

Poetry.

For the Liberator. CITY OF WASHINGTON. A SONNET. Suggested by the preparations which are being made to defend the Capital of the American Republic...

From the Portland Republican Banner. COMPROMISE. Let's compromise With the father of lies, For fear of his wrath infernal...

From the Norfolk County Journal. TIME TO START. At—Johnny Cope. "President Buchanan is packing his library, and will leave for Lancaster on the morning of March 5th..."

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

THE MEN FOR THE TIMES. Give us the nerve of steel, And the arm of fearless might, And the strength of will that is ready still...

The Liberator.

"THE SAME OLD SIXPENCE"

The Protestants of this country are apt to congratulate themselves on having escaped from the "corruptions" of the Romish church. Examination of the principles and practice of both parties has always shown the difference between them to be in degree only, not in kind...

The New York Evangelist, under the heading, "Pious Gamblers," quotes the following from Mr. Edmond Rome's brilliant book, entitled, "Contemporary Rome," as illustrating "one of the phases of life in that city of the Papacy..."

"While sitting in an eating-house, he witnessed the following exhibition of gambling piety with a wide-awake eye, at a table where an old man was playing. The cards were dealt by a woman, who finally struck his silver watch, to lose all, or to recover everything. Before entering the cards, he went to kneel before the Madonna of the restaurant, and prayed her to restore what he had lost, with something besides, promising to share the spoils with her, and to carry a great wax taper to the church of St. Agostino. Meantime, his adversary, without leaving his seat, prudently crossed himself, and murmured a counter prayer to the same Madonna. The old wagner lost, as he had lost before. He now from the table, and took his position in the face of that image that he had just adored. Some violence was to be expected against the Madonna; but the Virgin is honored in Rome as she is in no other where. Should the Romans ever become freethinkers, they may forget the old wagner, but in no conceivable case will they renounce the worship of the Virgin. The unlucky gambler, standing before her image, let fall his watch on the divine child in her arms. 'You wretched wretch, (sobs), he exclaimed, 'I have sinned against you right when he had you! His adversary gathered up the money and the watch, called for another flagon of wine, which he drank at his leisure, examining the point of his knife, stopped at the door to see if any one was waiting for him on the outside, and went his way..."

The Evangelist would represent piety, among habitual and professional gamblers, as something monstrous, absurd and impossible. It would represent the public performance of prayer for the success of a vicious enterprise, or of opposing prayers addressed to the same God in behalf of antagonistic forms of selfishness, as something at once shocking to the moral sense, and peculiar to the Romish faith. It would represent the use of prayer, by rival parties or individuals who are alike upholding a worldly, carnal and selfish policy, as a means of "carrying favor" with the Deity, each against the other, as something unknown in Protestantism. Yet that which it calls "piety" exists in this country, among the people whom it mis-names "evangelical," in open and permanent connection with vice far worse than gambling. Slavery is prayed for by the "business men's prayer-meetings," by the "Young Men's Christian Associations," by numerous ecclesiastical bodies, by the editors of "religious newspapers," and by clergymen of various sects, in the pulpit and elsewhere. And throughout our Northern States, at this moment, numerous bodies of people who "hope and trust" that they are "pious," and who hold, at any rate, some ecclesiastical certificate declaring them to be so, are energetically praying for the continuance of the Federal Union, and against the people who would break it; while a set of people throughout the Southern States, bearing in their mouths and pockets the same evidence of "piety," are praying to the same God for the destruction of the same Union, and against the people who would continue it. And the very men who are uttering these prayers at the South, are, at the same time, committing enormous outrages for the maintenance of slavery, not only against the slaves and the free people of color, but against Northern citizens casually among them; while the very men who are uttering the opposing prayers at the North are at the same time trying to put down abolitionism, and to suppress "agitation," favoring the continuance of slavery on account of the profitable trade they drive with slaveholders. The piety of these classes is precisely alike, cultivated by the same processes, tested by the same standard of dogmatic theology, holding "good and regular standing" in churches of the same denomination, and acknowledged as genuine in each party by the other. And in both, the existence of this piety is as thoroughly independent of Christian morality as among their despised brethren of the Romish church.

