



Nancy
Hanks
Lincoln
Public
Library

THE NATIONAL
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES

IN
ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES:

OR,

* 4265, 272

STRICTURES ON "A REPLY TO CERTAIN CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST THE AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, ETC. ETC. ; BY LEWIS TAPPAN OF NEW YORK, UNITED STATES : WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY JOHN SCOBLE."

BY RICHARD D. WEBB.

"I am aware, that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I *will* be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—AND I WILL BE HEARD.

"It is pretended that I am retarding the cause of emancipation by the coarseness of my invective, and the precipitancy of my measures. *The charge is not true.* On this question my influence, humble as it is, is felt at this moment to a considerable extent, and shall be felt in coming years—not perniciously, but beneficially—not as a curse, but as a blessing; and posterity will bear testimony that I was right. I desire to thank God that he enables me to disregard "the fear of man which bringeth a snare," and to speak his truth in its simplicity and power."

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

DUBLIN:

CHARLES HEDGELONG, GRAFTON-STREET.

1852.

Price Six-pence.

Dupr. 12.160.109

Family of
William Lloyd Garrison

July 8, 1899.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Reasons for the Present Strictures	3
A Parallel to Mr. Tappan's "Reply"	4
My own acquaintance with the Anti-slavery Cause	5
Mr. Scoble	9
The British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society	11
The American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society	14
The Bulwarks of American Slavery	16
The Bonds of Sect and Party	20
The American Anti-slavery Society unchanged in its principles	24
Non-resistance	27
Disuse of Slave-grown Produce	29
The National Era	30
The Transfer of the Emancipator	31
Mr. Tappan's Sacrifices	35
William Lloyd Garrison	35
Theodore Parker	40
Edmund Quincy	41
Wendell Phillips	42
Mr. Thompson's Testimony	43
Additional Testimony to the American Anti-slavery Society	49
A Comparison and Contrast	51
Conclusion	54
Appendix	55

NOTED BY TO

THE NATIONAL
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES
OF
ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

REASONS FOR THE PRESENT STRICTURES.

“A REPLY,” by Lewis Tappan of New York, “to Charges brought against the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society,” by myself and others, has been sent me by a member of the Dublin Anti-slavery Society, with a note explaining that he would not circulate a document in which I am censured, without first sending me a copy of the indictment.

Shortly after the formation of our Dublin Anti-Slavery Society, some of the members called to remonstrate with me against opinions I had expressed, in reference to the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, and its secretary, Mr. Scoble, in the columns of the *New York Anti-slavery Standard*. They considered we had no business with the management or conduct of any anti-slavery society but our own; that whatever their course might be, we should leave them to promote the cause in the way they thought best; and, if possible, go on ourselves without contention. It would doubtless be much more agreeable, if we could dispense with contention in the prosecution of this or any other cause. But the anti-slavery cause is essentially antagonistic. That it is difficult to avoid collision with others in the promotion of anti-slavery objects, is shown by the fact, that the very person who was most earnest in deprecating any unfriendly reference, on my part, to an anti-slavery society in which he has confidence, has taken the trouble to circulate amongst some members of our society, a pamphlet containing many severe remarks upon myself, charging me with deliberate untruthfulness, and calculated, where its statements are believed, to produce a most unfavourable impression against many whom I esteem among the ablest and most devoted friends of the slave.

I have read the “REPLY” carefully and repeatedly. It is plausibly written, but full of deceptive statements, which I

doubt not will be effectually answered by more competent pens than mine. I would willingly wait to see how they will deal with Messrs. Scoble and Tappan; but since it has seemed good to an influential member of the Dublin Anti-slavery Society to patronize the pamphlet in question, justice to the cause, to my friends, and to myself, requires that I should no longer keep silence.

A PARALLEL TO MR. TAPPAN'S "REPLY."

As the great majority of our local society are also members of the Society of Friends, I can give them an apt illustration of my opinion of the statements of John Scoble and Lewis Tappan. A book was lately published, entitled, "Quakerism, or the Story of my Life, by one who was for forty years a member of the Society of Friends." We know the disgust, indignation, and ridicule it created amongst the members and friends of the society; and that, on the other hand, it was welcomed as a life-like and faithful portrait by those who knew little of the subject, or were prejudiced against Friends. The book is undoubtedly racy and entertaining. A large edition has been sold at a high price, and a sort of "people's edition" has since been published, and will probably sell too. Now, I also was for upwards of forty years a member of the Society of Friends, and for nearly fifteen years I have devoted much of my attention to American slavery, and the efforts for its abolition; and I can truly say I consider "the Lady's Story of her Life" to be just as faithful a portrait of Quakerism and Quakers, as the joint pamphlet of Messrs. Scoble and Tappan is a true picture of the American Anti-slavery Society, and of the spirit, character, and labours of its prominent members. The Book and the Pamphlet are both, in my opinion, tissues of deliberate misrepresentations, more easily corrected than replied to. The statements in "Quakerism" are such as cannot be readily seen in their true light, except by those who know the Society of Friends so intimately, as to be able to separate the grain of truth from the bushel of chaff; and they are calculated to convey an idea so incorrect and distorted, as to be very much worse than no picture at all.

The "Story of my Life" is an attack on the Society of Friends, for the edification of those who, from ignorance or prejudice, are unable or unwilling to ascertain the truth respecting it. It is full of scandalous stories about individuals, some of which are plainly false; some grossly exaggerated; and others, even if true, do not affect the character of the so-

ciety; for no community or association can fairly be held responsible for the vices or follies of its members, unless its doctrines or discipline are likely to produce them.

Members of the Society of Friends well know that the book would need a volume as large as itself to answer it fully, and disentangle truth from error and misrepresentation; and, after all, the counter-statements would not influence those who are already prejudiced against Friends, or whose sectarian views coincide with those of the author. The reply would make its way chiefly among such as are already cognizant of the facts, and therefore aware of the errors and perversions contained in the work.

The present attempt to vindicate truth, and expose the erroneous statements and insinuations of Messrs. Scoble and Tappan, will doubtless labour under a similar disadvantage, and be appreciated chiefly by those who are already informed and convinced. Yet I trust it may also reach another large class, who have looked but slightly into the subject, and are ready to hear and judge with unprejudiced minds. I earnestly invite those who appreciate the great interests involved in this question to examine it for themselves; feeling assured that the character and measures of the American Anti-slavery Society will bear the strictest scrutiny.

MY OWN ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE.

To show that my views are not the crude results of a slight acquaintance with the anti-slavery cause, I shall give some particulars of my own experience and opportunities for judging.

In the summer of the year 1837, George Thompson visited Dublin, and delivered a course of lectures at the request of our Anti-slavery Committee. I then learned for the first time the history of the anti-slavery struggle which had been going on for some years in the United States, and in which, but two years before, he had been so prominent an actor. My interest was intensely engaged by the vastness of the enterprise, and the moral heroism evinced by those who had attempted it against odds so tremendous. Some numbers of the *New York Emancipator* fell into my hands; I read them eagerly, and left no stone unturned to improve my acquaintance with the objects and measures of the abolitionists. About this time I happened to meet with Miss Martineau's vivid and able essay, "The Martyr Age of the United States," on its first publication in the *Westminster Review*. Her vigorous sketches of character, and her generous sympathy with the self-denying

devotedness of the abolitionists, strongly impressed me, and to those impressions may be attributed much of that undiminished interest I have since felt in the anti-slavery cause.

The struggle was then going on, which resulted in the abolition of the Negro apprenticeship, and of colonial slavery. In 1838, I attended a convention that was held in London for the promotion of this object; and in 1840, I was one of a numerous delegation from Dublin to the so-called "World's Anti-slavery Convention," which was held in London in June. There I had the happiness of making the acquaintance of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Lucretia Mott, and many other prominent American abolitionists; and of hearing from their own lips some details of the arduous struggle in which they were engaged. It was then I ascertained what I had suspected before, that divisions had taken place in the anti-slavery ranks. I had observed that the *Emancipator* gave little information respecting the efforts of those New England abolitionists, with whom the enterprise originated. While in London, I had frequent opportunities of enjoying social intercourse with abolitionists of all parties, and was assiduous in my endeavours to obtain information. In the discussions that took place in the Convention, I was surprised by the ignorance of a majority of the British members respecting the labours and achievements of the American abolitionists. Many of these gentlemen were ministers; they appeared to be led by their professional prepossessions. Another large class was composed of members of the Society of Friends; they seemed to rely on such of their body as had taken a prominent part in the struggle against British slavery. They did not possess much information of their own, nor did they feel sufficient interest in American anti-slavery to induce them to seek for it.

