complaints originated. But, if these pastors, whilst desiring the Grimkes to quit the field, would themselves take it themselves:—if they would have men also, as well as women, to be dumb in the cause of 'the dumb'—then, I say, let not the Grimkes only continue their advocacy—but, let all the women of New England, and all the children too,—yes, and the very stones of your streets, lift up their cry for the oppressed, and keep it up, until her men have quit their hiding places, and come up to the help of the Lord in the slaves of crushed and groaning humanity. That one, who is doing nothing for the poor slave, and intending to do nothing for him, should be occupied in pronouncing criticisms on the efforts, which others are making for him, is about as unreasonable and imprudent, as it is for the cowardly traitor to be surveying from some place of security, which he has chosen for the purpose, the strong exertions of the patriot, and pointing out mistakes of his countrymen, who are perilling their all in the thickest of the battle.

The attacks on William Lloyd Garrison have, of course, gained my attention. Whatever may be the faults of this noble brother, I trust that abolitionists will never approve of the way taken by Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c. to correct them. If injustice had been done by Mr. Garrison to Mr. White and Mr. Blagden, that injustice should not have been seized on, as an occasion for destroying his influence and usefulness, and for producing a division in our cause. It should have been complained of to Mr. Garrison himself: and the complaint, instead of being trumpeted forth to the damage of our cause and the exultation of its enemies, should have been made in such a manner as to ensure that they, who felt it, tenderly regarded Mr. Garrison's feelings and reputation, and deeply felt the importance of preserving peace and harmony among abolitionists.

The best and most powerful argument in the Appeal of Messrs. Fitch, Towne, &c. on which I must say a few words. The true-hearted abolitionist will not consent, for one moment, that it belongs to him, or to any other, to decide, reading notices of anti-slavery meetings. The declining to read such notices is a well known branch of the system of means for suppressing the discussion of the question of slavery: and the minister, who has been long in this delicacy, takes ground with Gov. Marcy and Gov. Everett and the mobs. I readily admit, that when in the pulpit of another, a minister should not lack the courtesy of employing the first title. But, if it be one of those usages, that a notice of a meeting for exhortation or prayer in behalf of the millions of our enslaved countrymen shall be read, then does the minister sin greatly, who, with this knowledge, accepts an invitation to officiate in such a pulpit. He lends his sanction to the crime of stopping the ears 'at the cry of the poor.' Would he do so, were it his own wife and children, who are 'in bonds?' Oh no—he would 'remember them,' and wish all others to 'remember them.' His selfish heart can now forget the woes of the slave, because it is the wives and children of others, and not his own wife and children, into whose hearts the iron of slavery has entered.

But I have filled my sheet, and must stop. Take it up my pen, dear friend, I pray, that I could not accept your invitation—and not to write to you about matters which you understand far better than I do.

I am, my dear Sir,

With great regard, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASS. A. S. SOCIETY.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27.

While the Society were waiting for the committee of business to bring something before the meeting, Mr. Hanson, of Africa, was introduced, who said,

Mr. President—My object in rising, for a few moments, cannot perhaps be fully appreciated by this audience and, owing to the peculiarity of my circumstances, I hope they will grant me some indulgence. That I have been the dupe of deceit, and perhaps of continual villany, is the reason why I now address you. I was lured from my home and friends, and perhaps from independence and affluence, with the promise of being introduced into business, and then turned adrift among strangers, and all this, *because I am black*. When I heard of this country, I was very anxious to come to America—I was very much pleased with England. Sir, I have been in England. True, I was very young there, but I was just as black as I am now; and I was respected none the less for that. But in this country, a man is respected according to the color of his skin, and not according to his intellectual and moral worth. O Liberty, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason.

Surely, there is need of social intercourse and benevolence and fellow feeling, in such a world as this, where to-day we are, and to-morrow we are not. Although we are black, we have human feelings and sympathies. Look upon us and treat us just as you treat one another. This is all we ask of you. Slavery can be known by its fruits, and not by the bark that covers it. So every man should be known by his deeds, and not by the color of his skin.

REV. MR. GROSVENOR.

Mr. President, I have felt, during the last few moments, ashamed of my color. We have got such a habit of talking so much about color, that we have associated with it ideas of merit and demerit. I felt ashamed, while the gentleman was speaking, that we ever mention it. I was almost sorry that he felt it necessary to allude to it. I rise, if possible, to shake off the last vestige of prejudice against color; and I hope my respected friends, who are abolitionists, (and none other are worthy the name of abolitionists,) will rise up with dignity above all such narrow and ignoble feelings.

MR. JOHNSON.

Mr. President—I do not rise to make a speech; but to say that there is a book for sale at the anti-slavery office, which discusses the subject of prejudice; and I hope that every abolitionist, who has a particle of this prejudice remaining, will purchase it. I allude to the work entitled the *Negro Pew*.

MR. GOULD.

Mr. President—There is a gentleman in the hall, who thinks some expressions have fallen from one of the speakers, which are not correct. And, as I am coarse-minded, I think a conversation I have had with him, that he is truly a *gentleman*, I hope he will be heard.

THE PRESIDENT—We should be pleased to hear him.

STEREO OF MR. HOGAN, A SLAVEHOLDER.

Mr. President—I did not intend to speak; but a sentiment has fallen from the Rev. gentleman, which I think demands to be noticed; and from himself to receive an explanation of some kind. He said no man was worthy to be called an American citizen, who is not an abolitionist. I have the honor to be an American citizen; and if I could be persuaded that I have not the right to call myself an American, I would go and abstract my name from the roll of allegiance to the constitution. But I think I have as high claims to the privileges of an American citizen as any abolitionist; and I will go farther and say, if I were an abolitionist, I should not be worthy of American citizenship. If I were an abolitionist, I would, *ipso facto*, renounce all right to citizenship; and I will tell you why. We have a written constitution; and the great aim is to citizens to be bound to maintain that constitution. This oath he can take in many ways, by implication, or by assent. A native American takes no express oath, yet he swears by implication to maintain it. Now, sir, can I, as an abolitionist, consent to do this? I ask it seriously: for what is abolition? It is doing away with the constitution, which you are bound by oath, as well as I, to maintain. Were I an abolitionist, I should be a perjurer. A great portion of these United States are guaranteed by the constitution, in regard to slavery. It is given to them as a right; and by whom is it given? By you, as well as by the people of the South. Is not that your pledge? I say, as long as you give me my rights in the South, I will maintain them. Now, if I should be a perjurer if I should not maintain them. Why, sir, I should be indicted for rebellion, if I were an abolitionist. If the gentleman will satisfy me that I am not bound by the constitution, I will agree with him—I will be an abolitionist. Until then, I cannot.

There is another reason. It has always appeared to me very strange—nor could I even, in any work I have ever seen, be satisfied on this point. It does appear to me very strange that there is not from cover to cover, a religious language in the New-Testament, to sanction your proceedings. I am willing to look at the question in its full breadth—show me any commentary, show me any argument, show me any thing, which will satisfy me, and I will agree with you. I will go further, and state that there is not a solitary text in the Old-Testament to sanction your proceedings. We know that slavery did exist in the Old-Testament times. Show me a single text—no one can read the Bible without being convinced of it. I know it is said that the servitude there mentioned was not upon the chattel principle. Well, prove it, then. However, I will grant a negro, a man, and I agree he was sold. Here was he sold? Did not the seller receive money from the buyer? He was put into prison and chained. Was there ever slavery in America worse than that? But it is said Joseph was *sold for money*. Well, it was a servitude—a chattel servitude. Again, Abraham had 300 slaves, brought up in his own family. Was this chattel servitude? I cannot say positively; but I can say as positively as I can say it was not. Again, how many times did Solomon? The fact is, there is no one in citing solitary instances. Slavery covered the land; and we have as good reason for believing that it was chattel slavery as we have for believing that it was not.

Again, look at Greece and Rome. Why, it has been said here that the slavery which prevailed there was not like American slavery. And where is the difference? They could not only buy and sell their slaves, but put them to death.

But again, I say there is not a solitary passage in the Bible that justifies your proceedings. We are referred to this, 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.' Sir, I do not believe that this text in the Bible has been completely misapplied as this. The meaning of it is, that we should do unto others as we should wish them to do to us, *under similar circumstances*. If I were a slave, I would expect that my master would treat me kindly; and I would do the same to him. But, if I were free, I would change my condition as a slave. You say, if I am a man, you would expect him to do to you, if he were the master and you the slave.

I could proceed further, and show from this passage, how inconsistent are your proceedings. I will show that you act as differently from the apostles as it is possible for men to act. When Paul met a runaway slave, how did he treat him? Did he say, 'I am glad you have got your rights, you human chattel?' No, sir, he sent him back again to his master.

MR. COLE, A COLORED CITIZEN OF BOSTON.

Mr. President—I regret that an individual possessing the ability of that gentleman, should in the nineteenth century undertake to justify that institution of slavery, which is spread upon my brethren at the South. He has referred to the constitution, to prove that abolitionists are not entitled to the privileges of American citizens. Sir, that constitution will bear them out. There is not a solitary word about slavery in that constitution. The word slave is not in it. The constitution merely recognizes indirectly its existence, in some of its provisions. There was a compromise made, that the slave states should be entitled to a representation for three fifths of their slave population; and that slaves who escape should be delivered up to their masters. But so cautious were the framers of that instrument, to avoid recognizing slavery as a part of our system; and so conscious were they of its repugnance to the very spirit of our institutions, that their provisions were made without introducing into that sacred instrument the word slave or slavery. And it is evident that this compromise, far from amounting to a perpetual guarantee of slavery, was, on all hands, considered as but a *temporary* arrangement. This may be learned from the speech of Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, for the adoption of the federal constitution. Sir, the spirit of abolition was born in Virginia. If I am not mistaken, a resolution was introduced against this slave representation. Mr. Madison says, 'The Southern states will not enter into this union, unless they are permitted a *temporary* continuance of this system.'

The gentleman has also gone back to ancient times. He has referred us to the case of Joseph. Joseph was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose, sir, he was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose he was sold for a debt, I ask you, sir, were you out of the land of the Hebrews? Is there not robbery? Joseph was the first slave that we read of, and he, speaking by divine inspiration, calls it robbery. Slavery is founded in fraud.

Again, he quotes from ancient profane facts. Sir, we can trace the *modern origin* of *chattel slavery*. The first slave ship fitted out to the coast of Africa, was in the reign of Charles V.; and King William was the first that granted a patent to a company of merchants to go to the coast of Africa, and carry the natives of that land into bondage. When this country was first discovered by Columbus, that man was a slaveholder—a slave dealer. He undertook to enslave the aborigines of this country, and to carry the surplus of them to be sold as slaves. But, there was a spark of humanity then remaining in Spain, which was shocked at the thought of such a deed. Queen Elizabeth sent back these men.

Sir, it is treachery to the sacred cause of liberty for one man to enslave another. That spirit which enslaves my colored brother at the South, would enslave every man in this house. It is not because we are *black*, that our race are enslaved. It is the slaveholding spirit that would enslave every man if it had the power. The spirit of *abolition* is, to *do righteousness*—not do as you would expect the slave to do, if he were in your place, but to do to all mankind what you would have them do to you.

But further, I say the argument of that gentleman is *too late*. The institution of slavery is already tottering. The day is gone by, for talking of its perpetuity. The death-warrant is signed. Under this without doubt the fires of a volcano, which, if not quenched, will produce, ere long, a terrible explosion. Here comes in the principle of abolition, to quench these fires, by healing up the wounds of the victim, which are the cause of fuel. Unless the holders of slaves will *do justice*, the decree of heaven has gone out for their overthrow. All injustice must ultimately call down the vengeance of the God of the oppressed; and all slavery is injustice.

MR. FAHNESTOCK.

Mr. President—This gentleman has come forward and appealed to the Bible, in defence of slavery; and he says, if we can convince him that the Bible condemns it, he will be an abolitionist. I believe he is sincere; and I wish his argument might go forward on strict Christian principles. Let there be nothing personal, uncourteous, or unkind.

MR. HOGAN.

Mr. President—I merely wish you to understand that I wish to have it explained. I did not come here prepared to enter into this discussion; especially, as I know that I am surrounded with abler heads. I agree with this gentleman perfectly. Let us agree on that ground. It is not a question whether slavery is good or evil. It is a question whether we are right or wrong. I may differ from you, and you from me. We may both be wrong. But there is a rule. Let us stand upon that. Satisfy me that I am violating the Savior condemns slavery, and if my voice is not lifted up against it, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. I am sorry that you have not met for praying; I am sorry that you have recourse to such means. Last night you called slaveholders sinners above all other men. There are among them men, who, if they could be convinced that slaveholding is wrong, would give $10,000 where you give ten cents, for its removal. There are among these men, some of the highest officers of the earth, men of God, who have the true interests of the slaves at heart. There are two black churches in Savannah, with 1100 communicants. Were I an abolitionist, I should be a perjurer. A great portion of these United States are guaranteed by the constitution, in regard to slavery. It is given to them as a right; and by whom is it given? By you, as well as by the people of the South. Is not that your pledge? I say, as long as you give me my rights in the South, I will maintain them. Now, if I should be a perjurer if I should not maintain them. Why, sir, I should be indicted for rebellion, if I were an abolitionist. If the gentleman will satisfy me that I am not bound by the constitution, I will agree with him—I will be an abolitionist. Until then, I cannot.