Will it be pleaded that, however far short American slavery may fall of conformity with the Christianity of Jesus and of Paul, it is at least an "institution," a great, popular, respectable system, practiced by men of character and station, patronized by the State, favored by a large proportion of the press, substantially upheld by the Tract, Missionary and Bible Societies, and bulwarked by the Presbyterian, Episcopal, Baptist, Methodist and Congregational churches, and therefore that Protestant complicity with it ought not to be rated like Catholic complicity with a vice so mean and vulgar as gambling? Let us then take another instance.

Lying, surely, is a vice as mean and vulgar as gambling. Yet the clerical conductors of the "religious press" (so called) are accustomed to tell gross falsehoods respecting prominent abolitionists, such as William Lloyd Garrison, Parker Pillsbury and Theodore Parker, and against radical reformers generally, and then to refuse insertion to the refutation of those calumnies. Moreover, the same persons, in the same organs, are accustomed constantly to misrepresent, and when this proves insufficient, directly to lie, in defence of the theological hypotheses of their creed. For instance: it is only by such deliberate and persistent lying, in opposition to Scripture as well as to reason and history, that the institution falsely called "the Christian Sabbath" is maintained.

Is this charge, against a body of men so large and reputable as the conductors of the "religious press," too vague, comprehensive and indefinite? Well, I will give an instance.

Rev. Parsons Cooke, of Lynn, has, for a quarter of a century, (more or less,) used his editorship of religious papers in the manner above described, uttering malignant calumnies against men and women engaged in reformatory labors, and then shutting out the refutation of them from his columns.

Passing by his numerous false accusations against the excellent men above named, I will give the following as a specimen of his impudent and persistent mendacity:—

Many years ago, shortly after a great public debate had drawn attention to the fact that the German and English Reformers (Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Tyndale the Martyr, Bunyan, Baxter and others,) were thoroughly opposed to that doctrine respecting "The Sabbath" which is now preached from Orthodox pulpits, Rev. Parsons Cooke found it needful, for the interests of his order, to bring discredit upon this fact, and to check a belief which would tend to thin his congregation. Trusting to the probability that none of his hearers or readers possessed the complete works of either of the above writers, he impudently denied that they were Anti-Sabbatarians! And, citing this general lie with a special one, he quoted a passage from Calvin's "Institutes," reversing Calvin's meaning by the interpolation of two clauses forged by himself, and representing the whole as a correct translation from Calvin. This he published in his paper, The Patriot, and would not allow the insertion of any statement of the error, or even of the genuine passage, which I carried to his office immediately after this publication. It thus became impossible to bring to the eyes of his readers the proof, either of the falsehood or forgery he had committed; and they probably believed his accusations of falsehood against the men who had proved, by large and correct quotations, the Anti-Sabbatarianism of Calvin, Luther, Melancthon and others.

From that time to the present, Dr. Cooke has been accustomed to defend the doctrine and policy of his order by representations flagrantly false in fact, and grossly calumnious against men and women engaged in the work of reform, refusing to admit into his paper replies to these falsehoods and calumnies.

The unwelcome appearance in his paper, something more than a year ago, of an appeal to reason and to free discussion, for the settlement of controverted points in theology, the astounding impudence of the inquiry, from such a man, why the opponents to whom he had always refused a hearing used accents instead of arguments, induced me to offer him the following for publication.

A QUESTION ANSWERED. To the Editor of the Recorder: Sir—I had in your paper of December 8th an editorial article, apparently written in serious earnest, entitled, "Scolding at Divine Truth." You not only assume that "labors hated of God's truth" exists among the people of this country, but you find (you say) a kind of "meeting at sacred truth," of manifesting "contempt of God and his truth," of "taking it for granted, as a first principle, that the Gospel doctrines have had their day, and are to be rejected as cast-off garments." And, reprobating against this habit of scolding and meeting, which you represent as common, and as becoming more common, you appeal to reason and Scripture in the following terms:—

"What is the argument of main resort against evangelical truth, both in the pulpit and by the press, among its professed opponents? It is not argument drawn from the Bible, for these days, needs opposed to the doctrines of the Cross make little use of the Scriptures. Nor is it a serious appeal to reason."