As a result of these observations, I returned home fully assured that much as had been accomplished by the anti-slavery men and women of England, a vaster field of labour remained for the American abolitionists, demanding sterner courage, more sleepless vigilance, larger sacrifices, and the power to withstand more dangerous temptations than had ever been demanded here. In England, slavery was attacked at a distance; in the United States, the struggle is fought hand to hand. In England, public opinion was against slavery from the commencement of the struggle, and the contest was waged with the slave-trading merchants and the West India proprietors—a powerful and influential class, it is true, as the forty years' contest made manifest—yet exercising a feeble influence in England, when compared with the owners of three millions of

slaves in the United States. These form the most potent "interest" in the Union, supported as they are by their allies in the churches and the legislatures, and by that cowardly public sentiment which upholds slavery in the Free States—not so much from any absolute love of the system, or insensibility to its odious inconsistency with their proud professions of liberty and religion, as from a dread of any relaxation of those compromises in favour of the slaveholder, on the faith of which the Slave States and the Free States are held together. In the minds of most Americans, the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of their national existence are synonymous. The Slave States make it a condition of their adhesion to the federal compact, that the Free States shall assist them by civil process, and, if need be, by armed force, in recovering and retaining their slaves; and the Free States, to secure Southern allegiance to the Union, agree to the bargain. The national policy, the civil liberties of the people, the discipline of the religious organizations, the interests of Commerce, the character of the republic, are all made subservient to "the rights of the South," which always signifies the maintenance of slavery. With the exception of the sect of the Covenanters, and a small band of reformers, who condemn such a bargain as both wicked and impolitic, and who see with prophetic eyes the moral mildew this deliberate complicity with a mean and loathsome system is bringing on the nation,—all classes, sects, and parties in the United States regard the preservation of the Union as a sacred and patriotic duty. Hence the unpopularity of the thorough-going abolitionists, and the repugnance evinced by most Americans to discuss the abolition of slavery, however much they may appear to sympathize with struggles for liberty in other parts of the world—provided the oppressed are white. With black insurgents they rarely or never sympathize.

In the Convention, some of the most prominent and laborious American abolitionists were excluded from admission as members, on the ground that, being women, it would be contrary to British usage to receive them. As a result of this vote, Mr. Garrison and other deputies from the American Anti-slavery Society took their seats in the gallery; refusing to present their credentials to a body, whose rejection of their fellow delegates showed that zeal for the slave and a cordial welcome to his devoted friends, had less place in their hearts than deference to matters of usage and etiquette.

In the succeeding autumn, Mr. Scoble visited Ireland on behalf of the British and Foreign Society, in company with Messrs.

James G. Birney and H. B. Stanton, two members of that New York executive committee which had lately seceded from the American Anti-slavery Society, having previously sequestered the newspaper and book-stock of the society whose confidential servants they were. It may be well to say that Mr. Scoble had been in America in 1839, and had there become acquainted with the gentlemen with whom he now travelled, and with whose views and proceedings he entirely sympathised. Before this visit came round to us in Dublin, we heard that, under pretence of an anti-slavery tour for lecturing and explaining the position and claims of the anti-slavery cause in America, their actual object was accomplished in private social reunions of the friends of the cause, as they went from place to place. This object was, to convey information respecting the American abolitionists in such a way as to excite unfavourable impressions respecting the American Anti-slavery Society; especially the Boston abolitionists; and, above all, William Lloyd Garrison, to whom the enterprise FOR IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL EMANCIPATION owes its existence. Safely relying on that prevalent ignorance and indifference to which allusion has been already made, this part of their mission, if we judge by existing prejudice and misconception, must have been generally accomplished to their satisfaction. In Dublin, being forewarned, we were forearmed; and Mr. Scoble gained nothing by his private opportunity.

From that time to the present, now more than eleven years, my intercourse with the prominent members of the American Anti-slavery Society has never relaxed. By correspondence, by private intercourse during their visits to Dublin; or, when this was impracticable, during visits paid to them in England, and undertaken for this object; I have endeavoured to improve and extend my acquaintance with them. I have been a regular subscriber to the anti-slavery newspapers, and from their columns have had ample opportunity of canvassing the arguments adduced against them, and the accusations by which they have been assailed by their former friends, as well as by those who have always been their opponents. The grossest anonymous libels against the American Anti-slavery Society and especially Mr. Garrison, have been abundantly and gratuitously scattered from time to time. I have read every thing of this kind that came within my reach; and the result is, that the slandered abolitionists have my hearty sympathy and respect, and I trust that those who have tried to stab them in the dark will, when the truth is known, secure the estimation such conduct merits.

MR. SCOBLE.

Mr. Scoble informs us, in the first page of his Preface, that "he has never written a line, prepared a resolution, or delivered a speech against the American Anti-slavery Society, or *publicly* impeached the character or the motives of its supporters." In other words, he has not done what it was clearly his duty to do, if he had valid objections to make; for no greater service can be done to any cause, than to get rid of those who injure it by dishonest or injudicious co-operation. If Mr. Scoble had been in the habit of coming out boldly and openly to express any disapprobation he might have felt towards them, the American Anti-slavery Society would have known how to cope with him. He takes needless trouble to exculpate himself from the charge of *public* action against the American Anti-slavery Society. Had he filled columns of the *British and Foreign Anti-slavery Reporter* with accusations, resolutions, or speeches against it; had he publicly impeached the character and motives of its members, and allowed them an opportunity of as publicly coming forward in their own defence; how much more respectable would this have been, than to damage their reputation by private scandal and unanswerable inuendoes? But better late than never. It is well he has at last come forth, and exchanged his underground labors for overt action. Holding the responsible position of secretary to the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, he has constantly made use of the facilities it has afforded him, to undermine the influence of the American Anti-slavery Society. He speaks in his preface of his unfailing courtesy to the members of that society who have called upon him. I have met with most if not all of those who have visited England within the last twelve years; and I never heard till now of Mr. Scoble's kindness and courtesy towards them, but often to the contrary. The members of the American Anti-slavery Society have felt it, in the shape of secret insinuations that they could not parry, and a steady refusal to publish any reply or justification they happened to offer. As respects the public, Mr. Scoble is the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society. The subscribers pay their money. He is their right arm, their mouth-piece, and their representative. Under his guidance, the society which twenty years ago aroused the nations, and unshackled eight hundred thousand slaves in the British colonies, has dwindled down to an exclusive, uninfluential corporation, and is no longer a hearty confederacy for the overthrow of slavery. Within the last twelve years, it has in my opinion done more

injury to the slave, by lending the respectability of its former reputation to Mr. Scoble's bigoted hostility against the best friends of the anti-slavery cause, than it has achieved good by any anti-slavery labour of its own. Claiming the Protestant right of private interpretation for himself; acting as the mouth-piece of a body who, with little exception, belong to sects which have for ages complained of political exclusion and ecclesiastical intolerance; the secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society has used all its once potent influence to discountenance and discredit those whose anti-slavery measures and doctrinal opinions happened not precisely to square with his own—no matter how unquestionable their devotion to the slave, or how disinterested their services on his behalf.

Is this Representative of British Abolitionism the man for a position which peculiarly demands a person of wide sympathies and catholic charity, who estimates men by their fruits not their creeds, generous, large hearted, and magnanimous? Compare the New Broad-street Secretary with William Lloyd Garrison, beginning his glorious enterprise in a garret, working at his paper with the help of a negro boy, living on bread and water, attracting the eyes of a nation, labouring undauntedly, untiringly through twenty-five years, welcoming all help, defying all calumny, winning the personal respect of his enemies by the purity of his life and the generous beauty of his character, publishing in his own columns all the bitterest and most insulting attacks of his countless enemies; and say which of these men do you think the more likely instrument in the Divine hand to promote the cause of the slave, and to shake the foundations of a system which makes the existence of pure Christianity or true liberty in the United States impossible?

Mr. Scoble disclaims the imputation of illiberality. He avers that he is ready to join in labouring against slavery with any person, irrespective of his religious opinions; but if the American Anti-slavery Society "choose to call into *active* service," persons who maintain and express certain views on religious subjects to which he objects, he begs to decline co-operating with those who allow such liberty. If his own house were on fire, or his own child struggling in the water, or his own daughter exposed for sale on an auction block, would he refuse the *active* service of any one who had not learned his shibboleth? Would he content himself with the *sympathy* of all others who might be disposed to assist him? If not, why will he reject on the slave's behalf the aid of any who come to the rescue? He is not consistent in this

respect. I have seen him on the platform of the Peace Convention in Paris, promoting 'universal peace' in company with some whose moral reputation would bear no comparison with that of the most outspoken abolitionist.