There is another reason. It has always appeared to me very strange—nor could I even, in any work I have ever seen, be satisfied on this point. It does appear to me very strange that there is not from cover to cover, a religious language in the New-Testament, to sanction your proceedings. I am willing to look at the question in its full breadth—show me any commentary, show me any argument, show me any thing, which will satisfy me, and I will agree with you. I will go further, and state that there is not a solitary text in the Old-Testament to sanction your proceedings. We know that slavery did exist in the Old-Testament times. Show me a single text—no one can read the Bible without being convinced of it. I know it is said that the servitude there mentioned was not upon the chattel principle. Well, prove it, then. However, I will grant a negro, a man, and I agree he was sold. Here was he sold? Did not the seller receive money from the buyer? He was put into prison and chained. Was there ever slavery in America worse than that? But it is said Joseph was *sold for money*. Well, it was a servitude—a chattel servitude. Again, Abraham had 300 slaves, brought up in his own family. Was this chattel servitude? I cannot say positively; but I can say as positively as I can say it was not. Again, how many times did Solomon? The fact is, there is no use in citing solitary instances. Slavery covered the land; and we have as good reason for believing that it was chattel slavery as we have for believing that it was not.

Again, look at Greece and Rome. Why, it has been said here that the slavery which prevailed there was not like American slavery. And where is the difference? They could not only buy and sell their slaves, but put them to death.

But again, I say there is not a solitary passage in the Bible that justifies your proceedings. We are referred to this, 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.' Sir, I do not believe that this text in the Bible has been completely misapplied as this. The meaning of it is, that we should do unto others as we should wish them to do to us, *under similar circumstances*. If I were a slave, I would expect that my master would treat me kindly; and I would do the same to him. But, if I were free, I would change my condition as a slave. You say, if I am a man, you would expect him to do to you, if he were the master and you the slave.

I could proceed further, and show from this passage, how inconsistent are your proceedings. I will show that you act as differently from the apostles as it is possible for men to act. When Paul met a runaway slave, how did he treat him? Did he say, 'I am glad you have got your rights, you human chattel?' No, sir, he sent him back again to his master.

MR. COLE, A COLORED CITIZEN OF BOSTON.

Mr. President—I regret that an individual possessing the ability of that gentleman, should in the nineteenth century undertake to justify that institution of slavery, which is spread upon my brethren at the South. He has referred to the constitution, to prove that abolitionists are not entitled to the privileges of American citizens. Sir, that constitution will bear them out. There is not a solitary word about slavery in that constitution. The word slave is not in it. The constitution merely recognizes indirectly its existence, in some of its provisions. There was a compromise made, that the slave states should be entitled to a representation for three fifths of their slave population; and that slaves who escape should be delivered up to their masters. But so cautious were the framers of that instrument, to avoid recognizing slavery as a part of our system; and so conscious were they of its repugnance to the very spirit of our institutions, that their provisions were made without introducing into that sacred instrument the word slave or slavery. And it is evident that this compromise, far from amounting to a perpetual guarantee of slavery, was, on all hands, considered as but a *temporary* arrangement. This may be learned from the speech of Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, for the adoption of the federal constitution. Sir, the spirit of abolition was born in Virginia. If I am not mistaken, a resolution was introduced against this slave representation. Mr. Madison says, 'The Southern states will not enter into this union, unless they are permitted a *temporary* continuance of this system.'

The gentleman has also gone back to ancient times. He has referred us to the case of Joseph. Joseph was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose, sir, he was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose he was sold for a debt, I ask you, sir, were you out of the land of the Hebrews? Is there not robbery? Joseph was the first slave that we read of, and he, speaking by divine inspiration, calls it robbery. Slavery is founded in fraud.

Again, he quotes from profane facts. Sir, we can trace the *modern origin* of *chattel slavery*. The first slave ship fitted out to the coast of Africa, was in the reign of Charles V.; and King William was the first that granted a patent to a company of merchants to go to the coast of Africa, and carry the natives of that land into bondage. When this country was first discovered by Columbus, that man was a slaveholder—a slave dealer. He undertook to enslave the aborigines of this country, and to carry the surplus of them to be sold as slaves. But, there was a spark of humanity then remaining in Spain, which was shocked at the thought of such a deed. Queen Elizabeth sent back these men.

Sir, it is treachery to the sacred cause of liberty for one man to enslave another. That spirit which enslaves my colored brother at the South, would enslave every man in this house. It is not because we are *black*, that our race are enslaved. It is the slaveholding spirit that would enslave every man if it had the power. The spirit of *abolition* is, to *do righteousness*—not do as you would expect the slave to do, if he were in your place, but to do to all mankind what you would have them do to you.

But further, I say the argument of that gentleman is *too late*. The institution of slavery is already tottering. The day is gone by, for talking of its perpetuity. The death-warrant is signed. Under this without doubt the fires of a volcano, which, if not quenched, will produce, ere long, a terrible explosion. Here comes in the principle of abolition, to quench these fires, by healing up the wounds of the victim, which are the cause of fuel. Unless the holders of slaves will *do justice*, the decree of heaven has gone out for their overthrow. All injustice must ultimately call down the vengeance of the God of the oppressed; and all slavery is injustice.

MR. FAHNESTOCK.

Mr. President—This gentleman has come forward and appealed to the Bible, in defence of slavery; and he says, if we can convince him that the Bible condemns it, he will be an abolitionist. I believe he is sincere; and I wish his argument might go forward on strict Christian principles. Let there be nothing personal, uncourteous, or unkind.

MR. HOGAN.

Mr. President—I merely wish you to understand that I wish to have it explained. I did not come here prepared to enter into this discussion; especially, as I know that I am surrounded with abler heads. I agree with this gentleman perfectly. Let us agree on that ground. It is not a question whether slavery is good or evil. It is a question whether we are right or wrong. I may differ from you, and you from me. We may both be wrong. But there is a rule. Let us stand upon that. Satisfy me that I am violating the Savior condemns slavery, and if my voice is not lifted up against it, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. I am sorry that you have not met for praying; I am sorry that you have recourse to such means. Last night you called slaveholders sinners above all other men. There are among them men, who, if they could be convinced that slaveholding is wrong, would give $10,000 where you give ten cents, for its removal. There are among these men, some of the highest officers of the earth, men of God, who have the true interests of the slaves at heart. There are two black churches in Savannah, with 1100 communicants. Were I an abolitionist, I should be a perjurer. A great portion of these United States are guaranteed by the constitution, in regard to slavery. It is given to them as a right; and by whom is it given? By you, as well as by the people of the South. Is not that your pledge? I say, as long as you give me my rights in the South, I will maintain them. Now, if I should be a perjurer if I should not maintain them. Why, sir, I should be indicted for rebellion, if I were an abolitionist. If the gentleman will satisfy me that I am not bound by the constitution, I will agree with him—I will be an abolitionist. Until then, I cannot.

There is another reason. It has always appeared to me very strange—nor could I even, in any work I have ever seen, be satisfied on this point. It does appear to me very strange that there is not from cover to cover, a religious language in the New-Testament, to sanction your proceedings. I am willing to look at the question in its full breadth—show me any commentary, show me any argument, show me any thing, which will satisfy me, and I will agree with you. I will go further, and state that there is not a solitary text in the Old-Testament to sanction your proceedings. We know that slavery did exist in the Old-Testament times. Show me a single text—no one can read the Bible without being convinced of it. I know it is said that the servitude there mentioned was not upon the chattel principle. Well, prove it, then. However, I will grant a negro, a man, and I agree he was sold. Here was he sold? Did not the seller receive money from the buyer? He was put into prison and chained. Was there ever slavery in America worse than that? But it is said Joseph was *sold for money*. Well, it was a servitude—a chattel servitude. Again, Abraham had 300 slaves, brought up in his own family. Was this chattel servitude? I cannot say positively; but I can say as positively as I can say it was not. Again, how many times did Solomon? The fact is, there is no use in citing solitary instances. Slavery covered the land; and we have as good reason for believing that it was chattel slavery as we have for believing that it was not.

Again, look at Greece and Rome. Why, it has been said here that the slavery which prevailed there was not like American slavery. And where is the difference? They could not only buy and sell their slaves, but put them to death.

But again, I say there is not a solitary passage in the Bible that justifies your proceedings. We are referred to this, 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.' Sir, I do not believe that this text in the Bible has been completely misapplied as this. The meaning of it is, that we should do unto others as we should wish them to do to us, *under similar circumstances*. If I were a slave, I would expect that my master would treat me kindly; and I would do the same to him. But, if I were free, I would change my condition as a slave. You say, if I am a man, you would expect him to do to you, if he were the master and you the slave.

I could proceed further, and show from this passage, how inconsistent are your proceedings. I will show that you act as differently from the apostles as it is possible for men to act. When Paul met a runaway slave, how did he treat him? Did he say, 'I am glad you have got your rights, you human chattel?' No, sir, he sent him back again to his master.

MR. COLE, A COLORED CITIZEN OF BOSTON.

Mr. President—I regret that an individual possessing the ability of that gentleman, should in the nineteenth century undertake to justify that institution of slavery, which is spread upon my brethren at the South. He has referred to the constitution, to prove that abolitionists are not entitled to the privileges of American citizens. Sir, that constitution will bear them out. There is not a solitary word about slavery in that constitution. The word slave is not in it. The constitution merely recognizes indirectly its existence, in some of its provisions. There was a compromise made, that the slave states should be entitled to a representation for three fifths of their slave population; and that slaves who escape should be delivered up to their masters. But so cautious were the framers of that instrument, to avoid recognizing slavery as a part of our system; and so conscious were they of its repugnance to the very spirit of our institutions, that their provisions were made without introducing into that sacred instrument the word slave or slavery. And it is evident that this compromise, far from amounting to a perpetual guarantee of slavery, was, on all hands, considered as but a *temporary* arrangement. This may be learned from the speech of Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, for the adoption of the federal constitution. Sir, the spirit of abolition was born in Virginia. If I am not mistaken, a resolution was introduced against this slave representation. Mr. Madison says, 'The Southern states will not enter into this union, unless they are permitted a *temporary* continuance of this system.'

The gentleman has also gone back to ancient times. He has referred us to the case of Joseph. Joseph was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose, sir, he was a Hebrew. He was *stolen*. Suppose he was sold for a debt, I ask you, sir, were you out of the land of the Hebrews? Is there not robbery? Joseph was the first slave that we read of, and he, speaking by divine inspiration, calls it robbery. Slavery is founded in fraud.

Again, he quotes from profane facts. Sir, we can trace the *modern origin* of *chattel slavery*. The first slave ship fitted out to the coast of Africa, was in the reign of Charles V.; and King William was the first that granted a patent to a company of merchants to go to the coast of Africa, and carry the natives of that land into bondage. When this country was first discovered by Columbus, that man was a slaveholder—a slave dealer. He undertook to enslave the aborigines of this country, and to carry the surplus of them to be sold as slaves. But, there was a spark of humanity then remaining in Spain, which was shocked at the thought of such a deed. Queen Elizabeth sent back these men.

Sir, it is treachery to the sacred cause of liberty for one man to enslave another. That spirit which enslaves my colored brother at the South, would enslave every man in this house. It is not because we are *black*, that our race are enslaved. It is the slaveholding spirit that would enslave every man if it had the power. The spirit of *abolition* is, to *do righteousness*—not do as you would expect the slave to do, if he were in your place, but to do to all mankind what you would have them do to you.

But further, I say the argument of that gentleman is *too late*. The institution of slavery is already tottering. The day is gone by, for talking of its perpetuity. The death-warrant is signed. Under this without doubt the fires of a volcano, which, if not quenched, will produce, ere long, a terrible explosion. Here comes in the principle of abolition, to quench these fires, by healing up the wounds of the victim, which are the cause of fuel. Unless the holders of slaves will *do justice*, the decree of heaven has gone out for their overthrow. All injustice must ultimately call down the vengeance of the God of the oppressed; and all slavery is injustice.

MR. FAHNESTOCK.

Mr. President—This gentleman has come forward and appealed to the Bible, in defence of slavery; and he says, if we can convince him that the Bible condemns it, he will be an abolitionist. I believe he is sincere; and I wish his argument might go forward on strict Christian principles. Let there be nothing personal, uncourteous, or unkind.

MR. HOGAN.