"Do you say that you are thoroughly and rationally convinced that those old dogmas are indeed founded in delusion, and therefore that the Gospel that contains them is a farce? Then, as becomes rational and serious men, give the rational proofs that have led you to those convictions. Let us have solid reason instead of mere assertions. If there were no God in the case, it is an insult to men to enter at their credulity and superstition. But if these sentiments are delusions, and you have a superior penetration of reason by which you can show it, you would do a kindness rather to refute our doctrines. But your scoffs and sneers can neither refute nor refute."

Though I am not familiar with persons, or writings, or speeches, of the sort described in the above quotations from your article, I will take for granted, on your representation, that some such persons and things exist. But, having been, all my life, intimately familiar with the "religious" periodical press, I find the state of things of which you complain accounted for by one very uniform characteristic of the management and policy of that press, far more plausibly than by the assumption of an "inborn hatred of God's truth" as the exciting cause.

If the persons of whom you speak do not (as you say) make appeal either to reason or to Scripture, perhaps the reason is, that your columns and those of your associates are closed against any statement at once fair and full (or even moderately approaching those characteristics) in which either reason or Scripture is urged against your position. Perhaps it is because you suppose that you are often vainly tried to obtain the insertion in those columns, of a just statement of their position, that they have given it up as hopeless! Perhaps their despair of fairness on your part has been confirmed by the custom of the "religious" press—for instance, we will say, of the Recorder and the Congregationalist—to publish, in their editorial columns and elsewhere, things grossly false in defence of their own system, and things grossly false and calumnious in regard to the systems, the characters, the persons, the speeches and the writings of others, and then to refuse correction of those falsehoods, even when accompanied by complete and thorough documentary evidence.

If, still further, these "religious" presses have been accustomed, under occasional urgent contingencies, to falsify evidence in their own defence—for instance, to interpolate materially qualifying clauses in quotations, purporting to be from some authority respected by their readers, or to quote, enlarging it as high authority, some dictum which examination proves to be a thorough and deliberate imposture—and then to refuse insertion to a correction of such abuses—would not this help to account for some sobriety of expression in the persons thus dealt with?

If, after repeated experience of this sort of injustice, after repeated exclusion from your columns of their appeals to reason or to Scripture, or to both united, such persons have expressed the contempt which an ingenious mind would naturally feel for such conduct, and have also expressed a similar contempt for the doctrines which require such means for their defence, (or, at any rate, which you and your brethren of the "religious" press habitually defend by such means,) is this strange? Is it very unreasonable? And will not this state of things account (perhaps) for all the occasions in which you have found "meets" need, instead of appeals to reason?

Your friend and servant for the truth, CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

Boston, Dec. 15, 1859.

The publication of this article was refused by Dr. Cooke, the junior editor stating also, as his objection to it, that he did not like to see the Recorder put on a level with the Congregationalist! The later performances of Dr. Cooke have been the printing of a pro-slavery sermon, preached in celebration of the President's Fast, and reiteration of grossly calumnious statements against Theodore Parker; and, latest of all, an ebullition of vulgar scribbles against a lady, his superior alike in learning and wisdom, justice and generosity, intelligence and excellence, because she is maintaining the rights of her sex, the welfare of both sexes, and the liberty with which Christ makes free, against the narrow selfishness of a priestly class, who, for the perpetuation of their own usurped authority, would keep the men and women of the nineteenth century in subjection to a "ministration of death," devised among a half-civilized people, in an age long antecedent to the first century—c. x.

LETTER FROM REV. GILBERT HAVEN.