If Fox, Penn, Barclay, or the Quaker martyrs of New England came to life again, they would not be allowed to enlist themselves in the brigade of Scoble Abolitionists. Nearly all their views on religious subjects he would deem rank heresy; and they were often accused of outraging "the feelings and practices of Christian people."

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Justly to appreciate the value of the various efforts for the slave's liberation, we should try to attain the slave's point of view, and to imagine how we should estimate them, if those who are dearest to us were writhing beneath the torturing cowhide, and subjected to the infinite indignities and wrongs inseparable from the mildest form of slavery. What should we then think of that British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society—the successors of Clarkson and Wilberforce—who are so cautious about the company they keep, that they reject and discountenance the only anti-slavery society in America which makes the slave's cause its sole object—a society which embraces the most strenuous, most consistent, and most gifted friends of the slave?

England is an anti-slavery country. The philanthropy, the treasure, and the blood of Englishmen have been freely expended in the war against slavery. How, then, does it happen that the cause has languished in England within the last twelve years; that the public mind is so apathetic respecting it, and that, for one convert it has gained in that time, ten Englishmen have become tainted with the pro-slavery virus of American public opinion? I reply, this is partly owing to the increased intercourse with the United States; but chiefly to the apathy of the recognised friends of the anti-slavery cause in England, and their hostility to those who faithfully labour for the abolition of American slavery. If the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society had taken advantage of their position, they might have awakened the people of England so fully to the pro-slavery sins of the American churches and political parties, that the public opinion of these countries would have powerfully aided the American abolitionists. It is generally remarked that Englishmen, whether lay or clerical, who visit America, become rapidly imbued with the prejudice against color, and with indifference to slavery. The

number of exceptions to this rule is singularly small. Pecuniary interest, or the influence of their sects, soon reconciles them to the state of things in the United States. If the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society had exerted itself with energy, and in a catholic spirit, to educate and enlighten the English people on this subject, they would be much better prepared than they now are for the insidious representations of travelled Americans, who endeavour, wherever they go, to veil or palliate the enormous inconsistency of their own conduct with their loud professions of attachment to religion and liberty.*

With the valuable assistance of the London *Morning Advertiser*, a paper which evinces a remarkable acquaintance with the claims and bearings of the anti-slavery cause, the attention

* Partly owing, it is believed, to the rebukes of the London *Morning Advertiser*, and partly to the energetic exposure, by some friends of the anti-slavery cause in Bristol, of the shocking conduct of the pro-slavery clergy of the United States, in support of the Fugitive Slave Bill, the course of the *British and Foreign Anti-slavery Reporter* has been much more decided within the last few months than heretofore. In the last number (published April 1, 1852) after quoting some infamous suggestions of Mr. Webster, the American Prime Minister, sanctioning the expulsion of the free coloured population of the States, the editor indignantly enquires:—"What, after this, may not be feared, especially when we find that two-thirds of the ministers and churches of the various Christian denominations in the United States, give their sanction to the schemes of the Colonization Society, and are leagued with the slaveholders of the South in treading under foot the dearest rights of humanity, and in putting the ban of proscription on millions of their fellow-men and fellow-countrymen, on the ground of their colour?"

Now if, on Mr. Scoble's own showing, *two-thirds of the ministers and churches in the United States* are thus recreant, what becomes of his accusations of the faithful American friends of the slave who rebuke those churches and ministers, knowing that the proportion of the righteous left in the American Sodom is much smaller than one-third of the whole, and that the delinquents cannot be the churches and ministers of Christ. The following testimony of Parker Pillsbury, a zealous agent of the American Anti-slavery Society, respecting the state of the people in a part of the State of New York, is strong collateral evidence of what Mr. Scoble tells us of the ministers and churches:—

"I am constrained to echo the lamentation I have often heard in many parts of the country, that the young men of this age, especially, are abandoning themselves to the lowest folly and vice. The low standard of religious faith and practice, the temporizing spirit of the pulpit; the corruption and profligacy of the 'great men,' as they are called; the Mexican massacre; the Fugitive Slave Law; California dreams of 'fortunes made in a day;' drunkenness; a most excessive and fatal use of tobacco; joined to the very worst kind of reading that constantly steams up from our putrescent press, all these are either causes or consequences, the final end of which will be most disastrous to the welfare of the rising and risen generation."

And to a similar effect is the testimony of Daniel Whitney, an agent of the American Anti-slavery Society, writing from Worcester County, Massachusetts, Boylston, Jan. 31, 1852:—

"It is lamentable how few there are in those places, who can with any propriety be termed anti-slavery. Moral death pervades the masses of human beings in town and city. Mammon is the god worshipped by high and low, and whatever is supposed to stand in the way of his interests must be sacrificed. The slave system forms a part of his kingdom, and must not be disturbed; while the general law which leads men everywhere to hate those whom they have injured comes in to help on this great wrong."

of numbers is increasingly directed to the narrow and partizan spirit of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society. This spirit has been carried to such an unjustifiable extent in the society's organ, the *Reporter*, that no mention was made in its columns of Mr. Thompson's extraordinary labours during his recent anti-slavery tour in the United States. No reason can be assigned for this silence, except the editor's known hostility to the American Anti-slavery Society on account of its uncompromising, unsectarian character.*

As the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society are the only body who assume to represent the anti-slavery feeling of England, and the opinion is gaining ground that the work is very badly done by them; it may be well to give some particulars of the actual position of this society, its income and expenditure, and its mode of enlightening the English people respecting the claims of a cause which, from our increasing intercourse with the United States, is important to us in every point of view. I am indebted for my information to a letter from Mr. Farmer of London, published in the *Boston Liberator*, Jan. 16, 1852:—

“Now let us, as far as they themselves furnish the means, ascertain the number of abolitionists which the ‘British and Foreign’ represents in this country and throughout the world. I have before me the tenth annual report, for 1849. I have not been able to lay my hand upon a subsequent statement.

INCOME.

“The number of annual subscribers for the year 1849 throughout London and its vicinity, (comprising a population of two millions of souls,) was 34, and the amount subscribed by them was £46 8s.; number of subscribers in all other parts of the empire and of the world, 240; of subscriptions, £174 16s.; total number of subscribers, 274; subscriptions, £221 4s. The amount of donations for 1849, £1020 3s. 1d.

“There can be no doubt that, with an annual average income of donations of £1383, and of subscriptions, say £221, a large amount of real anti-slavery work *might* be done under faithful and economical managers. Now let us see in what manner the income of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society is applied. Exclusive of a balance due to treasurer, the expenditure of the year was £1151 13s. 7d. The items are as follow:—

EXPENDITURE.

“Cost of editing, printing, and publishing the *Anti-slavery Reporter*, £335 17s.—an item which, (to say nothing of its pro-slavery effect in its antagonism to the real abolitionists of America,) so far as any direct anti-slavery influence it possesses, may almost be pronounced sheer waste.

“Then follows, Printing, £61 13s. 3d; I suppose for the annual report and appendix, which circulates little beyond the society's own subscribers, and can have, therefore, scarcely any aggressive operation upon slavery.

* For documentary evidence in support of these statements, see Appendix.

“Then come Foreign Publications, Parliamentary Papers, &c., £83 7s. 7d.—the chief of which, I suppose, are used for the compilation of matter for the Reporter and the Report.

“Then follow postage, carriage of parcels, portorage, &c., £42 15s. 3d.

“Secretary, clerk, housekeeper, and messengers, £502 6s.

“Rent, and other items, £70 0s. 1d. Expenses of auxiliaries and travelling, £33 5s. Ditto public meeting, £21 10s. 11d. Sailors’ Home and Refugees, £2 18s. 6d.

MODE OF ACTION.