Mr. President—I merely wish you to understand that I wish to have it explained. I did not come here prepared to enter into this discussion; especially, as I know that I am surrounded with abler heads. I agree with this gentleman perfectly. Let us agree on that ground. It is not a question whether slavery is good or evil. It is a question whether we are right or wrong. I may differ from you, and you from me. We may both be wrong. But there is a rule. Let us stand upon that. Satisfy me that I am violating the Savior condemns slavery, and if my voice is not lifted up against it, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. I am sorry that you have not met for praying; I am sorry that you have recourse to such means. Last night you called slaveholders sinners above all other men. There are among them men, who, if they could be convinced that slaveholding is wrong, would give $10,000 where you give ten cents, for its removal. There are among these men, some of the highest officers of the earth, men of God, who have the true interests of the slaves at heart. There are two black churches in Savannah, with 1100 communicants. Were I an abolitionist, I should be a perjurer. A great portion of these United States are guaranteed by the constitution, in regard to slavery. It is given to them as a right; and by whom is it given? By you, as well as by the people of the South. Is not that your pledge? I say, as long as you give me my rights in the South, I will maintain them. Now, if I should be a perjurer if I should not maintain them. Why, sir, I should be indicted for rebellion, if I were an abolitionist. If the gentleman will satisfy me that I am not bound by the constitution, I will agree with him—I will be an abolitionist. Until then, I cannot.

There is another reason. It has always appeared to me very strange—nor could I even, in any work I have ever seen, be satisfied on this point. It does appear to me very strange that there is not from cover to cover, a religious language in the New-Testament, to sanction your proceedings. I am willing to look at the question in its full breadth—show me any commentary, show me any argument, show me any thing, which will satisfy me, and I will agree with you. I will go further, and state that there is

It was governmental oppression. It was like the oppression of the Irish under the British government, or of the Indians under our own. It was general oppression—not that of individual masters, but of the government and task masters. It was their business to go out and build great treasure cities. While a certain portion were drafted for this purpose, the remainder, with their families, still resided in the land of Goshen, the choicest part of Egypt. They had their wealth, their cattle, and the product of their lands, still. They also had the right of assembling together, to transact their own business; and they had the right of prayer, which is denied not only to the slave, but to the freeman, pleading in his behalf. Their elders went up with Moses, to petition for redress of grievances, and for permission to go up into the wilderness to worship. So far from being chattels personal, like American slaves, they were the owners of chattels; so far from being slaves, they possessed many political and civil rights. Yet, for that oppression, God comes out against them, and spreads sweeping desolation over the whole land.

Again, the case of Abraham. He went out to battle with 318 trained servants; and from his having so many young men under him, we may infer that, including all the members of the families, they must have amounted to thousands. Yet, when the angels came to visit his tent, Abraham received the guests at the door—went out and caught the calf—and Sarah assisted in dressing the meat, and waiting on the guests, just as if there had been no servants at all connected with the family. How can this be accounted for, on the supposition that Abraham was surrounded with crouching slaves, whose sole business it was to toil for their masters' benefit? The most obvious conclusion is, that it was a system of clanship; that Abraham was a great chieftain; and that these people, who are called his servants, had voluntarily put themselves under his protection, and chosen him as their leader.

Solomon's servants, to which the gentleman has alluded, were simply tributaries—tribes, or parts of tribes, paying allegiance to him, and paying tribute. And levies of men were taken, to work on his buildings: but we have no evidence that they worked without pay.

Again, as to the Mosaic system. The fact that some persons were spoken of as being *bought*, seems in the mind of the gentleman, to settle the question as to chattel-servitude. But, if he will just refer to the numerous passages where this term is used, he will find that it furnishes no evidence that the persons said to be bought, were considered as goods and chattels. The Lord directs the prophet Hosea to go and buy him a wife; and he goes, and gives so much grain and so much money for a wife. Did this constitute her a part of his chattels personal? Was she his slave?

Again, persons under the Mosaic system sold themselves. That is, for a certain sum of money, paid in advance, they agreed to serve a certain limited or indefinite period. In Deut. when God predicts judgments upon the nation, he says, ye shall be sold, and no man shall buy you. The idea is, that he will bring them into such a strait that they shall offer themselves for bondmen and bondwomen, and none shall buy them. Again, there is the case of Joseph and the Egyptians—Joseph bought them all; yet, they were not slaves—they were only tributaries to the King.

Again, what is the crime of man-stealing? The Bible says, If he steal a man, or if he be *found in his hand*, he shall surely be put to death. This is taking away from somebody the ownership of a man. The slave code says it is taking away a slave from a slaveholder, and so enacts that it shall be punished with death. Was that the meaning of that law—that if I went and took away a man from his master, I had stolen so much property, and therefore must be punished with death? What was the law of theft? If I stole *property*, the penalty was *restitution*. Now if the crime of man-stealing consisted in taking a man *as the property of another*, why was it not punished in the same manner? But no, the crime evidently consists in depriving a man of the ownership of himself—and the punishment of death is annexed, because it is a violation of a most sacred distinction which the Creator has established between men and things.

But Mr. Hogan has appealed to Christ and the apostles. When the question was put to our Saviour, 'Which is the great commandment?' he summed them up in two, loving God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves, and declared that this was the substance of the law and the prophets. He referred back to the law and the prophets, in which God has arrayed himself in most terrific forms against oppression. Now, if we refer to the law, we shall find that he says, 'Thou shalt not oppress the stranger;' and the prophets, 'Thou shalt not use thy neighbor's service without wages.' The Jews in our Saviour's time interpreted the law of love very much as our friend has done. They said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy'—love the Jew and hate the Samaritan. Do to the Jews as you would expect a Jew to do to you; and do to a Samaritan as you would expect a Samaritan to do to you if he were a Jew. The Jew undertook to say for himself how the Samaritan would think he ought to be treated. So our friend says he thinks if he were a slave, he should wish so and so. Now, our Saviour puts his finger on this very sense. By a parable, he brings the Samaritan to exercise true neighborly feeling toward the Jew, and tells the man who inquired who was his neighbor, to go and do likewise.

One word as to the Apostles. Peter says the law was made for certain criminals, and among others, for *men-stealers*. I would like to ask Mr. Hogan, who are men-stealers? Moses speaks of the man who steals a man and sells him, *or if he found in his hand*. I suppose our friend would agree that, if I go to Africa and take a man by force, I steal him; and that if I buy stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, I am a partaker with the thief. Now, suppose that I buy a cargo of slaves, on the ocean, which have been stolen; or suppose I have a friend who gives them to me by his will, and I accept them; the mere fact that they are found in my hand, will condemn me as a pirate. Suppose when brought before the court, I say, 'I beg you to forbear, I did not come into the possession of these men in the way you suppose.' 'Ah,' says the law; 'how you came into possession of them, is not the question. Get them as you may, if we find these men in your hands, you are engaged in the slave-trade. Now, I wish to know, what is the difference whether I go to Africa and purchase slaves, or receive them by inheritance, or whether I come into the possession of them in the same way here. They were originally stolen; and the thief could give no title to the buyer; and the buyer receiving no title, could give none, and so on down to the present time. Where is the difference between taking a child by the strong arm of the law, or taking it by violence from the coast of Africa? The one is violence through the law, and the other is violence without law.

Again; it is said that the Apostle recognizes the relation of master and slave, as a lawful relation, by giving directions to slaves *that have believing masters*. Does he say it in the first instance, because they are worthy of honor? No; he tells them to do it that religion be not dishonored—on the same ground that Christ tells us, if smitten on one cheek to turn the other—not because he does right. 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed; and they that have *believing masters*'—here are *two classes* of servants—one class *under the yoke*, and another, by implication, and comparison, having believing masters, *not under the yoke*. Let them not despise their masters on account of past injuries, because they have been put on an equality with them, as brethren beloved. This is obviously the meaning of the passage: you that are under the yoke, submit; but you that have believing masters—who are not under the yoke, don't despise them because they are brethren.

Mr. Hogan—The able and learned dissertations to which I have listened with interest, remind me of what was said on another occasion—they contain 'some things which are true, but not new—and others which are new, but not true—but they do not touch the point.

Mr. Grosvenor—There is one point not yet touched. The gentleman complains that we have manifested a bad spirit. Are we peculiarly guilty on this point? Are we even as guilty as our Southern fellow citizens themselves? Mr. Preston has said on the floor of the Senate, 'Let an abolitionist come within the territory of South Carolina, and we'll hang him.' I have lived at the South, in South Carolina. I have been in Georgia. I have experienced the kindness and hospitality of many slaveholders. But, now, when I have been engaged in the exercise of the right of free discussion, with this gentleman can I take his arm and go with him to the South, and be protected by him, under the broad shield of the constitution? No, sir, I should lose my life. There is one article in that constitution that I wish him to observe, and remind his fellow citizens of it when he returns. I refer to that article which guaranties the citizens of every state the right of citizenship in every other state. Were I to-day in that city where I was once pastor of a church, made up of masters and slaves, I should be treated as an out-law. And for what? Because I have exercised the rights of a free citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hogan—I think there would be a great want of courtesy, if I should not acknowledge the kindness with which I have been treated. But, in allusion to what has been said, in condemning by wholesale, and in answer to the inquiry, 'Have we not a right to speak what we please,' I must say that I don't think you are any party in the case. Suppose a Southern gentleman should come here, and speak in opposition to your institutions, and rail against those things which you hold most sacred and dear to your prosperity—

Many Voices—We hear him now.

[We did not get the remainder of Mr. Hogan's remarks. After he sat down, Mr. Grosvenor again took the floor.]

I wish to add here, that the idea just advanced by the gentleman is a most extraordinary one. What do we when we censure the institution of slavery, but to exercise the right which it is our duty to exercise? What idea had Mr. Jefferson as to the right of free discussion? In our judgment, we are only bringing truth and error in contact. What danger is the truth in, when both are left free? The gentleman mistakes the difference between using the right of free discussion in a peaceable manner, and the attempts to put it down by mobs and murder. We are threatened in the very halls of legislation with death, without the privilege of being heard in our own defence. With such death have we been visited.

Mr. Hogan—The gentleman misunderstands the questions altogether. He says, under the constitution, he is liable to be seized in this way, and put to death. No, Sir; it is because *you are not under that protection, and you hold it in defiance*. You may be right; but has not the South as good a right to judge as the North? Will you claim for yourselves what you will not allow to others? Suppose you believed me to be openly violating the constitution—what would you do? Would you allow me to persevere, and appeal to that constitution for protection? I believe the course you are pursuing is calculated to deluge the nation with blood. You do worse than to Lynch men. I put the question to yourselves: Suppose you go and preach your doctrines at the South, and stir up the slaves to insurrection, would not that be worse than Lynching men? Satisfy me that you alone have the right to judge, and then I will submit; but while I believe that one has as good a right as the other, I shall not. It is not because we are opposed to free discussion; but because you attempt to discuss a subject which the constitution forbids.

['Constitution forbids!' Why did you not, Mr. Hogan, when so severely pressed by Professor Cowles—why did you not point out the article in the constitution which forbids the discussion of slavery? Verily, if it had been there, you would have met with no embarrassment in the attempt—you would have had it at your tongue's end. I am forcibly reminded of the Catholic priest, who in a recent discussion with a Nestorian, before a Turkish mollah, on the subject of image worship, declared there were passages in the Bible which justified it, *but he could not find them*; and being allowed time for this purpose, he absconded before the time came.—*Reporter*.]

PEACE.

[For the Liberator.]

THE PRINCIPLE OF PEACE.

I have often thought that there were fewer Christians among us than is generally supposed. There are many active Abolitionists who are not Christians, either in theory or practice. A man or woman may be opposed to the unjust exercise of power in one instance, and extenuate or excuse it in another instance. Southern slavery affords the most glaring exhibition of human tyranny with which I am acquainted—insomuch so, that those who justify slavery by the bible, would refuse to believe that Jesus Christ kept slaves, even if told that such was the case by their own clerical teachers. Slavery is, perhaps, more directly opposed to the spirit of christianity than any other known crime; and, consequently, those who commit that crime, are more deserving the name of *heathens* than any other class of men. I know that Dr. Channing says slaveholders may be good christians; but the pale of *his* christian church is thus made to circumscribe the blackest abyss of hell. It is not strange, therefore, that many who have known but little of experimental christianity should condemn and detest the crime of American slavery. I conceive that an anti-abolitionist is capable of any crime, and when convinced that he can do so with impunity, will not hesitate to pick a pocket, rob, or murder. I *know* that I speak the truth, and those whom this truth will principally offend are the very men who sought the life of George Thompson, and shouted at the fall of Lovejoy. For men's characters on 'change, I have learned to entertain very little respect. Most men can shed their moral characters as easily as a snake crawls out of his skin. Society is, at present, one great masquerade. The christian virtues are represented by a sort of continental money, worthless in itself, and unredeemable. We may not be surprised, therefore, that great as the sin of slaveholding is, it finds apologists both among clergymen and gentlemen of high respectability. This latter fact proves that there is as much crime in the high places of this world as in those dens where poverty and distress force out the evil nature in the shape of theft and robbery.