CAMBRIDGE, JANUARY 29th, 1861.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, ESQ.: MY DEAR SIR,—In connection with the words of commendation with which you honor my discourse on the late national triumph of liberty, you very warmly dissent from some of my remarks concerning your course as an eminent leader in the great reform. I should not have thought of defending my statements against your censure, in your own columns or elsewhere, did you not invite, nay, urge me to do so. I wrote those brief sentences with great carelessness, for I was anxious to say nothing that would inflict pain upon any lover of this cause, and especially upon yourself, whom I have long recognized as its originator, under God. Upon my reviewing my few remarks in the light of your criticism, I still think they are truthful, generous, cordial. I know that was the spirit in which they were spoken. As you demand with great earnestness answers to the questions you there ask, and as this demand is necessarily made upon me, I do not feel at liberty to shrink from it, however delicate and disagreeable it may be to comply.

In almost the only conversation I ever had the privilege of holding with you, when I dissented from your course in respect to the Church, and especially in respect to evangelical religion, you replied, that you desired no endorsement from any one further than his conscience led him, and added these solemn words: "So, then, every one of us must give account of himself unto God." Most reverently do I accept this truth, and shall endeavor to discharge the duty to which you summon me, under the holy light of that solemn declaration.

Before I proceed farther, permit me to correct an error into which you were led by a similarity of names. I am not the editor of the Zion's Herald, but merely a member and stationed preacher of the N. E. Conference. I do not wish that my words should be supposed to have any such authority as might attend the utterances of an official representative of my Church. They stand and fall on their own merits. You also remark that my "relation to that Church" would be more honored in the breach than in the observance, until it ceased to welcome slaveholders to its communion table, as true Methodists, and brethren and sisters in the Lord." That Church has declared slaveholding to be contrary to the Bible and its book of discipline; so that every minister is really forbidden to "welcome" such members to the Lord's table. While we have no power nor desire to prevent any person from coming to this free and open table, who chooses to answer for himself the Christian invitation, following in this, the ordinance of the Apostle, we cannot, as Methodist ministers, "welcome" them. I have

under a slaveholding Doctor of Divinity to sit in my congregation for months together without once asking him to enter my pulpit, or consecrate and administer the sacred symbols of the Divine Love and Sacrifice. I think I sin without offence in this matter, even before so rigid an anti-slavery tribunal as your own. Letting these things pass, allow me to examine your objections in the order in which they are made.

You first censure me for not giving a sketch, at least, of the conflicts which "sprang up among the young philanthropists" at the beginning of this movement. You seem to think my silence was intended as a reflection upon you. I beg leave to say that I had no such intention. I only stated a lamentable fact that every reader of the Emancipator and Liberator of that period knew too well. I expressed no opinion as to the right or wrong of either party. I confess you had some reason to suppose I sympathized with your opponents, because in my next sentence there is a reflection upon a subsequent course of action, on which you base a second complaint. I say, "the conscience growing demanded the privilege of expressing itself at the ballot-box." This was resisted by Mr. Garrison." This you partially deny. I am glad to be corrected of an error into which I had fallen. I had supposed till I read your remarks, that you had from the beginning opposed bringing the question to the polls; and that you had done so not chiefly because of the pro-slavery character of the Constitution, but because you considered moral suasion to be the only means proper to be used in the conflict. But though privately mis-taken, my published statement did you no wrong. For that merely stated the fact that this demand was resisted, and gave no reason for the opposition. You say the omission did you injustice, because I seem to place you in antagonism to the conscience of others, without expressly saying that you acted under the guidance of an equally earnest conscience. I never asserted or imagined that your conscience was less active than theirs. Errors in judgment, as every one feels, often coexist with the most powerful workings of conscience. No one in this land, whatever be his position on this question, doubts Mr. Garrison's faithfulness to his conscience. The wildest slavery maniac of the South, his meanest apologist of the North, the millions of earnest foes of the system they defend, all acknowledge that nothing but the mighty presence of "stern duty, daughter of the voice of God," could have supported you in the long and bitter conflict. I believe that you and Mr. Gerrit Smith are equally conscientious in your perfectly antagonistic views of the Constitution. I believe the great mass of Abolitionists are equally conscientious in their view, half way between these extremes. They concede that the Constitution has two articles that were intended to yield slight privileges to slavery, which privileges ought not, in honor, to be interfered with by legislation. But every letter, aside from these concessions, and its whole spirit, in spite of them, is alive with the presence of Freedom. "A covenant with death, and an agreement with hell," is, as the Prophet declared it to be, an open and earnest alliance with sin for the sake of sin. The two provisions which make these concessions were wrung out of our fathers against their prayers and protestations. They abhorred the system that demanded them. It was no more such a covenant as Isaiah rebukes, than is yours such, when you practically "agree" with a master for the purchase of his slave, as your honorable subscription to many a poor slave's solicitations shows you to have done. You submit to the apparent "covenant" for the sake of the real good you can thus alone effect. They submitted with equal reluctance and with as great abhorrence of slavery to the apparent covenant, only because they considered that a united country and continent, on the principles of universal liberty and equality, could and would be conforming in practice to these principles. They were careful to offset their minute grants by such counter-acts as the suppression of the Foreign Slave Trade, the right of habeas corpus and trial by jury, the Ordinance of 1787, and especially by a preamble which is so full and glorious a statement of the loftiest aims and duties of government, that had their sons been faithful to its spirit as were they, would have long since destroyed the power of its petty, black-letter concessions, and filled the whole land, as it shall yet be filled, by its own native force, with the beauty and strength of perfect liberty.