“The Society adopts neither the action of the Old or New Organizationists. There are no signs of public meetings, (save one per annum of its own subscribers,) for the enlightenment of the public mind, and the bringing it up even to that pitch of anti-slavery perfection attained by Mr. Scoble, which would induce them to ‘begin to suspect’ the sincerity of a minister of the gospel who would not avow himself an anti-slavery man; and which might give the anti-slavery boldness to declare, in the face of all men, ‘I do not think any American should be ashamed to say that he is an abolitionist.’ Neither do they adopt the Liberty Party plan of action of convention and stump; although in their report they assert that there are many things connected with the ‘universal extinction of slavery, which require the interference of our legislature and government.’ I know most of the Committee, and can speak to their high respectability; but, at the same time, I mean no disrespect to them when I say, that it is well known that they are better qualified to manage a venerable, richly endowed, and incorporated society, with simple, clear, and well-defined objects, than to lead the public mind upon any question whatever. In such a society, no doubt, they would have made a happy selection in Mr. Scoble as their secretary.”

THE AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Meanwhile, the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society reserves all the countenance it can spare to American Abolitionists, for those who “style themselves” the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, which, as a well-known abolitionist in New York declares, “has a name and existence on Tuesday afternoon of anniversary week in May, for the space of three hours. The rest of the year it is the Vigilance Committee.” Some attempt will be made to explain the strange preference given to this remarkably hybernating society. But as it is clear that a society which keeps its eyes open for even three hours each year cannot be said to be no society at all, Mr. George Thompson must have been guilty of some exaggeration in saying, at a public meeting in Bristol, “there is no such society.”

Mr. Tappan, in his “REPLY,” makes the most of this exaggeration, expresses great indignation that Mr. Thompson should say there was “no such anti-slavery society” as the American and Foreign Society, and is apparently unable to comprehend that he meant only to imply that it was obscure, inefficient, and a poor travesty of the body from which it seceded. In the extracts subsequently given from his speech,

Mr. Thompson does not deny there is a *head* to the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society; he only denies the existence of a *body*. It is undeniable that the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society makes up a goodly list of officers; that it has a very stirring Secretary; and that the secretary is Lewis Tappan. Mr. Thompson maintains that it holds but one meeting in the year; that it has no auxiliaries; that it does not come before the public; that, whether from lack of funds or excess of modesty, its influence is not felt by the slaveholder; and that, in attempting to puff this pretentious, inefficient shadow into fictitious importance, to the exclusion of the claims of the really zealous, laborious American Anti-slavery Society, the committee in New Broad Street, London, is guilty of treason against the slave, and deception towards the anti-slavery people of England.

The following is the answer received by Mr. Thompson, in reply to a letter of enquiry about the American and Foreign Society. I place entire confidence in the integrity of his informant, who is a friend and correspondent of my own:—

New York, November 22, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,

It is a month and more since I received your letter, asking for information in relation to the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The truth is, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is so entirely what you call it, that there is nothing to be told about it; or rather, there is nothing more to be told than you know already. I should have written to say this much, had I not hoped every week to have something definite to say, and especially to be able to answer categorically the questions you ask respecting its Executive Committee. Several of the persons were entirely unknown to me, even by name; nor could I find any body among my acquaintance who knew them any better. I at last applied to a man who in time past had been one of those to whom L. Tappan had been accustomed to apply for funds, when needed for the little anti-slavery work he does, but who is now a friend of the American Society. This gentleman even could not give me the desired information, till he applied directly to ——— a thing which of course I could not do. However, you have now the list complete, partly from this source, partly by myself.

For the rest, I may repeat what I suppose you know already. The American and Foreign Society has an office in Buckman-street. This office is also occupied by a Missionary Society, which publishes a monthly paper, and supports a few missionaries. The office I presume really belongs to this last society, and is supported by and for it. The American and Foreign publishes no paper, and has no lecturing agents. Once a year it holds a meeting in the Tabernacle, when a report is read by Tappan, and two or three speeches made. This, or far as I can learn, is all it ever does; except that it publishes an almanac.

I have occasionally seen a pamphlet professing to be published by it. Generally the pamphlets, and they are very few, which have issued from that office, have borne the imprint of ——— and are advertised for sale by him. Lewis Tappan you know is the secretary; but so far from being paid, he is in fact the society, which so far as I can learn relies altogether upon him for its

existence, and such funds as it needs for its purposes. When, however, it does any thing except the little above-mentioned, it ceases to be the American and Foreign Society, and becomes the Vigilance Committee. In this capacity it aids a few fugitives, and has in one or two cases conducted the case of a fugitive claimed as a slave. I cannot learn that the Executive Committee ever has meetings, or that they would have anything to do if they did. Some of them may sometimes come together and transact business, but it is the local business of a Vigilance Committee, which is precisely the same sort of work as that done by the old Abolition Society of Pennsylvania, which has been in existence for more than fifty years, and is opposed to the modern anti-slavery movement.

I should add, that the American and Foreign Society has to my knowledge no auxiliaries; and if you will refer to its last report, you will find, I think, that it does not pretend to have done anything during the preceding year.

This is all I can tell you. I wish it were more; but it is hard to prove a negative.

Very truly your friend,
S. H. GAY.

THE BULWARKS OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Mr. Scoble deplotes the spirit in which the proceedings of the American Anti-slavery Society are carried on. This he declares is entirely different from that by which it was animated in its "first and best years," when "they sought not the destruction but the purification of the churches from all participation in the guilt of slavery, by means wisely adapted to that end;" and he infers that its present object is "not so much the overthrow of slavery, as the destruction of all that is sacred in the institutions of Christianity."

This objection to the spirit of the American Anti-Slavery Society comes with a bad grace from the secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, who published, twelve years ago, Mr. J. G. Birney's pamphlet entitled, "The American Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery." Can we say anything worse of the American church than the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society has thus officially declared of them to the world? It is a fact that the Protestant orthodox churches of the slave states include the majority of American slaveholders — those floggers of women, who sell babies by the pound, and traffic in their own sons and daughters. But it is not true that the abolitionists, in their anti-slavery capacity, attack the functions, doctrines, or practices of the churches, except so far as the churches sanction or countenance the crime of holding slaves. They maintain that a church and ministry who advocate the continuance of slavery and persecute abolitionists cannot be a church and ministry of Christ. There is much said about the "really religious and moral people of the United States" being repelled by the

violence and bad spirit of the abolitionists. Have, then, the moral and religious such very faint perceptions of their plainest duty, that they will by no means come to the help of those who have fallen among thieves, lest they should thereby touch some heterodox Samaritan with the hem of their garments? If this be so, they cannot be surprised if they are considered among the bulwarks of American slavery. The slaveholder sees society divided into two classes, the anti-slavery class and the pro-slavery class; the latter including not only those who come forward to the direct support of his darling institution, but those who, by their silence and inertia, allow him to prosecute his crimes in peace. I can imagine no darker treason against any form of faith, than to attempt to reconcile it with the unutterable wickedness of slavery. No extent of unbelief, no blindness to evidence, can be compared in guilt with the practical blasphemy of the "Christian" slaveholder, or of the Christian church which countenances and shelters his crime. In my opinion, the abolitionists have done more service to real, practical, substantial Christianity, by their efforts to bring the churches to the law and to the testimony, and by pointing out to them the shocking contrast between their conduct and their profession, than has been effected by all the vast multitudes of ministers, north and south, who have held up their hands in horror at the doctrinal aberrations of Mr. Garrison and his fellow-labourers.

Familiar as Mr. Tappan is with the early history of the anti-slavery struggle, he cannot fail to be well aware of the causes which have alienated some of its champions from the prevalent theology of the community around them. The anti-slavery cause was essentially unpopular in the United States. It needed no slight grasp of principle to enable a man to stand firm. It was necessary to dig deep, and lay the foundation on a solid rock; and this they found in the conviction of the *brotherhood of man*, and the equality of all men in the sight of their Creator. This was their bond of union, their starting point, their treasure hidden in the field, to purchase which they were ready joyfully to sell all their other possessions. No other ground was strong enough to build upon. The arguments of pity, of expediency, of common honesty, might indeed be brought to bear against the citadel of slavery, and all with some effect. But these weapons were not able to bear the brunt of the battle; their points were liable to be parried or broken by counter-arguments, by logic, by statistics, by isolated facts, or convenient texts. The requisitions of the anti-slavery cause were found to go deeper, to lay the

axe nearer to the root of the tree of evil, and therefore to threaten a greater number of its branches.