The sincere abolitionist has made some progress in the acquirement of Christian views and feelings; but he is so much more an abolitionist, the more he is a christian. In proportion as he is ruled by the mild and childlike spirit of Jesus Christ, he will be a good abolitionist. By a *mild* spirit, I do not mean a heart that can remain unaffected by the woes of others, and who can speak soft words to the tyrant while his victim writhes in agony at his feet. By a mild spirit, I do not mean that state of mind in which we can beat a child for playing at marbles on Sunday, and say 'How art thou, my brother?' to the priest who buys and sells his hearers. By a mild spirit, I do not mean that state of mind in which we can hate a man for differing from us in speculative belief, and hesitate to reprove him who transforms our brother into a beast of burthen. I do not call it an evidence of a christian spirit to go to law for ten dollars, and remain calm while millions are robbed of the proceeds of their labor during life. I do not call it a proof of christian feeling, when a gifted sister lifts up her voice for the slave, to ransack the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, to prove that she should hold her tongue, while the man of blood is welcomed to our pulpits and received as a messenger from Heaven.

But, by a mild spirit, I mean a spirit of forgiveness. I believe that the more ready we are to forgive injuries done to ourselves, individually, the more earnest we shall be in behalf of the rights of the slave, and the more indignant at his wrongs. The late Mr. Lovejoy would have given greater evidence of his love for the slave, if he had not resented the injuries offered to himself. In my opinion, he was *not a christian*. The only evidence (?) that remains of his possessing any feeling in common with christianity, was his defence of the slave; but there are many persons who possess sufficient christianity for that purpose, as he must be a consummate sinner who is not an abolitionist. Mr. Lovejoy's clerical profession did not constitute him a christian. A man may preach and pray all his life, without a spark of christianity in his bosom. I judge him solely by his *actions*. The man who can gird himself to go forth and bruise, wound, and mangle his fellow-creatures, is no christian. Peter was zealous for his Lord when he smote the servant of the high priest, but it was not *christian* zeal by which he was actuated. It was merely the common animal attachment which one man or brute may feel for another. Accordingly, Peter was the first to deny his Lord when he was led off unresistingly, like a common felon. Like many other partially converted men, Mr. Lovejoy saw the evil of slavery, but when the Spirit led him to the cross, he stumbled and fell. How inapplicable to him would have been the title of 'Christ's sheep.' Suppose he had triumphed and slain several men, whose orphans had subsequently attended the meetings where he officiated. Suppose one of the children had said on his return home, 'I have just heard a very affecting sermon from the man who killed my father!' All this is within the range of probability. It might all have taken place, if he had survived that bloody night.

The Peace principle is abolitionism completely carried out. It is a source of thankfulness that there are so many who are willing to advance as far as abolition, and although that does not make them christians, yet it imbues them with a measure of the spirit of christianity. The colored race are, at present, the greatest sufferers from the anti-christian spirit of the world, and the Church must pass through the door of abolitionism before she can become christianized. Then we shall receive more light. We shall perceive that every exercise of physical force over our fellows is criminal. Peace is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. Without *that*, it would be no better than other systems of religion. The name which God has honored above every other name is, 'The Prince of Peace.'

WILLIAM COMSTOCK.

EVANGELICAL ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Boston, Feb. 17, 1838.

Mr. Garrison:

Sir—I attended a meeting of the '*Evangelical Anti-Slavery Society*' on Thursday evening last, at the Marlboro' Chapel; and as all meetings relating to slavery are more or less interesting, some account of this meeting may not be unacceptable to your readers.

The meeting was called to order by the Rev. E. M. P. Wells, and a prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Fitch. Mr. Wells, who evidently acted his part reluctantly, then rose and said, 'He perceived by the papers that he was expected to address the meeting, and explain the principles and objects of the society,'—but, he exclaimed, 'I find myself in a very unpleasant situation!' 'He had heard complaints against the abolitionists in this vicinity, but as *he had not seen or read the organ of their society in this State, for about two years past*, he could not speak from *actual knowledge*, concerning the justice of them!' '*He regretted that he was not better informed!*' '*I am told*,' said he, '*for I have not read it*, that good men have been publicly denounced, for not granting the use of a house for an Anti-Slavery Convention, in opposition to the feelings of a majority of the parish, of which they were a committee!' And this, sir, was the grand objection to the present organization, and the *only* specific one, advanced in the course of his remarks! His authority for the above, he very prudently kept to himself. Possibly Mr. Manager Gulliver, and his recruiting sergeant, ——— ———, might throw some light upon the subject, if they chose.

I was surprised that a gentleman of Mr. Wells's reputation, after having voluntarily confessed his *entire ignorance* of the facts in the case, should proceed to denounce those of as fair a standing in society as himself, upon the mere *ipse dixit* of others!—I commend the prudence and the honesty of the speaker, in confessing his ignorance of what he stated, but I cannot justify him, in condemning those against whom he was unable to bring any accusation, from his own personal knowledge. It would seem that his ignorance should have sealed his lips in silence! Is it the duty of an honest man,—is it acting the part of a christian, to accuse others of improper and unchristian conduct, upon no better evidence than the assertions of an enemy? Is it just and righteous to condemn a brother *unheard?* What would the Rev. Mr. Wells say of an infidel, who should condemn the Bible, and denounce its doctrines, without having *seen or read it?* What would he say of Congress, should they receive, and act upon, the petitions of slaveholders, and refuse *even to read* the petitions of the opposite party, on the same subject? If Mr. Wells had not the reputation of being an intelligent gentleman, we should conclude at once, that he not only manifested a want of common civility and christian courtesy, but even of common intelligence!

The object in forming a new society, he said, was, that they might be enabled to carry on the Anti-Slavery warfare, in a 'spirit of good will!' This remark was repeated several times, and with peculiar emphasis.—Are we to understand by this, that the members (if it is proper to use the plural number,) of the Evangelical Society cannot manifest the spirit of *good will*, in any other way? Or are we understand them to accuse other societies of acting in a spirit of *ill will?* Let the spirit of good will decide between us and them. *Good* will, surely, never prompted the speaker to cast unjust aspersions upon the characters of those against whom, as he frankly acknowledged, he *knew* nothing deserving of censure!

Mr. Wells having concluded his remarks, an address was delivered by Mr. Fitch. The greater part of it was interesting and appropriate, although it was not delivered with his accustomed zeal and energy—something evidently depressed his spirits—he was not at home.—He made a few remarks upon the Evangelical organization, but stated nothing new or important.—'He was willing that all, of any name, of every name, and of no name at all, *who loved God*, should act with the evangelicals,' but he gave us no rule by which to judge of this love. The Bible rule, I fear, will not answer the purpose: if it will, I cannot see the need of a new organization. I hope we shall not be left in the dark.—After the address, the constitution was read by the President, Mr. Wells, and all persons, wishing to become members, were invited to walk forward and sign their names. I did not observe that any person signed it, and I therefore conclude that the original 'evangelical christians' were left 'alone in their' exclusiveness.

P. H. S.

VERMONT AWAKE!

Northfield, Vt. Feb. 8th, 1838.

Dear Bro. Garrison,

It is with unspeakable pleasure that I am able to announce to you, that the cause of the oppressed is onward in every part of this state. My entire time for fifteen months, has been devoted to the work of lecturing, and raising funds for the American Society; and in every place where I have as yet visited, our *principles* and *measures* have met with a warm reception by many of the *thinking* and *good* in Church and State; and it may be said, and that emphatically, that Vermont, as a whole, is RIGHT on the 'exciting subject;'—some, to be sure, yet oppose—but the opposition is not violent as formerly; and those who take sides against the abolitionists, (as one pro-slavery man remarked a few days since, at the close of a public debate between myself and judge N—— of Morristown,) speak just as though a divine conviction was resting on their minds, that they are opposing the principles of eternal justice and truth.

Yesterday I attended the annual meeting of the Washington county A. S. Society, at Montpelier. It was a deeply interesting season. The speeches on the occasion were generally very spirited, and much to the point; and what was better than all the rest, we had a 'chattel,' right from the 'patriarchal institution' of the south to address us on the occasion. This piece of runaway property stood erect, and gave the audience a succinct account of its history for thirty-two years, and so simple and artless was the style, and so appropriate the language, and so perfectly rational the narrative, that the evidence of its truth could not be resisted; and if I may judge from the appearance of the audience, while the stealing tear was wiped from many an eye, the sentiment spontaneously fell from every lip, it is not a 'thing'—*he* is a MAN. For myself, I have not the least doubt but one of the most brilliant intellects lies hid in this human form. Who, I ask, is prepared to bear the guilt of grinding God's image to the dust, and making man a thing?

In conclusion, I would remark that the 'New Organization' has not a friend in this state, to my knowledge. We are satisfied with the old school, and think it would ill become us to array ourselves against the pioneers in this good and heavenly cause. Go on, my dear bro. Garrison, in your great and holy work of opposing the souls-destroying and God-defying system of American slavery. Be as 'harsh as truth,' but let all your weapons be SPIRITUAL—then will they be mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strong hold of the devil, SLAVERY.

Yours for God and the oppressed,

G. BECKLEY.

WEST AMESBURY YOUNG MEN'S ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At the annual meeting of the West Amesbury Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society, held on Friday evening, Jan. 26th, the following list of persons were elected as officers for the ensuing year:

President, George P. Patton; Vice President, Frederic A. Sargent; Secretary, Noah Jackman; Treasurer, Jonathan S. Osgood.

The following preamble and resolutions were then adopted.

Whereas, the interests of our country will soon be transferred from our fathers, to the young and rising generation: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of every young man to take a firm, bold, and decided stand in favor of the cause of universal and impartial liberty.

Resolved, That the success which has hitherto attended the efforts of abolitionists, in this place and elsewhere, calls upon us at this time to express our gratitude to Almighty God, and should inspire us with fresh courage in the good work in which we are engaged, in hastening on that day when liberty shall be proclaimed to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to those who are bound.

It was then voted, to hold a meeting on the evening of the fourth Wednesday of each month.

Voted, unanimously, to invite William Lloyd Garrison to lecture on the subject of slavery in this place, as soon as he can make it convenient.

Voted, That the above proceedings be sent for publication to the Editor of the Liberator and Watchtower.

JAMES WHITTIER, Jr. *Chairman*.

Noah Jackman, *Secretary*.

BOSTON.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1838.

☞ The editor of the Liberator is so ill as to be unable to attend to his editorial labors, or to any correspondence. He intended to accompany the excellent letter of Henry Grew with some comments, and also the letter of 'An Abolitionist' to Dr. Channing, but is unable to do so. The former expresses his own views, religiously, in a very satisfactory manner. The latter is a conclusive reply to Dr. Channing's letter to Abolitionists, but challenges the criticism of 'ultra' peace men. 'Hampden' to Daniel Webster, can be no other than our friend N. P. Rogers of Plymouth, N. H. who always wields a pen of fire. A friend will take charge of the Liberator until the editor's recovery.

A FREE COUNTRY.

The following letter, it will be perceived, was addressed to Francis Jackson, by his brother Hon. Wm. Jackson, while a member of Congress. It was read the other day, by Mr. Birney, to the Committee of the Legislature on the subject of slavery, &c. in the District of Columbia. It is another of the many proofs, that slavery has already in fact divided the union, nay that it has made American citizens, who dare to cherish and avow the sentiments of Franklin, Jay and Rush on the subject of liberty, outlaws in the capital of their country. Is it then true, that slavery makes freemen outlaws in the District of Columbia, for no crime but that of being freemen? It is even so. Read the letter that follows, and while the blush is on your cheek, vow most solemnly that you will do your utmost to drive the foul monster at least from the seat of Government.

Washington, April 11, 1836.

Francis Jackson,

Dear brother,—After a trial of ten days, and an imprisonment of eight and a half months, Dr. Crandall has been acquitted.

An intelligent and highly respectable lawyer, who has heard the trial, said but a few moments since, that the whole prosecution from beginning to end had been so utterly groundless, that all concerned in it ought to be indicted.

Immediately, on receiving your letter requesting my attention to his situation, I called on Dr. Crandall, and have at different times spent several hours in conversation with him. I found him intelligent, discreet, and gentlemanly; and from inquiry learn, that he has uniformly sustained a highly respectable character in Connecticut, New-York, and Washington.

He was charged with distributing abolition tracts, which charge, if sustained, was no violation of law, nor as I understand, has a particle of evidence been adduced, either before the Grand Jury or at his trial, that he ever distributed such tracts, or any other papers relating to the subject of slavery; or that he ever attempted, in any other way, to inculcate upon others, in this District, his views in regard to that institution.

Thus you see, that in the Capital of our boasted Republic of Freemen, the express provisions of whose Constitution secures to all the liberty of the press and freedom of discussion, a citizen came near loosing his life, and actually suffered more than eight months imprisonment for thinking differently from the majority, without publishing, or even expressing in any way, his thoughts.

After his trial was over, his innocence proved beyond all doubt, and he fully acquitted, his counsel and friends, under a conviction that he would be unsafe elsewhere, had him again locked into the prison, from whence I accompanied him to my own room after *nine o'clock in the evening, where he continued until one o'clock the next morning*, at which hour he left Washington for Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Thus this amiable and respectable young man's prospects are all overturned, his property sacrificed, and his health greatly injured by long imprisonment; and after full proof of his innocence, *he is compelled to flee from the Capital of his country for his life, like a felon in the dark!*

Yours affectionately,

WILLIAM JACKSON.