The third ground of complaint is more grievous, and by its demands, constrains me to a more painful duty. I say, "Led by his love of free speech, he permitted some of his leading associates to burden the 'anonymous infirmary' with gross infidelities and social absurdities." You remark: "We deny the charge, and call for evidence. None of our 'leading associates' have sought to do any such thing. They have advocated the anti-slavery cause on its own merits, and have not sought to burden it with any extraneous question. Nor is it for us to 'permit' them to do either this or that. They are of age, and can speak for themselves. When Mr. Haven will point out the gross infidelities and social absurdities to which he refers, we will give them our gravest consideration. Till then, the imputation is a stab in the dark." This is a frank and full denial of my assertion. Let us frankly consider it. You will notice that I do not censure the course of all your leading associates. Some of them are entirely free from both of these charges. Many of those residing in this vicinity are as guiltless in respect to the latter accusation as any other persons of culture and social position. The most famous of these associates has not been guilty, so far as I am aware, of an infidel or "absurd" utterance. He is too indiscriminate in his assaults on the Church and clergy for their anti-slavery unfaithfulness, but never assails their creed or calling. He includes them all under condemnation, that he may have mercy upon none. He forgets that in 1835, before he joined your ranks, the body of which I have the honor to be a member, organized an anti-slavery society on the broadest ground of immediate emancipation, and elected delegates to the General Conference, who began then the great fight which has passed into all the churches, and resulted in many victories. He fails to recognize the fact that this earliest action has not only never been reversed, but has been adopted by a majority of our Conference; so that to-day there are thousands of Methodist preachers as good and true Abolitionists as any of the chosen few whom he carefully exempts from his sweeping wrath. But this defect in knowledge or honesty is never united with the more offensive and dangerous errors into which others have fallen.

You will also notice that I give you the full benefit of the only defence I ever heard you make for "permitting" without hindrance, and without rebuke, the intrusion of these topics into the Liberator and the meetings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, namely: free speech, a free press, a free platform. You ask for proof. "Many names and facts arise in my mind, but the attendance of them would only lead me into a painful and prolix controversy." In the very paper in which this demand is made, is a communication from one of these "leading associates," who has uttered in many meetings of your Society and in the columns of the Liberator, most fearful blasphemies against the Bible, the Church, "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," has advocated many social abominations in "the conduct of life," and been especially offensive to all truly cultured natures in his assaults on the sacred ordinance of marriage.