Starting with this conviction of the brotherhood of the race, pleading for the slave because he was a brother and had equal rights, the distinctions of sect, sex, or party were as nothing in their sight. This one thing they were sure of, and they unhesitatingly cast aside every obstruction thrown in their way, regardless of its name or professed sanctity; regardless (perhaps sometimes too much so) of the mint, anise, and cummin, but determined not to pass over justice and the love of God. They had no quarrel with the Bible; far from it; but when texts were thrown in their way, and chapter and verse arrayed against them, they could not wait to compare translations, collate passages, or study idioms. This one thing they knew, that all men were brethren, and that the enslavement of one brother by another could not be right, plead for it who may; and this conviction they expressed in no measured terms. They declared that if the Bible, the church, the ministry, the Constitution, the Union, or any thing under heaven said that slavery was right, it affirmed what was untrue; and they left the *onus probandi* on their opponents.

The supporters of a pro-slavery church thought they had now found the vulnerable point of the abolitionists. Heretic, infidel, atheist—no name was too opprobrious to hurl at them. They were referred to Abraham's slaves, to the laws of Moses for the regulation of slavery, to the silence of Christ on the subject, to the rendition of Onesimus to his master by Paul. They were assailed as the worst of disorganisers; instead of being hailed as the revivers of that gospel of love and brotherhood preached by Christ, but long hidden under errors and dogmas.

If the wickedness of the church and her practical denial of Christ have estranged some of the abolitionists, is that the fault of the American Society? To form a fair judgment of the society, why not turn to its reports, its resolutions, its organs, its actions, its effect? No wonder that hollow professors are troubled. The American Anti-slavery Society has taken the initiative, and is following nearer after Christ in its practice, than the backslidden American Church is doing. She denies him, crucifies him afresh, degrades his character, and makes his mission of salvation null and void. She makes men infidels to her, by presenting them a cup of abomination in the name of Christianity. It is for dashing this cup aside, and confessing before men the Christian doctrine of freedom, the right of man to himself, that pro-slavery divines denounce the

recusants as infidels. And many well-meaning persons, unaccustomed to distinguish narrowly between the form of godliness and the power thereof, are deceived by the cry.

I need not picture what slavery is—the thorough loathsomeness of its corruption, the dreadful inhumanity of its details, the utter wickedness of its system. Whether considered socially, civilly, or ecclesiastically, it is all the imagination can conceive as most diabolical. Innumerable extracts might be given from the writings and sermons of American ministers, shewing the kind of Christianity which they preach in reference to this subject, and which so many have been branded as infidels for not accepting. Here are a few:—

The Rev. Dr. Gardiner Spring, an eminent Presbyterian clergyman of New York, well known in this country by his religious publications, lately declared from the pulpit that, “if by one prayer he could liberate every slave in the world, he would not dare to offer it.”

The Rev. Moses Stuart, D.D., an eminent biblical scholar, reminds his readers that “many Southern slaveholders are true *Christians*.” That “sending back a fugitive to them is not like restoring one to an idolatrous people.” That “though we may *pity* the fugitive, yet the Mosaic law does not authorize the rejection of the claims of the slaveholders to their stolen or strayed *property*.”

The Rev. W. M. Rogers, an orthodox minister of Boston, delivered on the last Thanksgiving-day a Sermon in which he says, “When the slave asks me to stand between him and his master, what does he ask? He asks me to murder a nation’s life; and I will not do it, because I have a conscience,—because there is a God.”

The Right Rev. Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, on the 13th of January last, while admitting that slavery, from *its inherent nature*, had in every age been a curse and a blight to the nation which cherished it, throws the sacred mantle of the Scriptures over it. He says, “It was warranted by the Old Testament, and inquires, ‘What effect had the Gospel in doing away with slavery? None whatever.’” Therefore, he argues, as it is expressly permitted by the Bible, it does not in itself involve any sin; but that every Christian is authorized by the Divine law to own slaves, provided they were not treated with unnecessary cruelty.

The Rev. Orville Dewey, D.D., of the Unitarian connexion, is maintaining in public lectures that the safety of the Union is not to be hazarded for the sake of the African race. Correcting a mis-statement of what he had expressed on a former occasion, he declares, in a lecture before the Mercantile Library Association:—*This* is what I said, both in my speech and lecture: ‘I would consent’—for I said nothing of *sending* anybody—‘I would *consent* that my own brother, my own son, should go (*i. e.*, into slavery—*ten times rather* would I go myself—than this Union should be sacrificed for me or for us;’ and I am ready to stand by this as a just and honourable sentiment; and I can only wonder that any man should think it extravagant or ridiculous.”

The Rev. Mr. Wadsworth of Philadelphia, in a recent Thanksgiving Sermon, says:—“In treating Southern Christian slaveholders with Christian courtesy, and sending back their fugitives when apprehended among you, you neither endorse the system nor partake of its evils; you are only performing in good faith the agreements and redeeming the pledges of your forefathers, and leaving to each man for himself to answer for his own act at the feet of Jesus.”

Throughout the Pamphlet the disposition of both writers to appeal to sectarian prejudices is evident. Accusations are made that imply anything or nothing. Mr. Scoble talks of the agents of the society "outraging the feelings and practices of Christian people;" and Mr. Tappan complains of some of them having used language "justly offensive to the great body of the moral and religious people of the country." May I enquire, of whom does this great body consist? If he answer, the abolitionists; I reply, they are not offended; for they know the charges are just. If he mean the members of the great pro-slavery churches and pro-slavery parties; they belong to "the bulwarks of American slavery," and naturally object to every condemnation of their own apathy to the slave or complicity with his oppressors. Nothing more clearly indicates a narrow spirit than this readiness to assail men with shadowy charges, that leave much to the imagination and readily excite prevalent prejudices. No doubt, it would be easy to make imputations in the same style against members of the British and Foreign, and American and Foreign Anti-slavery Societies, if Mr. Scoble would kindly undertake the inquisition. Indifference to the ordinances—hostility to a 'hireling' ministry—a denial of 'the sanctity of the Christian sabbath' as a divine institution—a wide diversity of opinions as to the sense and extent in which they view 'the scriptures as a divine revelation,' &c. might be established; but would in no degree impeach the sincerity and fervour of the anti-slavery zeal of those who hold them. Conversations, extracts, and *on dits* might be cited in abundance, respecting the evangelical sayings and doings of the orthodox members of the American Anti-slavery Society since 1840. But what would this prove, since the society is no more responsible for its orthodox than for its heterodox members, in their individual action or utterance in other capacities?

THE BONDS OF SECT AND PARTY.

One of the most powerful bonds by which men are united is that of religious communion. With the majority it is stronger than the ties of kindred, the assaults of ridicule, the appeals of reason, or the claims of self-interest. How natural, then, after the first outburst of enthusiasm in favour of the slave, that the claims of sect and of sectarian organizations began to resume their wonted influence; and that very many who had nobly borne the brunt of mobocratic influence, the destruction of their property, the ruin of their business, and the estrangement of friends, were unable to withstand the

pleadings of those early impressions; or that the methodist, the presbyterian, the congregationalist, or the baptist was frequently tempted to listen to the remonstrances of his spiritual guides, who endeavoured to abate his zeal in an enterprize which the majority of the sect felt to be a standing condemnation of their own sins of omission or commission.

Nor is it surprising that in a country where the churches are the bulwarks of the national crime, there should be an increasing disposition to canvass the doctrines and pretensions of the criminals. Wherever the conduct of professed Christians has been farthest removed from the precepts and practice of the Founder of Christianity, a spirit of sceptical enquiry has sprung up. It is known that scepticism is almost universal amongst the educated classes in those countries where political despotism is upheld by the Romish priesthood, and where religion presents herself to the intelligent mind in the guise of a stupid, tyrannical superstition. "Faith without works is dead," and the *religion* of the slaveholders and pro-slavery churches of the United States, whatever else it may be, is not *Christianity*. There is an abundant profession of religion at the south—there are baptists, methodists, episcopalians, presbyterians, and friends; yet it is notorious that banishment, torture, imprisonment, or death, is the fate of any one who stands up boldly to free the slave or condemn his oppressor; that the practical Christian, under whatever name he may be known, is effectually gagged in the slave states by the brute force of his fellow-professors; and in the so-called free states it is impossible for him, while connected with any of the religious organizations, to bear an uncompromising testimony against slavery and the complicity of the churches in upholding it, without incurring an amount of censure equivalent to virtual excommunication.