NEW ENGLAND SPECTATOR.

This paper, in giving notice of the recent meeting of the City Evangelical A. S. Society, speaks of it only as 'the City Anti-Slavery Society'!—Is the constitution changed; or is the Spectator sick of the term 'Evangelical,' in this connection?—But not content with this, the editor adds:—

'The christian public may be assured, nothing will there be done or said, tending to check the work of divine grace now in progress in this city.'

All the comment we have to make on this is, that, according to Messrs. Fitch, Towne & Co. 'insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying.'

Again, in the same number of the paper, in an article headed 'Christian Action in behalf of the slave,' is the following:—

'We know there are many, who sincerely desire to do all in their power in behalf of the suffering slave; yet they cannot conscientiously co-operate with the *present anti*-slavery movements, because they think they see in them principles of *radicalism*, which threaten to subvert the foundations of society; and because they cannot sympathize with a course of action, at war with christian charity and the courtesies of life. We do not say, that these fears are in all respects well founded; and, yet we do say, that they are not entirely destitute of foundation, nor so destitute of it as not to furnish a just ground for standing aloof from these operations.'

All this is said, observe, of 'present anti-slavery movements' generally, not of any one movement; and it charges them all alike (1) with a 'radicalism, which threatens to subvert the foundations of society;' (2) with 'a course of action, at war with christian charity and the courtesies of life'; (3) with so much of these things, that all have 'just ground for standing aloof from these operations'; and therefore (4) 'the object of the article is to point out several ways' in which there can be '*christian* action in behalf of the slave,' 'independently of any general organization.'

To all this we say, that 'insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying'; that the charges made are indiscriminate, false, and slanderous; that they are the charges of the worst enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, but are in perfect keeping with the recent unchristian and slanderous course of the Spectator; and that, we publish them not to refute them, but as a specimen of the insinuations and slanders which that paper is continually heaping on 'the present anti-slavery movements.'

DEMOCRACY.

We go for Democracy in its broadest sense, and we would have a party, if we could, embracing the whole family of man; but we would not, we could not, consistent with our principles, sustain men nor measures which we believe repugnant to the true democratic principle.—*Daily Advocate*.

That's right, friend Hallet. We go for such democracy. Therefore the first thing done, in the 'reorganization of the Democratic party,' of which you speak, will doubtless be to repudiate the 'man' who declares beforehand, that he will 'veto' the will of the majority, and that too in a republic, sooner than he will have anything to do with giving LIBERTY to one sixth of 'THE PEOPLE' in the Capital of his country, unless a slave-driving MINORITY will let him! And the next thing, in the 're-organization,' we presume will be to inform the would-be leader of democracy, that 'the true democratic principle' and the divine right of slave-holding will not 'go' together; otherwise, friend Hallett may rest assured that his 'Democracy in the broadest sense' will be understood by *real* democrats to be '*stuff*.'

PETITIONS, PETITIONS, PETITIONS.

Abolitionists of Massachusetts—

Twenty thousand persons have sent memorials to the State Legislature, asking that body to protest, in the name of the people, against the unconstitutional and despotic resolution, adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States, on the 21st of December last. This is well, but well needs to be made better, even on this topic. Farther, blank petitions, like that which we last week printed, have been sent to every part of the state for circulation. This petition asks the Legislature to declare (1) that Congress has Constitutional power to abolish slavery and the slave trade, in the District of Columbia; and (2) that this power should be immediately exercised. Now there are, in this State, at least 200 Anti-Slavery Societies formed on the principles of immediate emancipation. At a moderate estimate, these will average 100 members each. But few, very few of them are juvenile societies, and of the others, but a small portion of their members are minors. Besides these, there is a multitude of abolitionists in the State, who are not members of any society. So that, upon the most moderate calculation, there are in this State, at least 20,000 adults, who are immediate abolitionists, and therefore, upon this estimate, petitions ought to have been sent to the State Legislature, on the above subject, before this, from at least TWENTY-THOUSAND petitioners;—and if there had been, who does not know that the Legislature would at once speak the voice of immediatism in regard to the District? But, alas! what is the fact? Why, that on the first topic, 20,000 have petitioned, and on the latter, only 6,400! Yes, humiliating as it is, *of twenty thousand adult abolitionists in the State of Massachusetts, not seven thousand have yet even* ASKED *their legislature to do what it can, for the overthrow of that system of abominations, which is professedly the abhorrence of their souls!* Again, of more than 100 towns in the Commonwealth, in which there are flourishing abolition societies, only 36 have sent in petitions for abolition in the District. In the whole of Essex County, only four towns have sent in petitions, and yet there are in that county some ten or twelve other towns, in which are at least 2000 persons enrolled as members of abolition societies, to say nothing of the many other persons, not thus enrolled, who are for abolition in the District; and yet not a petition from one of them. In Worcester county, only nine have sent petitions; in Middlesex five, in Bristol only *one* and so through the state generally! Friends of the slave, is this right?—Is this abolitionism?—Is this 'remembering them that are in bonds as bound with them?' Are you to be content with this?

What then is to be done? Last year the legislature passed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That Congress, having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, possess the right to abolish slavery in said District, and that its exercise should only be restrained by a regard to the public good.

This resolution admits the *right* of Congress to abolish slavery in the District, and that nothing but 'the public good' should restrain its exercise. This session the legislature should take another step, and say that justice, humanity, the honor of the nation, and 'the public good,' so far from restraining, require, not only the exercise, but the *immediate* exercise of this right, in the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in that District. To this end, abolitionists must now make the District their focal point of action. Besides, with 20,000 petitioners against the resolution of Dec. 21st, and only 6,400 against slavery, &c. in the District, the 6,400 look smaller than they would otherwise do, and the influence on the committee of the legislature is to make them feel, that while multitudes are ready to stand for the right of petition, the abolitionists are but a handful. In this state of things, then, the fear, if not the prospect now is, that the legislature will go but little, if at all, in advance of last year. The position of our cause is, therefore, most critical. Therefore send in the petitions—circulate them promptly and thoroughly, and in *two weeks from this*, let the speaker's table groan with petitions. Friends of the slave, it is for you to decide the question. Speak as freemen and free women ought to speak, and your representatives will speak as they ought. Otherwise, they will not; and if you fail in your duty, how can you blame them for failing in theirs? ☞ Then send in the petitions.

We subjoin a form of petition.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The undersigned———of———in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, respectfully and earnestly pray your honorable bodies, without delay,

To declare that Congress has also the Constitutional right to abolish slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; and that the rights of humanity, the claims of justice, the honor of the nation, and 'the public good,' alike demand, that in each of these respects, Congress should immediately exercise said right; and that a copy of said declarations be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives of this State, in Congress, to be, by them, laid before that body; and to each of the Governors of the several States, to be, by them, laid before their respective Legislatures; and that your honorable bodies instruct or request the Senators and Representatives of this State, in Congress, to use their utmost influence to effect an immediate and total abolition of Slavery and the Slave-trade in said District of Columbia.

LETTERS.

S. Keese, D. J. Sexton, Thomas B. Davis, A. D. Shadd, John Cox, J. Hale, p. m., J. B. Merritt, D. & S. Bradford, J. Wright, P. Le B. Stickney.

☞ Bro. May's lecture on Peace, at the Odeon, on Monday evening, we understood was a very impressive and uncompromising effort,—taking the ground that it is not lawful for a christian to use physical force towards his enemies in any case whatever.

☞ The History of the Anti-Slavery Controversy, advertised as preparing for publication, will be written by a veteran in the war, and will doubtless be a valuable and interesting work.

☞ Mr. Comstock is alone responsible for the sentiments contained in his communication.

☞ Please pay particular attention to the article on Petitions.

RETURNS WANTED FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

There are many Anti-Slavery Societies in this State, whose officers, &c. have never been reported. It is very desirable that *every* Society, male, female, or juvenile, should be reported. This, therefore, is to request the Secretary, or President, or some member of each A. S. Society, in the state, to forward *immediately* to A. A. Phelps, Boston, the name of the Society, the names of its officers, the time of its formation, and the number of members.

☞ N. B. Some societies have been recently reported. Will the proper persons see that the others are reported as soon as possible? Please attend to the matter NOW.

Boston, Feb. 9, 1838 (tf.) A. A. PHELPS, Agt.

NOTICE.

Mr. Joseph Nason, a scientific Artisan of this city, will lecture before the Adelphic Union, on Tuesday evening next. Subject—The Steam Engine. Mr. Nason has taken great pains, and been at considerable expense, to make the exercises of the evening interesting. He will exhibit a number of working models of different construction, actually operating, and having attached to them machinery to illustrate the operations. The public may be assured that there will be no danger of the 'bursting of boilers,' as the preparations will all be made in another room. Those who wish to obtain seats, will do well to be in season, for so rare and interesting an exhibition will scarcely fail to bring out a full house.

WANTED IMMEDIATELY,

Emancipator, Vol. II. No. 1; and Liberator, Vol. VII, No. 17.

Any person who has a copy of either of the above, will confer a *special favor*, by forwarding them *immediately*, to A. A. Phelps, Boston.

☞ Reader, will you be so kind as to look, *now*, and see if you have a copy that you can spare, for the *good of the cause?*

PEACE LECTURES AT THE ODEON.

The fifth lecture on peace, under the direction of the American Peace Society, will be delivered at the Odeon, Monday 26th instant, by Amasa Walker, Esq. on the practicability of the object. The services will commence at half past seven o'clock, P. M. and a collection will be taken.

Preparing for Publication!

HISTORY

OF THE

CONTROVERSY RESPECTING SLAVERY,

During the first seven years,

AND OF

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES,

From the year 1830 to 1838.

'Every man should let his man-servant, and every man his maid-servant go free, that none should serve himself of them. Thus saith the Lord—Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor.'

Jeremiah.

THE existing controversy respecting American slavery comprises the most momentous intestine collision which has arisen during the nineteenth century; for it includes the elevation of nearly three millions of human beings from the most appalling and melancholy debasement, to the character and rank of social humanity. Whether therefore we refer to the grandeur of the results, or to the magnitude of the interests which are involved, that sacred warfare is no less impressive to the sensibilities of the philanthropist, than it is agitating to the participants and to the spectators of the moral convulsion. When the clangor of the arms shall have ceased by the triumph of the Anti-Slavery champions, after they shall have brought 'into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;' and the strong excitement which is now produced by the proximity of the battle-field shall have been deprived of its fervor—even then the annals of the present contest upon slavery will comprise one of a very instructive chapter in the history of our eventful times.

Look at the combatants. It is domestic despotism endeavoring to crush and strangle social liberty. Brotherly love, seconded by evangelical holiness, makes its assault upon selfishness and vice intrenched in their strong holds. Upon the battlements of slavery's castle, stand armed in all dread and sanguinary array, innumerable 'principalities, powers, rulers of the darkness of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places'—and the fortress of iniquity is attempted to be stormed by a few scorned soldiers of 'the Prince of Peace,' whose only armor and weapons are these—They are 'girded about with truth.' Righteousness and love are their breast-plate. They carry 'the shield of faith.' For a helmet, they wear 'the hope of salvation.' They wield 'the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God'—while their evangelical coat-of-mail is sustained and cemented by 'all prayer.' Although they 'are accounted as sheep for the slaughter,' yet they 'endure hardness,' because they are certain, however protracted may be the holy war, that they will be 'more than conquerors through him who loved us.'

It is equally our duty as it is our privilege, who have been engaged in the strife from its commencement, and who have never either slept upon guard, or deserted our post, to preserve a compendious memorial of *all the important facts of every kind* which have transpired, *during the first seven years of the conflict*, relative to slavery in the United States of America. It is therefore designed to issue a standard volume, that shall embody *every essentially illustrative topic, remote or immediate*, which is connected with the grand inspiring theme—and thus to present to our citizens, and especially to all the members of Anti-Slavery Societies, an *authentic narrative* of the affecting disputation from official documents, and a *chronological record* sufficiently comprehensive, to supersede all reference to any other work, unless where very minute details or the precise phraseology may be indispensable. ISAAC KNAPP.

Boston, January 1, 1838.

NAMES OF PUBLIC CHARACTERS,

TO be seen in the MASSACHUSETTS REGISTER, for 1838,—such as Judges, Governors, Justices, Counsellors, Attorneys, Sheriffs, Postmasters, Physicians, Military Officers, Ministers in every town, Literary men, Officers in Banks and Insurance Companies, Officers of the United States Government, Foreign Ministers, Consuls, &c. Army and Naval Officers, City Officers, &c. &c. &c For sale by JAMES LORING, 132 Washington street.

JUST PUBLISHED.

SLAVERY ILLUSTRATED IN ITS EFFECTS UPON WOMAN AND DOMESTIC SOCIETY.

'A generation, O how lofty are their eyes!—whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw teeth as knives, to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men!'—Agar.

'They have given a boy for a harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink!'—Joel.

'They sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes; and turn aside the way of the meek. A man and his father will go in unto the same maid, to profane my holy name!'—Amos.