The very next editorial to the one in which you make the above denial has this remark concerning the "Word of God," in a review of Rev. Mr. White's sermon: "Its assertion [that of the Sermon] that 'every cause must stand or fall by the verdict of the Bible' indicates a treat-ment of reverence or a traditional credulity, and not close, independent thinking. We totally dissent from this posture. The Bible has settled nothing in theology, science, morality, or religion, beyond the prevailing opinions of the times. Neither human rights nor human obligations originate with or depend upon anything in the Bible." Similar remarks concerning other axioms of historic, Biblical, vital Christianity are found in the same article. They are, in my judgment, "grossly infidel." By this I mean, they are in violent hostility to the expres-

sions of the Universal Church, and of the Bible itself. If they are true, infidelity is true, and not its opposite, faith. If false, they are the worst of falsehoods.

I was greatly pained, a few years since, to hear you say, in the Melodeon, that the evangelical religion, which you truly said was the faith of the nation, was so bound up with the system of slavery, that the only way to destroy this monster was to destroy that faith. I thought you had forgotten that the earliest anniversary of the same Society were conducted almost exclusively by ministers and members of evangelical churches, most of whom have kept that early faith and fervor, though they cannot honorably appear on that platform. It was also forgotten that this same Society, in 1835, by a unanimous vote, appointed a day of fasting and prayer for the extirpation of slavery; and it was especially forgotten that the meeting connected with this Society, which was the first that was broken up by a Boston mob headed by a Boston Mayor, was an anti-slavery prayer meeting. Though the mobs and Mayors of Boston yet honor you, and disgrace themselves and their city, with their contemptible assaults upon free speech and the cause in which you so faithfully use that "liberty of prophesying," yet I fear it will be some time before an evangelical prayer-meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society is again thus infamously interrupted. If the Managers of that Society would appoint one, I have no doubt a great multitude of Christians would gladly be present, and share with them the godly pleasure, and, if need be, the ungodly persecutions of the hour. Why can they not revive this practice at the coming Anniversaries?

But I should be justly accused of timidity, the last fault which the Liberator pardons, if I failed to mention that one of our "leading associates" who has but lately left you. All the others must pale their ineffectual fires before the lurid blaze of this baleful star.

No one can surpass me in admiration of the talents, learning or zeal in the Anti-Slavery cause of Theodore Parker. No one can deplore more sorrowfully his "gross infidelity." It infected all his public life. He never separated his literary or reformatory efforts from his anti-Christian teachings. In his Letter to his Society, he boasts that through these channels he constantly poured his stream. It may be said that his religious doctrines had nothing to do with his service in the cause of Freedom. This is hardly so. They were ventilated in almost every anti-slavery address he ever delivered. They largely absorbed his letters and addresses to the Progressive Friends, which were published in the Liberator with words of approval. He was never publicly rebuked by that journal for these gross infidelities. And when he died, its eulogies, as well as those of the Society it represents, were unbounded, were indiscriminate. Nay, not so. Some of them discriminated in favor of the dreadful errors it had been the chief labor of his life to up-build. In view of these and many other painful facts, I can but think my remark was true. I have read the Liberator many times, and I have rarely looked into its columns, that its faith as a Christian, the faith of Paul and John, of Polycarp and Ignatius, of Luther and the Pilgrim Fathers, of Wesley and Wilberforce, of Charles T. Torrey and John Brown, of myriads upon myriads of saints and martyrs, that glorious, that divine, that eternal faith, has not been shocked by the profane skepticism that were permitted to corrode its pages.

"'Tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis, 'tis true." Your last complaint is, that I reflect upon your piety in my remark about Wilberforce. A typographical mistake of your printer has led you into an error in this paragraph. I say, "Would that, in his sphere of effort, and to the measure of his large abilities and influence, he had kept this liberty from becoming licentiousness!" He prints "this," "his," and you think I refer to you as personally guilty. I did not, but only lamented that, by your rebuke, or, at least, by your defence of the faith once delivered to the saints when it was thus put to open shame, you had not constrained these enemies of our Lord and His Christ to cease their public clamor, if not their secret hate.