The Society of Friends has been more identified with efforts for the abolition of slavery than any other religious body. In England, a member of this body is considered an *ex-officio* opponent of slavery. In America, many of the earlier apostles of the cause were Friends. I cannot therefore adduce a more striking proof of the influence of slavery there, than the rupture which took place some years ago amongst Friends in Indiana. A large body withdrew, and formed a yearly meeting, under the name of the Anti-slavery Yearly Meeting of Friends of Indiana, differing in no respect of doctrine and discipline from the large body, except that they thus obtained a freedom of action in opposition to slavery, which was denied to them by the influential members of the yearly meet-

ing from which they withdrew. Before their secession, they were studiously discountenanced; they were placed on no appointments; and those who held office were deprived of their position. Overseers, ministers, and elders were allowed to act no longer in those capacities, unless on condition that they withdrew from all co-operation against slavery with persons not within the bounds of the society. This very co-operation had been repeatedly and earnestly recommended to Friends in America, in the epistles of the London yearly meeting; and yet some of the very persons who signed those epistles as clerks united with other influential Friends, some of whom were prominent members of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, on a mission of reconciliation to Indiana; where they confined their labours to an attempt to induce the Anti-slavery Friends to acquiesce passively in the tyranny of the parent yearly meeting, and to withdraw, for the sake of the unity of the Society, from that active co-operation with their fellow-citizens on behalf of the slave, which had been recommended by those influential members of the London yearly meeting, and committee-men of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, fellow-labourers of Messrs. Scoble and Tappan. The Friends' yearly meeting of Indiana is the largest in the world, numbering above 20,000 members. Yet Indiana is one of the most wickedly pro-slavery of all the free states. Fugitive slaves are re-captured with little difficulty, some slaves are illegally held, and laws have lately been passed in the state legislature to expel the free people of colour, or still further to discountenance their settlement in the state. I have been given to understand that if the Society of Friends, who form at least one in fifty of the population, had not preferred the peace of the society to the cause of humanity, they might easily have prevented the passing of these wicked and inhuman laws. Having no scruple to vote under the pro-slavery constitution of the United States, and possessing universal suffrage, they wield far greater direct political influence than Friends in England, who, though a mere handful of the population, rendered such effectual service in the abolition of the British slave-trade and British colonial slavery.*

* The *British and Foreign Anti-slavery Reporter* has taken no notice of this secession, nor has it alluded to the existence of the Free Mission Baptists, who withdrew from the Baptist Triennial Convention on anti-slavery grounds, and against whom there is no pretext of heresy, nor any other cause for the neglect, except that the mission is for some reason distasteful to the editor. The history of this secession is briefly as follows:—

“When the Baptist Convention was organized in 1814, slaveholders were admitted

We might suppose that nothing more would be necessary to enlist an honest professor of religion against American slavery, than to show him that the doctrines and discipline which typify his own idea of Christianity cannot withstand the influence of this gigantic system of wickedness and pollution. And yet it is mournfully true, that in the United States the faithful men and women who point out to the sects the ravages which the institution of slavery make amongst them, are often treated as spies in the camp, enemies to their country, and traitors to Christianity; not as watchers on the walls, the truest friends of religion and liberty.

It may be asked, why all this? what has all this to do with Mr. Scoble's exceptions to the conduct and spirit of the American Anti-slavery Society? I answer, much. He is sore because fidelity to the slave has obliged the abolitionists to attack those "bulwarks of American slavery," which are falsely called "the Christian churches" of America. He knows that when the anti-slavery enterprise was commenced, much was hoped from the co-operation of the religious organizations; and that it was not until after patient labour with them, the friends of the slave were obliged to turn from the pulpit to the people. He knows that if the pulpit had done its duty, no anti-slavery society would have been needed. He knows that the "bulwarks of American Slavery" deserve nothing but "bitterness and hostility;" and that it is only as such, the religious organizations have ever been attacked by the abolitionists. Nothing that is "sacred in the institutions of Christianity" has been censured by them. A time-serving ministry, corrupt and hypocritical organizations, have been and are denounced and exposed; but these are "the bulwarks of American slavery;" they are not Christianity.

members on the plea that they did not justify the *principle* of holding slaves, but simply held them out of kindness!

"They succeeded, however, in electing a slaveholder as president for twenty-one years out of thirty during which the Convention has existed; and every church planted by its agents in slave-territory became a slave-holding church. In order to silence the anti-slavery remonstrances of the Northern Baptists, they required that the *Baptist Missionary Magazine* should give a pledge to be silent on the subject. The pledge was given, and has been kept! They required of leading Northern Baptists that they should sign a pledge of continued fellowship with slaveholders—many did so! They required that no Anti-slavery Baptist should be elected an officer in the missionary body—not one was elected! And not until all these requisitions were conceded to them, would the slaveholders pay in their contributions to the society.

"The sacrifice of Christian principle made to slaveholding domination led some members to refuse to co-operate with the Missionary Convention. They, therefore, organized in Boston, Mass. in 1843, a society named the Baptist Free Mission Society, which refuses to receive slaveholders to membership, or to admit their blood-stained offerings into its treasury."

Mr. Scoble dwells on the "objectionable agency" of the American Anti-slavery Society; and Mr. Tappan gives extracts from letters and newspapers in support of his position, that their agents and lecturers are "all of them, it is believed, opposed to the constitution and union of the States, to the churches, to the ministry, to the sanctity of the Lord's day; and most of them, if not all, to the inspiration of the Scriptures."

Is Mr. Tappan serious in objecting to these anti-slavery agents and lecturers, that they are hostile to a Constitution and a Union which are the political safeguards of American slavery? He should have expressly stated that they are hostile to a *pro-slavery* church, a *pro-slavery* ministry, and to that pharisaical observance of Sunday which forbids any public allusion on that day to the great crime of the American people. Too many professed friends of the slave have wasted time in catechising their fellow-labourers, instead of keeping to the business for which they were professedly associated. Let us first help the good Samaritan in his labours, and then, if we please, study theology at the feet of the Priest and the Levite. But we do not undertake to defend all that has been said by every anti-slavery agent or lecturer; nor is it needful. They are free agents, and must have their own opinions. The American Anti-slavery Society limits its action to a warfare against slavery, never turning aside to investigate the varying phases of faith of its members, and having neither the power nor the will to excommunicate any on the ground of heresy.

THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY UNCHANGED IN ITS PRINCIPLES.

Mr. Scoble tells us in his Introduction, "that the American Anti-slavery Society, as at present constituted, differs in several essential particulars from the original society, whose name it, nevertheless, bears. That society, among other things, provided, both in its declaration of sentiments and its constitution, for a wise and vigorous political, as well as moral, action, for the removal of slavery from the United States." As far as I can ascertain, the American Anti-slavery Society differs in *no* "essential particular" from its Declaration of Sentiments, which was not only "*signed*" but *written* at Philadelphia in 1833, by Mr. Garrison. Now, as well as then, and at all times during its existence, the American Anti-slavery Society labours politically. It presents petitions, it addresses state legislatures and the national congress, and it powerfully influences the political parties, by bringing public opinion to bear upon them. Its

newspapers also give the debates which arise in reference to slavery in the halls of congress and of the state legislatures. In short, it does every thing that it can do politically, except mix itself up in the strife of party politics.

Many of the accusations contained in this pamphlet indicate a profound reliance on the ignorance of the reader. Englishmen are proverbially indifferent to the internal affairs of other countries—the United States not excepted. They have a dim idea, when they think of the matter at all, that the great palladium of Brother Jonathan is the famous Declaration of Independence, which declares that “all men are born free and equal, and alike entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” On the contrary, the American great charter, by which the federal union was finally cemented, on parchment, is the Constitution of the United States; and by this instrument, which was promulgated in 1787, the inhabitants of the free states “are now living under a pledge of their tremendous physical force to fasten the galling fetters of tyranny upon the limbs of millions in the southern states;—they are liable to be called at any moment to suppress a general insurrection of the slaves;—they authorise the slave-owner to vote for three-fifths of his slaves as property, and thus enable him to perpetuate his oppression;—they support a standing army at the south for its protection;—and they seize the slave who has escaped into their territories, and send him back to be tortured by an enraged master or a brutal driver.”* An oath of fidelity to this constitution is required of all who take office under the United States government; and it is clear that this oath no consistent abolitionist can take, with the intention of obeying its pro-slavery provisions in their popular interpretation.

Shortly after the United States secured their independence of Great Britain, they consented to a compromise with the slave states of Georgia and Carolina, by which the maintenance of slavery was guaranteed, and the African slave trade protected for a number of years. From that time to the present, slavery has been strengthening her bands, and the slave-holding interest is now the great interest of the country. It has greatly increased the number of the slave states and the extent of slaveholding territory, it has obtained the enactment of the recent Fugitive Slave Law, it kidnaps free citizens, exercises a censorship over the press, and is evidently not disposed to withhold its demands until the whole country is subjected to its sway.