For sale by Isaac Knapp, 25, Cornhill.
Feb. 16. istf

FOR SALE,

Three lots of land in Milk Row, Charlestown, containing one third of an acre each. For further particulars, inquire of the subscriber, PRIMUS HALL, corner Southack & George St.

Also, to let, a house situated in Milk Row, possession given April 1. Enquire as above. Feb. 5.

JUST 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 Sarah M. Grimke.

For sale by Isaac Knapp, 25, Cornhill.
Feb. 14 istf

BOARD WANTED.

A gentleman and his wife wish to obtain board in a private family. Enquire at 25, Cornhill.
Feb. 14.

LITERARY.

☞ The following effusion is by a young lad, who has been sick from a child, and has never had the ordinary advantages of education—Nevertheless, he is more than a match for the Bishop. His rhyme, if destitute of high poetical merit, is at least characterised by good sense and sound moral discrimination. The address alluded to has already appeared in our columns.—*Ed. Lib.*

BISHOP HEADING'S ADDRESS.

Is this the land which men proclaim
A land of liberty and fame?
A land that's blest of all the earth,
Where all her sons are free from birth?
A land where milk and honey flow,
Where balmy winds untainted blow—
In short, to sum up all its worth,
A second paradise on earth?
Where is the man who dares to say,
It does possess one glittering ray
Of freedom, to dispel the gloom,
More awful than the silent tomb,
Which hovers round Columbia's shore,
Where liberty is known no more?
E'en Heading pleads with powerful zeal,
The cause of those who dare to steal
And shackle Afric's free-born race,
And doom them as their beasts of chase;
Force them to groan in servile chains,
And rob them of their hard-earned gains.
And, take his words just as he spoke them,—
That is, if I have not mistook them,—
He says that men may worship God,
With hands fresh dipped in human blood;
And even says, with brazen face,
Until some man will show the place
Wrote by some old apostle grave,
Which says, 'Thou shalt not own a slave,'
He ne'er shall cease to think it right—
But aids it on with all his might.
Yea, Bishop Heading says 'tis right
For Christian men, if they are white,
To rob a race by nature free,
Of all the joys of liberty;
To chain the mind, destroy the soul,
Till time itself shall cease to roll.
And that our doubts may be removed,
He even says that Christ approved
Of murder, robbery, and chains,
And selling souls for earthly gains.
And is this Bishop such a dunce,
So blind and stupid all at once,
As thus to raise the hue and cry,
And give to Christ himself the lie?
For Christ to all mankind has said,
As plain as language can be made,
'Thou shalt not covet other's pelf;
But love thy neighbor as thyself.'
But then to prove it lawful gain,
He quotes from Matthew to explain
That God allows the great and wise
The poor and needy to despise;
When the same scriptures plainly state,
That God does not respect the great,
More than the poor, oppressed and lame,
But does love *all* mankind the same—
In his own likeness made them all,
Both black and white, both great and small.
But Heading proves, as plain as day,
The scriptures don't mean what they say!
For Christ has said, 'To others do
As you'd have others do to you;'
But he has found, or else he guess'd,
It means, the poor shall be oppressed.
And if the slaves should e'er obtain
Their freedom from oppression's chain,
He says aloud, with doleful cry,
'You do not as you'd be done by!'
What! not to give a man his right,
Because he's black, and you are white!
In almost every age, it seems,
The grand high priests have had their dreams,
Or wakeful visions full of spite,
That black is not so good as white:
E'en Aaron, his great predecessor,
Although like Heading a professor,
With horror pictured in his face,
He found that one of Ethiop's race
Ranked with the leaders of the Jews—
And, horror-stricken at the news,
He sought for Miriam, his sister,
With conscience scorching to a blister,
And in a rage to her he stated
How badly Moses had been mated—
His wife, although of noble blood,
A princess of the Midian sod,
Yet she was deep immersed in sin—
For why? She had a swarthy skin!
A crime too great to be forgiven,
Or to allow a seat in heaven:
And both of them, with murmurs loud,
Spread tumult through the listening crowd.
To punish these two haughty scribes,
For sowing discord through the tribes,
And murmuring at the works of God,
He smote them with his chastening rod.
Again, says Heading, those who speak
Upon the first day of the week,
And raise their voice and boldly plead
For millions who are doomed to bleed
Beneath a bloody tyrant's rod,
And strangers to the word of God,
They 'desecrate' the day of rest,
By pleading for the poor oppressed!
So cavilling scribes and lawyers thought,
When they the blessed Saviour caught
Right in the act, one Sabbath day,
Of healing one who sick did lay;
And they were filled with rage and ire,
(The praise of men their sole desire)—
And cried, affectedly distressed,
'He desecrates this day of rest!'
And boldly sought how to destroy
The Saviour, who dared thus employ
The day in doing good to men,
When they declared it was a sin.
The Bishop says, should all men be
For letting the oppressed go free,
The sons of Ham would never find
Religion to instruct their mind.
To quote his words—he even said,
Unless their minds to God were led
By some sincere and christian brother,
They all would go to hell together.
But who, pray tell me, if you durst,
Will answer for their souls at last?
I'll leave you, sir, to solve this query
In your own mind so cold and dreary—
Upon whose head will rest the blame?
But peradventure you'll exclaim,
'Upon those men you seek to fetter.'
But why have you not taught them better?
Pray, solve this well, within your mind,
Ere you again address mankind.

J. S.

For the Liberator.

WHO MADE THE FIELDS?

'Mother, who made the verdant field,
The lofty trees and waving grass;
The flowers that such sweet fragrance yield,
To fill the air whene'er I pass?'

'Twas God, my child; he made the earth,
And all the beauteous things you see;
He gives the humblest flowers their birth,
And watches over you and me.'

'Then God is good, and I will try
To love and serve him more, mamma;
Although he lives beyond the sky,
Will he not hear my prayer so far?'

'He will, my child—our thoughts he sees,
And every hidden secret thing;
And infant voices always please
The great and glorious heavenly King.

'And if you love him now he'll bless,
And daily pour those favors down,
More rich than feeble words express—
And when you die your spirit crown.'

D. C. C.

MISCELLANEOUS.

COLONIZATION.

The Emancipator contains a letter from one of the anti-slavery agents now lecturing in Pennsylvania, Mr. Wm. H. Burleigh, dated 'Harrisburgh, Jan. 29th.' As several copies of the Liberator circulate in that part of the country, we make the following extracts from Mr. B's letter—premising that it is a synopsis of a lecture delivered in Harrisburgh by Dr. Booth, an agent of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society. 'It had been advertised that he would lecture upon colonization, but he did not speak a dozen sentences upon that topic during his harangue of an hour and a half.' Mr. Burleigh then adds—

He began by stating that there was too much 'morbid excitement' in the community upon the subject of slavery—that he labored to allay that excitement, and had been successful in doing it in many places, and hoped to succeed here. The colonization scheme, during its quiet operation for fifteen years, produced no excitement in the land, nor any injury to religion. He then gave us a brief history of slavery, commencing with the 'first slave,' Joseph, who was sold by his brethren—and from the history of Joseph, together with the subsequent account of the enslavement of the Israelites in Egypt, he inferred that 'slavery, under certain circumstances, may be in the providence of God'—but very correctly added that this rendered 'the wickedness of man none the less.' After speaking of the enslavement of the children of Israel by the Africans, he said—'Perhaps God has a controversy with that people for enslaving the Israelites and the Circassians.' Perhaps he has. What then? Why, if God has a controversy with Africa for enslaving the descendants of Abraham, he undoubtedly has a controversy with our nation for enslaving the descendants of Ham. God is not a partial judge. If in the olden time he abhorred oppression, he abhors it none the less now. It cannot be less displeasing to Him when committed by Christian America than by pagan Africa.

Slavery, said Mr. Booth, was introduced into the American colonies under the sanction of Great Britain. It was absolutely forced on us, contrary to our will, through the cupidity of the mother country—and though Great Britain had done nobly, and was worthy of great praise, in that she had paid the planters in her colonies the full value for their slaves—it yet becomes her to be very modest in what she says to us. Slavery has existed here ever since the existence of the colonies, and though it is 'a sin, a curse, and a shame,' yet God has greatly prospered and blessed us, notwithstanding its existence. Slavery exists to this day in Pennsylvania and New Jersey (Why don't you go to the South?)—the North has assisted in palming it upon the South, and it therefore becomes the North to be very modest in what she says to the South. He then pretended to go into an examination of the question, whether slavery is under all circumstances sinful. He quoted Lev. xxv. 44th, 45th, and 46th verses, to prove that God not only permitted, but sanctioned and positively enjoined the system of slavery—perpetual slavery, among his own people—and it was right, because God commanded it. This astonishing declaration was prefaced and concluded with the assertion, 'I am not a pro-slavery man'—a very necessary declaration, if he would have his hearers believe it, for the whole drift of his speech was calculated to produce in their minds a very different conclusion. He next quoted from the New Testament to prove that slavery was not condemned under the gospel dispensation—that slaveholders were recognized as 'partakers of the benefit,' &c.; but as his remarks on this point were simply the echo of the Counter Appeal of President Fisk & Co. I need not quote them. As in his remarks upon the Old Testament, he begged the question throughout. Is slavery, then, under all circumstances, a sin? He thought not. Sin is a voluntary transgression of a known law. That law must be either civil or moral. The slaveholders do not transgress civil law in retaining their human property, for the civil law not only allows it, but in many instances actually forbids emancipation. The slaveholders have no right to resist this civil law—if they manumit their slaves contrary to the civil law, they resist it—they sin against God; they partly bring upon themselves the malediction of heaven; *they incur damnation!* He then attempted to show that the slaveholder violated no moral law. There is no direct denunciation of slavery in the Gospel of the New Testament. The slaveholder has more scripture in his favor than we have against him. 'If we resort to Scripture for the condemnation of slavery, the southerner can beat us all out.' There are instances in the South in which slaves are held in strict conformity to the law of love. He quoted several examples of pious slaveholders, *among his own acquaintance*, at the South, who hold slaves in strict conformity to this law, and *thousands upon thousands are similarly situated'*; slaveholders without violating any law of God or man; *slaveholders in strict conformity with the law of love!* In these cases, 'the slave is just as much a sinner for being held a slave, as the slaveholder is for holding him as such!' He quoted some hard sayings of the abolitionists; greatly deprecated a dissolution of the Union, for then we could send no more tracts, and Bibles, and hymn-books, and missionaries to the slaves; there are 200,000 slave members of Christian churches; the colonization scheme is in accordance with the gospel; it is the handmaid of religion; the auxiliary of the church; never was prospered more than now—several southern legislatures, and private individuals, *in the South*, have lately made large appropriations to it—and on to-morrow evening (Monday) he pledged himself to prove that the colonization scheme can emancipate the South, abolish the slave trade, and regenerate Africa.

Having an appointment myself this evening, I do not expect to hear this wonderful demonstration. I regret it—because I might perhaps learn a great deal—or if I should not be edified, I could hardly fail of being amused. I hope he may at least succeed in convincing his audience that he is not a pro-slavery man, for in spite of his frequent assertions last evening to that effect, he left upon many minds a very different impression. I consider his whole harangue as a colorable defence of slavery; an attempted justification of the 'patriarchal system' upon 'evangelical principles.' Perhaps it is worthy of note, that no colored people attended the lecture; at least, I could discover none, though I looked around the house for that purpose.

During the course of his remarks, Mr. Booth read an extract from Mr. Birney, endorsed by the Emancipator as 'sound doctrine,' in order to prove that abolitionists have entirely given up the point of the sinfulness of the 'legal relation' of slavery, and assent to a 'mental emancipation,' while the legal relation may still remain without sin. He also stated that Mr. Burleigh has advanced the same doctrine in this place repeatedly; he has said, 'Manumit the slave mentally, but let the legal and formal relation remain.' He did not assert that I had said this publicly, but in private conversations. Now, I shall leave you to take care of this charge, so far as the Emancipator is concerned. I do not see the paper as often as I wish I did; but I must say, if this is the doctrine of the American Anti-Slavery Society, I am not fit to be its agent, for I cannot defend principles so manifestly wrong and absurd. The assertion that I have advocated such sentiments here, or any where else, is a grand mistake.