Only one sentence reflects upon your character. The others criticize your conduct—a fate to which every public man is necessarily exposed. The one that suggests a moral defect is that last sad prayer, "Would that he, like Wilberforce, had kept his heart sweet with prayer and piety through the whole of this great war." I cannot see the heart, and may have misjudged you in that remark. I shall be most happy to make confession if I have done you wrong. I belong to a church that believes works are as essential as faith, and our Savior says, "By their fruits ye shall know them." As a believer in the divine inspiration and authority of all the Holy Scriptures, in the atonement of Christ, in the impossibility of escaping eternal punishment from our just and loving Redeemer, "if we neglect so great salvation," what must be my conclusion as to the spiritual condition of a great philanthropist, when I see him admitting to his journal, for years together, and defending in his editorial columns, either by himself or his subordinates, doctrines which assail and would sin-override these all-important truths? What must I think of his "prayer and piety," when I see him a regular attendant on Sabbath services which are almost exclusively devoted to this work? Was the piety of Wilberforce of this stamp? Did he sit, a quiet, if not a sympathetic listener, while his minister denounced with the most unsparing invective the revival of God's work, and declared the operations of the Holy Spirit to be but the cunning devices of the ministers of Jesus Christ? No equal torrent of blasphemous infidelity poured forth from the erapitive craters of Voltaire and Paine, both great philanthropists and reformers. Far less did their lava flow over such great and gracious truths as did that which burst forth from Music Hall in those anti-revival sermons; sermons, I fear, which had the approval of the Liberator. Voltaire assailed a dead and putrid form of Christianity; Paine struck at the Bible when French infidelity was tainting the Church with its rottenness. Parker struck at the Church in her highest possible work; struck at her when God was prospering that work in a wonderful manner; struck at the work itself, denying it, ridiculing it, by caricature, by misrepresentation, by mingling the errors of some of its devotees with its own lustrous and perfect beauty. It was as if he had charged Moses with idolatry because the Israelites fell into this sin, or Christ with profanity because his chief apostle once swore. And yet these discourses, which, with that dying Letter, will yet make all his friends bleed to their very hearts, with shame and sorrow, are approved in the pages of the Atlantic by another of these "leading associates."

No record of silent acquiescence in such fatal heresies mars the memory of Wilberforce. He labored and wrote for evangelical religion as actively as he wrought for human liberty. His "Practical View of Christianity," an earnest appeal for the truth and the experience of the Gospel, is issued, ununsullied, by even the traitorous Tract Society of New York. His praise was in all the churches, and his support there also, while the ungodly raged against him. I fear my dear sir, that you do not desire such a record as this. Would to God you had it! Would to God that that earliest appeal to reliance on, and sympathy with the Church and the ministry had never been abandoned! Would that you could yet see and enter this path of human, no less than heavenly duty and glory!

I have no doubt of your future renown. I have no doubt that your past and present persecution by base men, some of whom are high in office, and are even false professors of a perfect religion, will only make your name the more glorious in the blackness of shame that will cover their memory. You have never strove so fiercely against the truth as it is in Jesus, as to destroy your well-worn fame for your services and sacrifices for the slave. Though you have "permitted some of your leading associates" to engage in this work, still your own eye has been so nearly single, your body so full of the blessed light of human emancipation, that I am confident you will shine as the stars in the memory of this nation. I have said, more than once, in my pulpits, that the Christian Abolitionists will carve your firm marble, as a grate-

ful recognition of your preeminent relation to this great work. May they yet be able to place before that statue as glowing a tribute to your late but earnest faithfulness in the cause of experimental piety, as they assuredly will to your faithfulness in the cause of abolitionism!