In the United States the political sentiment is extremely

* From the Declaration of the National Anti-slavery Convention at which the American Anti-slavery Society was established.

powerful. Every free white citizen is in effect one of the sovereigns of the republic. The country is divided into two great parties—the whigs, who are the more wealthy and conservative; and the democrats, who include the larger portion of the labouring classes. It is difficult for us to estimate the strength of his party ties upon an American. Legally, the same freedom of opinion, the same facility of change, exist as amongst ourselves. Practically, it is looked upon as a species of treason for a man to desert his party, to decline its behests, or to have a political will of his own. There is something of military discipline in this stern enforcement of party obedience. The American Anti-slavery Society having come to the full perception of the utter incompatibility of allegiance to the union and the constitution, with a true and consistent testimony against slavery, have made their election. Although they have no test of membership, except the admission that slavery is a sin, and as such should be immediately abandoned; although they receive politicians of all parties and professors of all creeds into co-operation with them; still they proclaim the duty of ceasing from “union with slaveholders;” and they deny the consistency of those abolitionists, who, for any purpose whatever, take an oath of fidelity to a constitution, which is all but universally understood to demand the recognition, and, if need be, the maintenance by force of arms, of the institution of slavery. Therefore, while they labour politically, as far as allegiance to conscientious conviction will permit, they are not, and never were, a political *party* organization. The refusal of the society to be dragged into such a position, which would have destroyed their moral influence, and lowered them to the level of the selfish and unprincipled politicians around them, was one of the causes of that lamentable secession in 1840, in which Mr. Tappan took such a prominent part. The abolitionists have kept back from the polls, they have separated from the churches, they have submitted to the vilest and the most galling imputations, rather than act inconsistently with the testimonies they bear.

The promulgation of correct anti-slavery principles, the task of watching and rebuking the aberrations of parties and of churches, without fear or favour, and in despite of hostility or unpopularity, are the special mission of the American Anti-slavery Society. Although the Liberty Party, Free Soil Party, and Christian Anti-slavery Association include many honest-hearted friends of the slave, under their banner will also be found that vast and ever-shifting number who abhor slavery, but not sufficiently so to give up sectarian position or the

rewards of party for the slave's sake; and who wish for the credit without the sacrifices incident to an anti-slavery reputation. But these do not push the cause onward, and fight the battle.*

NON-RESISTANCE.

At the time of the secession, great use was made of the non-resistant opinions of a handful of the abolitionists, as an argument against the American Anti-slavery Society. It was urged that no non-resistant could be a true abolitionist; that he might talk as long as he pleased against slavery, but that in rejecting political action, he had thrown away "the staff of accomplishment." It was of no avail to say to these objectors, that among the abolitionists none were more devoted or more useful labourers than the non-resistants; or to point out to them, that the burden of the anti-slavery struggle in England was chiefly borne by members of the Society of Friends,

* The *Liberty Party* had its origin in the unconquerable passion of the Americans for political action. The American Anti-slavery Society direct the attention of the people away from the misleading influence of their passions and prejudices, to the great principles of liberty and religion by which they profess to be guided; whilst the *Liberty Party* enter into direct competition with the whigs and democrats. They aim to be "a Third Party," with the abolition of slavery for their gathering cry, and the usual tactics of party warfare as their mode of action. They nominate for office, meet in *caucus*, magnify their nominees, and interpret the Constitution of the United States in a sense different from everybody else, including the Abolitionists. The number of the opponents of slavery who hold Liberty Party views is probably considerable, but those who actually continue to labour in this direction are believed to be very few. Among the latter is Gerrit Smith, a distinguished and munificent philanthropist.

The object of the *Free-soil Party* is chiefly to maintain the balance of power in favour of the free States, by aiming to prevent the intrusion of slavery into the territories of the Union which may eventually become States, and as such exercise an influence on Congress in favor of the North or the South, as they happen to reject or retain the institution of slavery. The *Free-soilers* accept the pro-slavery stipulations of the American Constitution; they are opposed to the existence of slavery, but do not, as a party, advocate the doctrines of the sin of slavery and the duty of immediate emancipation. In short, they are not Abolitionists.

The *Christian Anti-slavery Association* was lately established (as Professor Finney, the eminent writer on Revivals, declares) "in order to rescue the cause of the slave from the hands of the infidels." It consists chiefly of individuals who troubled themselves very little about the Anti-Slavery cause until it became, if not unpopular, at least disreputable to oppose it. In all the sects and parties there are feebly sincere souls; and such as these comfort their consciences by taking shelter in *Free-soil* and *Liberty Parties*, *Christian Anti-Slavery Associations*, and such like.

At the Convention held in Chicago, in July, 1851, for the formation of the *Christian Anti-Slavery Association*, among other allusions to past efforts for the abolition of American slavery, it was inferred that, until that time, the cause had been left in the hands of the infidels. Now if this imputation was correct, it must apply to the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, (which the *British and Foreign Anti-slavery Reporter* calls, "that great instrumentality for the abolition of slavery in the United States,") as well as to all other anti-slavery instrumentalities. If it was false, why did Mr. Tappan, who was appointed one of the officers of this infant association, submit to such a libel on all the organizations for anti-slavery purposes with which he has been connected for the last twenty years?

whose peace doctrines equally assume the inviolability of human life, and are alike founded upon the teachings of Christ—although the non-resistants are more literal in their interpretation of his precepts.

It was not originally demanded that any man, in joining the abolitionists, should give up his peculiar religious opinions. But he was expected to be true to his convictions, and to carry out the cause consistently with them. It was therefore absurd, invidious, and unjust to select the non-resistants for exclusion from the anti-slavery ranks, on the ground that their peculiar views as to civil government disqualified them from rendering substantial assistance. The five points of Calvinism, the visions of the Swedenborgians, the transubstantiation of the Romanists, the rejection of the ordinances by the Quakers or of the Trinity by the Unitarians, might as well have been named as disqualifying those who held these doctrines for the anti-slavery ranks.

But this objection to the co-operation of non-resistants is not made in good faith. Messrs. Scoble and Tappan well know that the abstinence of the American Anti-slavery Society from participation in *party* politics, had not its foundation in the non-resistant opinions of a few of its members. I have already set forth its objections to the American constitution, and they are so plain and reasonable, that no honest person need fail to comprehend and appreciate them.

It is true that the members of the "Liberty Party" in the United States do not interpret the Constitution as do the judges, the legislature, and the great majority of the people of that country. The theory of this party is, that the common interpretation is incorrect; that the framers of the constitution could not have intended to contravene the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence; and that an opponent to slavery may properly swear to the constitution, take office under government, or enter congress, with a resolution to fulfil the obligations he undertakes—not in the sense in which they are generally interpreted, but in the anti-slavery sense of the Liberty Party. Indeed, the loyalty of the Americans to their Constitution is such, that it is no wonder there are many opponents of slavery who cannot bear to believe, that the charter of their own liberty and national greatness is also the warrant for tightening the chains of the slave. But the American Anti-slavery Society deem the course of the Liberty Party inconsistent with a perfect regard to truth; they refuse to take an oath with the apparent intention of breaking it;

and they consider any merely party course derogatory to the high moral purpose of the abolitionists, as adhered to by them generally in the earlier years of the enterprise.

If Mr. Scoble had given some such explanation as this, he would have put his readers in possession of the reasons for the abstinence of the abolitionists from political agitation for the attainment of their object. Viewed in the light of this explanation, the expression which Mr. Garrison (as Mr. Scoble informs us) is "reported" to have used—"If my single vote would emancipate all the slaves in the United States tomorrow, I would not give that vote"—is no indication of an indifference to slavery, but of that adherence to principle by which the abolitionists are so remarkably distinguished. I think it was Edmund Quincy who said that "the first and highest duty of every man is to keep himself above all moral taint, if not above all suspicion;" and Wendell Phillips, when taunted with the inexpedient policy of the American Society, declared that "we have not come into the world to abolish slavery, but to do our duty."

DISUSE OF SLAVE-GROWN PRODUCE.