At the close of his lecture, Mr. Booth descended the stairs, and standing in the space before the pulpit, declared his readiness to be corrected, if he had said any thing incorrect; that he kept himself open to conviction, &c. As he had grossly misrepresented my sentiments, I at once concluded that this was an invitation to me; and feeling it to be my duty to correct the erroneous impression which would otherwise be made, I immediately rose for this purpose. 'Through the courtesy of the lecturer, then,' I began, 'I will take this opportunity to correct an error——' 'Not here—not here, sir,' he interrupted; 'I will have no discussion here; if you wish controversy, you may come to my private room—I will have none of it here.' He spoke very rapidly, and under evident excitement, for a short time; and when he stopped, I again spoke, declaring that my object was not controversy, but simply to correct a mis-statement which had been connected with my name. Dr. Booth again interrupted; he would hear no corrections; I could come to him in private, &c. Another colonizationist, in a very peremptory manner, bade me sit down, declaring he was an officer of the church, and laying his hand upon my shoulder to enforce his mandate. I submitted, of course; for I saw it would be useless to attempt to speak. Dr. Booth, a few moments afterward, said if any one felt aggrieved at any thing he had said, he might see him in private, and if he had stated any thing incorrectly, he would rectify it the next evening. Wonderful magnanimity! He makes a gross misrepresentation in public, and is willing it should be corrected in private; and then he will correct it in his own way, before another audience, on another evening! And this is the man who declares himself a friend to free discussion! I should find it exceedingly difficult to persuade myself that such conduct is honorable. I do not believe that any agent of the Anti-Slavery Society would be guilty of such gross injustice and base poltroonery. Why are the colonizationists so reluctant to have their mis-statements corrected, if those mis-statements are made unintentionally? Why are they so fearful of discussion, if the abolitionists are in error?

Yours for the slave,
W. H. BURLEIGH.

DEATH OF OSEOLA.

The New York Star has the following account of the death of Oseola, the Seminole chief.

'He died on Thursday night at Fort Moultrie, on Sullivan's Island, in the harbor of Charleston. Mr. Catlin informs that a few days before he left, Oseola was suddenly attacked with a violent inflammation of the throat, which proved quinsey. The officers and surgeon thought him dying, and sat up with him. By copious bleeding in the arm, he recovered. It was at this moment that Mr. C. saw Oseola under circumstances of so impressive a character that he can never erase them from his mind. For some distance, before reaching his quarters, he heard his deep and heavy groans, and on entering found the noble chieftain—who could endure every hardship in Florida's desolate hammocks, and who dared to peril any danger 'that man dare do'—prostrate on his back, unnerved, and conquered by disease. His proud spirit in its grandeur chafing life's torrent in a compressed ravine against the destructive and perishable embankments that impeded its bounding course. For, nobly formed as his outward person was, he felt that it was too circumscribed to contain a soul like his, and that with all other things earthly, it carried the fatal impress of death.

In his extreme suffering, he had torn off his Angola Turban, and his black clustering tresses now flowed in dishevelled wildness down his nobly formed neck and shoulders, and over the lap of the favorite wife on whom his head reposed. The other was bathing his chest, and it was thus that the groupe were arranged when the artist saw this graphic scene. Oseola, manfully as he breasted mortal nature, could not conceal the pain he endured. His features were distorted, or thrown into an expression of mingled despair and resolute firmness to meet his fate; the eye rolling in wild frenzy beneath the fretted brow; the chest heaving like the ocean billows; the throat laboring in the apparently last death-struggle of the deep gurgling rattle, which gave to that fine mouth, that once could utter such winning eloquence, the expression of dark despair, that implored some pitying hand to put an end to his misery. There was nothing in the dying gladiator, or the writhings of Laocoon—nor of all that sculpture or painting has conceived to express the moral sublimity of human suffering, that could surpass this scene—that received a deeper coloring from the darkness of the chamber, only faintly illumed at times by the gleam that fitfully glared from the fire-place upon the noble wreck that was perishing on its hearth.

DOCTRINAL.

NOT UNDER LAW BUT UNDER GRACE.

Philadelphia, Jan. 5, 1838.

Dear Sir:—As the Liberator is now under your exclusive control, I send you an article for publication, which was originally designed for the Spectator, the editor having expressed in his paper a desire to be corrected, if he had misapprehended your views on the law. I considered those views as grossly misrepresented, though not designedly so. Every christian principle requires him to confess, that his inferences from your premises and accusations, based on those inferences, are unwarranted by logic and charity. I regret his unwillingness to do you justice by making some acknowledgement, more than his declining to publish my own communication.

Yours in the cause of the oppressed,
HENRY GREW.

P. S. When I subscribed for the Spectator, I had no knowledge of its opposition to the Liberator.

W. L. Garrison.

For the Spectator.

Dear Brother Porter:

In your paper of the 8th inst. I notice some remarks on the phrase, 'free from the law of sin and death;' particularly the following: 'We can therefore only infer that Mr. Garrison intends to say, that we are freed from the moral law—truly, a conclusion which must strike with horror every one acquainted with human nature.' Brother Garrison's view of this subject, whether correct or not, is not novel. Others, whose reputation for a sacred regard to the high interests of holiness is not to be questioned, have avowed the same. I beg leave to present to your candid consideration, and to that of your readers, the particular reasons for this belief, and the passages of holy scripture on which it is founded. We shall then, I think, clearly see, at least, that the above conclusion is unnecessary.

Those who adopt this view understand that, antecedent to, and independent of, all particular precepts or codes of law, whether patriarchal, jewish, or christian, man was, and is under, what may be termed the moral law, or the law of love, both in relation to God and his neighbor. The foundation of this law is the eternal principle of righteousness. On this principle, the apostle, Rom. chap. 1, justifies the condemnation of those who had no written law. This law is not peculiar to any particular dispensation of the divine government. It is binding under all; being founded on that principle of righteousness, which is immutable and eternal.

It is further understood that the infinite Ruler of the universe, according to his own wise and benevolent counsel, has, at various times, given various laws of a moral and ceremonial nature. To Adam, he gave a special command as a test of obedience. He spake also to the Patriarchs, giving them various directions. He commanded Abraham to leave his kindred, giving him the most gracious promises, and confirmed the covenant in Christ to him. Gal. 3, 17.

Four hundred and thirty years after this confirmation, the law of Sinai was given. Gal. 3, 17. It was written on tables of stone, and included the ten commandments. Its requirements were of a moral, ceremonial and typical character. In respect to this law, it is important to observe the following facts:

1. It was given to the Jews after their separation from other nations.

2. Although it contains moral precepts, it is never, either in whole or in part, termed *the moral law*. The ten commandments are never, in the bible, called the moral law.

3. 'It was added because of transgressions, *till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*' Gal. 3, 19. That seed was Christ. Gal. 3, 16.

4. Accordingly, when the seed came, this law, which was ordained to be authoritative *only* 'till the seed should come,' was, without exception of any of its parts, positively declared to be dead. 'But now (said the inspired apostle) we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' Rom. 7, 6 7. Here is clear proof that it is not the ceremonial law merely that is 'dead,' for it is that law which says, 'Thou shalt not covet.' Astonishing! says the pious objector. Why then I may covet my neighbor's wife! May you indeed? Does it necessarily follow, that, because you are not under the law of Sinai, you are under no law at all? As well may I, who was formerly a subject of Great Britain, say, that, because I am now free from the dominion of British law, I may rob my neighbor which that law forbids. I am under American law, which equally forbids it. Though you are not under the Sinai covenant or law, you are 'not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,' which not only forbids the act of adultery, but prohibits your looking on a woman to lust after her in your heart. I respect your holy principles. Be not alarmed. Whatever of a moral nature there was in the Sinai covenant, is found, in its highest perfection, in Messiah's laws.

More proof may be considered. 2 Cor. 3 chap. the apostle contrasts the law 'written and engraven in stones,' (which certainly included the ten commandments,) with 'the New Testament,' or 'law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.' He exhibits the far-excelling glory of the latter and its permanency. The former is 'the ministration 'of condemnation,' 'of death.' The latter, 'of righteousness'—'of the spirit.' The former, he declares, '*is done away*,' ver. 11; the latter '*remaineth*.' It is written by 'the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart.'

In Rom. 7 chap. the apostle teaches, that the law has no more dominion over christians, than the law which binds a woman to her husband has dominion over her when that husband is dead.

In the 8th chap. 2 ver. he says, 'For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death.' If this was the only passage on the subject, it might, perhaps, be understood as meaning only that we are freed from *the condemnation* of the law, as he asserts in the previous verse. But it is important to observe the general and repeated expressions of the apostle, in reference to this subject. To be under a law, and to be under the condemnation of that law, are different things. The repeated declarations of the apostle are, not, simply, that we are delivered from *the condemnation* of the law, or that we are not *under its curse*, but that we are delivered from the law itself—that 'we are no longer under' it—that it is changed—that it is dead—that it 'is done away.' See Rom. 7. 6; 6. 14; 8. 2; 2 Cor. 3. 11; Gal. 2. 19; 5. 18; Heb. 7. 12. Moreover, this is one ground of our deliverance from the law and its curse. 'But now (says the apostle) we are delivered from the law, *that being dead wherein we were held*.' Rom. 7. 6. 'There is verily a *disannulling* of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did*; by the which we draw nigh unto God.' Heb. 7. 18, 19. The law indeed was in itself 'holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good;' but it 'was weak through the flesh.' The obligation to love God and our neighbor, which it maintains, existed before its enactment, and continues after its abrogation.

Our apostle has something more of an important and serious nature to say to those 'that desire to be under the law.' In the allegory respecting the two covenants, Gal. 4 chap. he clearly teaches that those who are under the law are yet in bondage, Gal. 3. 10: he declares, that 'as many as are of the works of the law, are *under the curse*.'

It is claimed by those who adopt this view of the subject, not only that it is not incompatible with the cause of morality or holiness, but that it is absolutely essential to that cause. By this, it is not understood that we presume to think, that all who do not so understand it are unholy; but that, according to the divine wisdom, it was absolutely necessary that the whole Sinai law, the old covenant, should be disannulled, to make way for the new, in order that God might have a peculiar people to serve him, who shall be zealous of good works.—'Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are *become dead to the law* by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, *that we should bring forth fruit unto God*.' 'Now we are *delivered from the law*, that being *dead* wherein we were held; *that we should serve in newness of spirit*.' Rom. 7. 4, 6. The argument of the apostle is, that we can no more be married to Christ to bring forth fruit unto God, unless the Sinai law (which included the ten commandments,) is dead to us, and we are dead to that, than a woman can be lawfully married to another man while her husband is living. To christians, he says, 'Sin shall not have dominion over you: (why not?) for ye are *not under the law*, but under grace.' Rom. 6. 14. With Paul, freedom from the Sinai law, which 'gendereth to bondage,' and freedom from sin, were inseparable. In the twenty-second verse he adds, 'But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.' Again, Gal. 2. 19, he remarks, 'For I, through the law, am dead to the law, *that I might live unto God*.' 'Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.' Gal. 3. 25. 'If ye are led by the Spirit, *ye are not under the law*.' 5. 18.

The Sinai law has accomplished the purposes of divine wisdom. 'It was added (to pre-existing law) because of transgressions,' and 'that the offence might abound;' i. e. that the exceeding sinfulness of sin might be manifest. By the new covenant, this important truth is far more effectually exhibited. In the perfect obedience of the Son of God, unto the death of the cross, the evil of sin more fully appears, while every divine perfection shines with excelling lustre. 'If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.'

Your intelligent mind will perceive, that though the Sinai law 'is done away,' the new covenant, which remaineth, more fully enforces obligation to 'holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.' By its awful threatenings, the fearful restraints of sin are not diminished, but increased. 'He that despised Moses's law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses;' but a 'much sorer punishment' is threatened in the Gospel, against the despiser of its 'truth and grace.'

Yours respectfully, in christian love,
HENRY GREW.

PROSPECTUS.

QUARTERLY ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE, ENLARGED.

In the opinion of not a few in whose judgment the public are wont to place confidence, the time is fully come when the most important practical question of this age should have a journal of the higher order devoted to its discussion. Apathy is departed. The pen or the sword must soon decide whether or not slavery is to remain one of the elements of our republic. By all those who prefer the mode of argument to that of brute force, it cannot but be deemed important that there should be a periodical, in which all questions pertaining to slavery, may be settled in the light of thorough investigation. Surely, the many gifted minds that are now intensely concentrating their powers of thought upon this subject, will forfeit their high responsibilities to God and the age in which they live, if they do not make their vindication of liberty not only effectual for the present, but as durable as the causes which lead to oppression. The interests and the history of the present controversy, are too important to be committed to the sheet which perishes with the day that gives it birth. Such was the conviction which originated the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, and it has acquired fresh strength with every day. Two volumes have been completed; but from the narrowness of their limits, and the smallness of the labor bestowed upon them, they have by no means satisfied the demands of the cause to which they have been devoted.

It is now proposed to ENLARGE the work, and give it a character almost entirely new.

I. Each number will contain at least 250 pages, making two volumes of 500 pages per annum, of the size and quality of the North American Review.

II. About 150 pages will be devoted to the discussion of slavery, and topics intimately related to it.

III. At least 50 pages will be occupied by a minute and condensed record of facts and events, both foreign and domestic, which go to form the history of the abolition movement.

IV. The remaining pages will be open to uncontroversial literature. Since slaveholders have confessed that the literature of the world is against them, it is not doubted that this department will receive contributions from the best sources.