Nothing pains me more, in this hour, when the glorious object which you revived, and in which you have so mightily labored, seems so near its consummation, than to see your exclusion from the enthusiastic devotion of the great multitude through which that end is hastening. The name and presence of Wm. Lloyd Garrison ought to create a passion of reverence and admiration far surpassing that which the name and presence of Wm. H. Seward, or Charles Sumner, or Horace Greeley creates. Why does it not? Why do we to avoid contamination, hasten to declare that they are not of his household? Not because you adhere to moral suasion; that would only increase the esteem of Christians. Not because of your interpretation of the Constitution. This enthusiasm overlooks conceptions of that document. Parties and politics are but a narrow channel in the great and wide sea. Not because you have opposed all violent methods of attacking this evil; not even because you have aly and often rightly chastised Church and clergy, for their own timidity and their complicity with this sin. If no men members have applied the lash with equal ardor, if not with equal ability. Some of them are now wearing her highest honors for their past and present fidelity.

The cause lies deeper. It is, in my opinion, simply and solely because you have, with silence, if with approval, "permitted some of your leading associates" to burden the cause with gross infidelities and social absurdities, and the people commit you to the errors they have taught. They have been allowed to wear your name as a cloak for their sins. They may not have assumed it; but it has been applied by others, and never disowned by you. I do not make a "priestly stab." God forbid! I speak as a frail and sinful man,—saved, I trust, by grace alone. Most deeply do I regret the identification of your name with the absurdities and abominations of this little clique, who seem to have reversed the apostolic injunction, "In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men," and have become children in understanding, men in malice, as they rage against the Church, the Bible, the Sabbath, the observance of perpetual marriage, and other sacred and blessed gifts of God to man. Most gladly would I see you and others, less worthy, yet pure and excellent, that surround you, abandoning this society of men and perverse minds, and of doctrines far more pernicious and standing in your lot and place among those who would gratefully embalm your name with the boldest fragrance of Christian love.

I have written with "a sad sincerity." You may plain questions, and I doubt not, expected and desired plain answers. I shall ever venerate you as a pioneer in America of the divine work, so near, I trust, its completion. I am confident the Church and the country, North and South, will yet see you revere you. I pray and hope that they may yet be able to crown their gratitude with the highest of honors, which descends from God on those alone who not only labor for the redemption of their fellow-men from the cruel yoke of human bondage, but labor none the less for their infinitely greater redemption from the heavier yoke of sin and death, a salvation purchased for us by the blood of our Lord and Savior, and offered to all who will come unto God through Him!

With great respect, I remain yours for Christ and the slave, G. H.

VASSAR FEMALE COLLEGE.

It seems most fitting and timely that you, the able and most considerate editor of our distinguished journal, should embrace in its ample, well-filled columns a fuller account of the recently created institution above mentioned. Nearly a year since, you furnished a notice of what was intended; now you can report progress. Our New York Legislature, with unparalleled promptness and unanimity, have just incorporated the college, naming twenty-nine trustees, to whom the management of its concerns have been confided. The magnificent founder, Matthew Vassar, Esq.—one of your regular subscribers nearly forty years ago—has devoted to the purpose of its endowment, a beautiful tract of ground, embracing two hundred acres, one or two miles east of the city of Poughkeepsie. It is bounded by an ample stream of the purest water, issuing from copious and never-failing springs, and intended to form two beautiful lakes, for quiet and retired boating in summer, and skating in winter. Between the two there is a waterfall of fifteen or twenty feet, now used for a mill, and giving the name of "Mill Cove" to the estate. Easily will this water be carried to the highest part of the college edifice, and distributed to every apartment—a new and admirable feature in college arrangements, preventive of health and cleanliness.

THE PRINCIPAL OFFICE. The principal edifice is already contracted for, and will be commenced early in the spring. It is certainly the noblest plan in the most complete arrangements, ever devoted to educational purposes, in this, or perhaps any other country. It will present a front of 500 feet, varying in depth from 40 to 120 feet, admirably adapted to furnish all needed public rooms, residence for the president and several professors, and beautiful, well-lighted and ventilated private chambers, for about 300 pupils. This edifice, with its furnishing, is to cost about \$200,000; as much more will be made a permanent investment for the support in part of instructors, [and more for the most deserving pupils, who may require it,] so that the founding of this establishment, including the ample grounds, will nearly reach the amount of \$450,000. The