V. The most prominent characteristic of the work will be its openness to both sides of the controversy. Articles in favor of slavery, or opposed to either the doctrines or measures of the abolitionists, if possessing sufficient literary merit, and accompanied by the name of the writer, will be admitted to the extent of 75 pages in each number, and the replies will, in all cases, be restricted to the same length as the articles which call them forth. The strongest champions of slavery, as well as those who, professing opposition to that system, are also hostile to the doctrines or measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will be invited to avail themselves of this department of the Magazine for the promulgation of their sentiments. They will be treated with fairness and courtesy, their articles will be printed with the utmost attention to accuracy, in the same type with the rest of the work; and it will be their fault, or that of their cause, if the abolitionists do not thus receive the fire of one of their own batteries. The conductors of this work will always prefer living men to men of straw, as their antagonists.

VI. Pains will be taken to give value to the work by offering adequate compensation to able writers whose pens are their living. The exigencies of the cause will frequently require articles of deep research, that will cost laborious and long-continued examination both of books and men. The right men to make such investigations, are not always the ones who can do it gratuitously. Nor can we expect any one to undertake such a task for a mere newspaper. It is the province of such a work as the one proposed, to call forth, by suitable rewards and a durable page, the best literary talents. To this end, we shall by no means confine ourselves to our own country, but shall endeavor to attract contributions, whencesoever philanthropy speaks the English language. It is necessary to undermine and countermine the fortress of oppression, beneath and around, as well as to come down upon it with hail and fire from above. It is time for the advocates of human rights throughout the world, to make common cause against the system of chattel-bondage, and annihilate, if it be possible, all its pretentions, whether to justice, expediency, or necessity.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the value of such a work, to all who feel any degree of interest in the moral or physical welfare of the human race. What abolitionist will not desire to possess an encyclopædia of the cause, and to bequeath it to his children? Will any one be deterred by a price—which, after all, is less, in proportion to the matter, than that of any of our first rate Reviews?

Arrangements somewhat extensive, have already been made to fill the pages of the enlarged Magazine. Of the many writers favorably known to the public, who have promised contributions regularly or occasionally, we have liberty to name the following:

N. P. Rogers, Esq.	Prof. W. Smyth,
Gerrit Smith, Esq.	Rev. J. Blanchard,
Rev. Samuel Steele,	Rev. George Beecher,
Rev. George Allen,	Pres. Beriah Green,
Dr. F. J. Lemoyne,	Wendell Phillips, Esq.
Henry B. Stanton, Esq.	Rev. Samuel Crothers,
Wm. Lloyd Garrison,	Rev. Sam'l J. May,
J. W. Browne, Esq.	Jos. H. Kimball, Esq.
S. E. Sewall, Esq.	Wm. Leggett, Esq.
Dr. John Farmer,	Benjamin Lundy, Esq.
Rev. J. Leavitt,	Wm. Goodell, Esq.
Wm. H. Burleigh, Esq.	Alvan Stewart, Esq.
E. D. Barber, Esq.	Mrs. L. M. Child,
Rev. John Black, D. D.	Rev. John Monteith,
Rev. James A. Thome,	Rev. Edward R. Tyler,
Mrs. M. W. Chapman,	Isaac Fisher, Esq.
Hon. Wm. Jay,	Rev. A. W. Black,
James G. Birney, Esq.	Dr. James McCune Smith,
Rev. Chas. Follen, D. D.	Chas. Stuart,
Rev. N. S. S. Beman, D. D.	J. G. Whittier, Esq.
Prof. Henry Cowles,	Prof. John Morgan,
Prof. John P. Cowles,	Rev. Asa Shinn, D. D.
Rev. S. H. Cox, D. D.	Rev. Amos. A. Phelps,
C. C. Burleigh,	David Lee Child, Esq.

PRICE.

For a single copy, FIVE DOLLARS per annum, payable at the time of subscribing, or on the delivery of the first number. If payment be delayed till the appearance of the second number, SIX DOLLARS will be required.

For five copies, TWENTY DOLLARS per annum will be received; but if payment be delayed as above, FIVE DOLLARS will be required for each copy.

The first number will be issued as soon as the subscription list will warrant.

Subscriptions and payment will be received by the Publishing Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 143 Nassau street, New York. Communications should be addressed to the editor, E. WRIGHT, Jr., at the same place.

☞ It is expected other names will soon be added to the list of contributors.

☞ The travelling and local agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and the agents for the Emancipator are authorized and requested to act as agents for the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

☞ Newspapers friendly to the plan are requested to give the above one or more insertions.

'Select' Society.—The New England Spectator informs us that an association has been formed in that city, called the 'Boston [Evangelical] Anti-Slavery Society;' the fundamental principle of which is that 'holding men as property is a heinous crime,' and the constitutional term of membership that 'any person of evangelical sentiments, assenting to the above principles and measures, and contributing statedly,' may be a member. We place the word [Evangelical] in the title as we find it. What the Society proposes to *do for the slave*, different from other societies, we have not learned. They of course will not be auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society, as they have not adopted the cardinal principle that SLAVEHOLDING is A CRIME.—*Emancipator.*

Recession of Georgetown, D. C.—The mayor of Georgetown has called a meeting for the purpose of taking into consideration 'the improper and wanton interference with their property and constitutional rights, on the part of the people of some of the States, as evidenced by the petitions daily thrust upon Congress, seeking the abolition of slavery in the District; and finally, to judge and determine the expediency, necessity and importance of procuring a recession of that town and the portion of Washington county West of Rock Creek to Maryland.'—*Baltimore Gazette.*

Allen Cotton, who was lately tried and condemned, at Huntsville, Alabama, for negro stealing, was executed the 29th Dec.

COMMUNICATIONS.

SLAVERY ILLUSTRATED IN ITS EFFECTS UPON WOMAN AND DOMESTIC SOCIETY.

Mr. Editor:

The pamphlet, which you have lately published under the above title, seems to have startled some of our 'weaker brethren,' and it has been remarked, that the statements should be received with caution for two reasons. One is this—'The stories *cannot* be true.' We have nothing to do with *cans* and *cannots*. Water always flows downward when left to its own course, and *cannot*, we say, run uphill; but the floods of Jordan ran both ways at the same time, and therefore the wickedness of slavery may be true.

Another objection is this—'The names of the parties, places, &c. are not given.' What then? Is it necessary that the finger of scorn and the brand of reprobation should be fixed without absolute necessity upon individuals in our anti-slavery controversy? I think not; for the emancipation of one gang of slaves, or the conversion of one or two slaveholders, will not demolish the iniquitous system. If a man like George A. Baxter, D. D. or W. Winans, or D. K. Gilmer, chooses to put himself into the van, and to maintain that the evils of slavery are 'Bible doctrine that will stand, and necessary to preserve the Union,' they may be shot at and discomfitted—but the white women, many of whom are in the same bondage as their colored sisters, only of a different character, may be exhorted and admonished in the mass.

The real question is this—does the pamphlet, which has been published, unfold a correct impression of slaveholding society?—not of every individual; for that pamphlet expressly disclaims the application of its shocking portrait to multitudes of the women—but the facts may be true of one, though not of another. There is a great difference in the character and effects of slavery in every district where it exists. One man is morose, and his next neighbor is mild—one is a furious driver, and the next probably seldom uses the whip—one is personally licentious, but his companion may only encourage it in his slaves. But they all feel a deep interest in multiplying the human property, and the articles of slave traffic.

I think, however, that the unintentional testimony of others may be cited as a proof; that the author, whoever he is, understands the subject of that little volume. One perfectly undesigned coincidence is furnished by *Sarah M. Grimke*, in her eighth letter on the 'condition of Women in the United States,' which was published in the Liberator of January 19, 1838. As she is discussing the general topic, her evidence, therefore, is indirect; and yet all that the pamphlet which Mr. Knapp has issued implies, is contained in the following extract. Having stated that in Christian America, 'female slaves in our slave markets are bought and sold to gratify the brutal lust of those who bear the name of Christians,' 'and that those victims have no refuge from unbridled cruelty and lust,' and then quoting the 'Kentucky Union' as authority for the fact which is avowed in the pamphlet, that the condition of the American female slaves is unparalleled, except by West Indian slavery, in the history of mankind—*Sarah M. Grimke* thus testifies; and it should be remembered, that no persons can be more competent witnesses than herself and Angelina E. Grimke upon that heart-rending subject.

'Nor does the colored woman suffer alone. The moral purity of the white woman is deeply contaminated. In the daily habit of seeing the virtue of her enslaved sister sacrificed without hesitancy or remorse, she looks upon the crimes of seduction and illicit intercourse without horror, and although not personally involved in the guilt, she loses that value for innocence in her own, as well as the other sex, which is one of the strongest safeguards to virtue. She lives in habitual intercourse with men, whom she knows to be polluted by licentiousness, and often she is compelled to witness in her own domestic circle, those disgusting and heart-sickening jealousies and strifes which disgraced and distracted the family of Abraham. In addition to this, the female slaves suffer every species of degradation. Can any American woman look at these scenes of shocking licentiousness and cruelty, fold her hands in apathy, and say, 'I have nothing to do with slavery?' *She cannot be guiltless.*'

That is a very *lady-like way of veiling* the hateful scenes which are displayed in our far-famed and eulogized '*Southern domestic institutions*'—but if it does not comprise and affirm all that the pamphlet above referred to includes, then our 'Mother's tongue' is understood neither by the sisters Grimke, nor by

A Puritan.

EAST RANDOLPH A. S. SOCIETY.

At a meeting of the East Randolph Anti-Slavery Society, held Jan 13th, the following resolutions were presented by a committee, and unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That we claim the right, through our representatives in Congress, to legislate on the subject of slavery, as on other subjects, in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories belonging to the several states, composing the Union in common, and that we shall continue to press our claims by petitions and memorials to Congress, until it shall be fully recognized and established.

That we claim the right to review all laws and ordinances by which the institution of slavery is sustained and protected in the states where it exists, with the same freedom we review the productions of any other authors, and to publish our opinions of their merit or demerit in any way we choose, not inconsistent with perfect freedom of speech and of the press, as guarantied to us by the constitution.

That the recent resolution passed in the House of Representatives of the U. S., to lay all petitions and memorials relating to slavery, on the table, unread and unconsidered, has virtually denied the right of the people to petition for redress of grievances, and driven the plough-share of ruin deep into the vitals of the U. S. constitution.

That while we disapprove of the traitorous conduct of those northern representatives, who voted for that resolution, we most especially commend the undaunted course of the Hon. John Q. Adams, in defending the unrestricted right of the people to petition for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and the territories of the U. S.; and that we will use all honorable means to secure his re-election.

That in the fearful circumstances of this country, as connected with Texas, with Canada, with the Indians, with Slavery, with the overwhelming torrent of MOB LAW that is sweeping like a storm of fire over the land—with the tragical events which have of late been acted at Alton, resulting in the death of the ever to be lamented Lovejoy—it becomes the friends of freedom to baptize themselves anew at the fountain of liberty—to debate the question once, for all, whether they are abolitionists from impulse or principle; whether they can stand at the post of duty, and if cut down, to fall and die martyrs.

That whatever obstacles we may meet with as abolitionists, we will nevertheless with an unwavering purpose maintain and defend the principles which are laid down in the preamble of our Constitution.

That the present crisis in the cause of emancipation emphatically calls on all of us, as individuals and as a society, for increased exertions and undaunted perseverance.

F. D. HOLBROOK, *President.*

Wm. W. Linfield, *Rec. Sec.*

RELIEVE THE SUFFERING POOR!

'Ah, little think the gay, licentious proud,
Whom pleasure, power, and affluence surround;
They who their thoughtless hours in giddy mirth,
And wanton, often cruel, riot waste;
Ah! little think they, while they dance along,
How many feel this very moment death,
And all the sad variety of pain.
* * * How many drink the cup
Of baleful grief, or eat the bitter bread
Of misery! Sore pierced by wintry winds,
How many shrink into the sordid hut
Of cheerless poverty!'—Thomson.

'Tis but a little thing
To give a cup of water; yet its draught
Of cold refreshment, drained from fevered lips,
May give a shock of pleasure to the frame,
More exquisite than when nectarian juice
Renews the life of joy in happiest hours.
It is a little thing to speak a phrase
Of common comfort, which by daily use
Has almost lost its sense; yet on the ear
Of him who sought to die unmourned, 't will fall
Like choicest music.'

ABOLITION IN WESTERN NEW-YORK.

'I have just returned from the Anti-Slavery Convention for western New-York, held at Rochester the 10th, 11th, and 12th instant. A most noble spectacle did it present—and cause for gratitude that during its nine sittings, the utmost harmony and good feeling prevailed among all abolitionists. While the clerical subject was under discussion, three ministers of the city interposed to prevent the adoption of the resolution, of whom it is but justice to state, they conducted themselves as men becoming their stations, provided it be granted that a minister of Christ may or can adopt any other than the full recognition of human rights. Travelling was exceeding bad; it may with truth be said, it could not be worse, as was manifested by the breaking down of the carriage in which I rode—say four times in 140 miles; yet, for all this, we had in attendance from seven to nine hundred persons, a goodly number of them females. A Presbyterian minister, who has travelled much, and of whom it may be said he is universally known, came to me during one of the sessions, and informed me that he had been up and down the various aisles, and that of all the meetings he had attended, he believed he had never seen one in which so much intelligence was embodied.'