Mr. Tappan observes that the American Anti-slavery Society has departed from its original testimony against the use of slave-grown produce. This is conceded; but the question is left open, though not made a condition of membership. Some prominent members of the society esteem this testimony of great importance, whilst others just as prominent think differently. I believe Mr. Tappan *was* himself opposed to it; and the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society make no rule on the subject. Yet so strong are the feelings of Mr. Joseph Sturge on this point, that in a recent letter to the *Bristol Examiner*, he goes so far as to say of the American Anti-slavery Society, or some of its members—"Nor can I convince myself of their zeal for the rights of the slave, when I find such willingly participating in the guilt of the slave-trade and slavery, by using those products which are the great support of the system and its horrors, rather than incur the smallest trouble to supply themselves with those which are unstained by the blood and unwashed by the tears of the slave." Strangely enough, this test of anti-slavery zeal is introduced to our notice, immediately after a sentence in which a rebuke is administered to some abolitionists, for "condemning those who are conscientiously withheld from adopting their views" in the prosecution of the cause.

On the other hand, when the American Society, many years ago, adopted a resolution not to consume or traffic in the product of slave-labour, Judge Jay intimated that he must withdraw from the society, unless they rescinded that resolution. And he was right. The proper business of the society is to convict men of *the sin of holding slaves*. People will abstain from slave-labour produce if they deem it right and consistent to do so; just as they will act right politically on similar conviction. But the society does not make it imperative on its members that they shall admit the principle of withdrawing from all political union with slaveholders; and in the conviction that it is possible to be a sincere abolitionist, and yet remain unconvinced of the sin of consuming slave-grown produce, they finally rescinded the above-mentioned resolution. However, a large proportion of the members of the Society abstain from this produce, and its organ, the *National Anti-slavery Standard*, devotes column after column to the discussion of the subject.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

The only point on which it is necessary to notice any reference of Mr. Tappan to myself, is with respect to the establishment of the *National Era*. This, he informs us, was due to the exertions of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society; whilst, in one of my letters to the *Bristol Examiner*, I attributed it to its present editor, Dr. Bailey. My information was taken from the Fifteenth Report of the American Anti-slavery Society, and is as follows:—"Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, recently editor of the *Cincinnati Philanthropist*, has recently established a newspaper entitled *The National Era*, as the metropolitan organ of the Third Political Party, and of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society in Washington." It will thus be seen that my assertion was not made without warrant, and that if I was mistaken, there was no intention to mislead. In asserting, at the same time, that the *Era* is not now the organ of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, I followed a recent statement of the editor, that his paper is perfectly independent.

The great circulation of the *National Era* indicates the existence of a large class in the United States, (the result of the labours of the abolitionists,) who so far dislike slavery, that they are willing to patronize a paper which points out its deplorable influence on the national affairs; but are too much attached to a pro-slavery constitution, and to churches in league

with slaveholders, to withdraw their support from these “bulwarks” of the system.

THE TRANSFER OF ‘THE EMANCIPATOR.’

Mr. Tappan has heard from a friend near Bristol, that the most reckless charges against the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society have been published in that neighbourhood. Now, these charges possibly referred to “the old and absurd story of the *Emancipator* transfer” and things thereto belonging, with which every abolitionist is familiar, as they have been repeatedly published in America and Ireland. I am not cognizant of any preconcerted calumnies against Mr. Tappan. All the individuals he names as having *conspired* against him suppose they merely talk of known truths when they refer to those ‘old and absurd’ stories. However, that my readers may be enabled to form an independent judgment, I shall give them some particulars from the pen of Mr. Edmund Quincy of Dedham, Massachusetts, a zealous and devoted abolitionist, who is perfectly conversant with the “strange eventful history” of that time:—

“There are one or two particulars of the history of the Executive Committee of 1839-'40, which are worthy of remembrance. That Committee had had entrusted to it by the abolitionists, within the three years preceding May, 1840, no less a sum than A HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS, besides many thousands in previous years. This money it had expended in various ways—in salaries, publications, &c. A large sum, not less than 20,000 dollars, had been invested in the *Emancipator*, the organ of the Society, and expended to make good the deficiency of subscriptions, &c. A large sum had also been invested in publications and other booksellers’ stock. As the Annual Meeting of 1840 approached, the signs of the time showed very plainly that the sceptre was about to depart from the Committee that had so long swayed it. The Society, after placing in its hands no less a sum than 47,000 dollars in six months, (having virtually forbid them at the previous Annual Meeting to raise more than 32,000 dollars,) and finding that this great amount was chiefly expended in attempting to destroy the auxiliary societies that mainly furnished it, and in maligning the characters of their most devoted members, stopped the supplies, and manifested a strong determination to call their servants to a strict reckoning at the next Annual Meeting. The Committee were alarmed, and immediately took measures to dispose of the property and organ of their constituents. On the 16th of April, within less than four weeks of the Annual Meeting, the Committee, *under pretence of poverty*, conveyed the *Emancipator* to a society of young men in New York, who were in effect themselves under another name. The amount necessary to be raised to preserve the *Emancipator* for its rightful owners was less than *three hundred dollars*. THE COMMITTEE AT THAT MOMENT HAD AT THEIR DISPOSAL ASSETS, STANDING IN THEIR OWN BOOKS, AT MORE THAN EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS! At the *very same meeting* at which they thus *conveyed* away the *Emancipator*, because they could not raise *three hundred* dollars, they voted to appropriate THREE HUNDRED dollars to enable Mr. Birney to go to England, and FIVE HUNDRED dollars

to enable Mr. Stanton to make the same excursion ! And the money was raised, for to England they went."

" But there was other property to be disposed of—and it was managed on this wise. There was a certain sum due for salaries and expenses to Mr. Birney, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Lewis Tappan, amounting in all to *three thousand, nine hundred and ninety-five dollars, and ninety-eight cents* (3,995.98 dollars). It was voted that this amount be paid to those gentlemen in publications, *at half the wholesale price*. Accordingly, they received for the amount aforesaid, (3,995.98 dollars) property worth, *at wholesale prices*, SEVEN THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-ONE DOLLARS, NINETY-SIX CENTS (7,991.96) !! All the stock on hand, after these appropriations, was conveyed to two of the Committee as trustees, to secure certain debts and liabilities, mostly to themselves, and not a syllable has been heard from them on the subject from that day to this. So when the Society came together to call its unjust stewards to account, they found themselves stripped of their organ, and of every farthing of their property, and had to begin the world anew.*

" Mr. Leavitt justifies this conduct of the Committee, on the ground that ' IN SELLING THE EMANCIPATOR, AND IN ASSIGNING THE OTHER PROPERTY TO TRUSTEES, THEY (THE COMMITTEE,) ACTED AS OWNERS.' That is to say, a Committee consisting of bankrupt merchants, salaried dependents on the Society, (as secretaries, editor, agents, &c.) two or three fourth-rate city clergymen, and one or two colored men ; who had not probably, all together, contributed during those three years fifty dollars to the treasury of the Society, while they drew thousands and tens of thousands from it for their own salaries and expenses, received from their constituents A HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND dollars, in trust for the purposes of the Society ; which forthwith, according to Mr. Leavitt, became THEIR OWN !! This is the only defence ever attempted of their conduct, and they are certainly entitled to the full benefit of it.

" I may as well state here, that among the other articles of the Society's property which that Committee had carried off with them, was its CASH BOOK. They have refused to allow their successors even a glimpse of it. So that we are in entire ignorance of the disposition of the large funds placed in their hands."—*National Anti-Slavery Standard*, Sept. 19, 1844.

" Mr. Leavitt promised, some weeks ago, a fresh account of the magical process by which he finds himself the fortunate possessor of a piece of property belonging to the American Anti-Slavery Society, without purchase, without its consent—in short, of HOW HE GOT THE EMANCIPATOR. This he has not done. But as I do not think it possible that he can do better than he has already done, I wish to make a remark or two on the pretence of poverty under which it was done. It will be remembered that the old Executive Committee sold the Eman-

* According to Mr. Tappan, the trustees [of whom he was one] appointed by the Old Executive Committee, offered to restore the book stock, but not the *Emancipator*, on security being given for the payment of their liabilities: BUT THIS OFFER WAS DECLINED." The effect of this statement,—which, as thus made, is the most imposing in Mr. Tappan's pamphlet,—would have been very different if he had added that the New Committee refused, by agreeing to this arrangement, to recognize the right to retain the *Emancipator*, which they considered the most important portion of the sequestered property. They demanded back the whole of the property out of which the American Anti-slavery Society had been swindled. Just as conscientious members of the Society of Friends, who regard distraints for ecclesiastical demands as a virtual robbery, refuse, by accepting a balance remaining over after a dstraint is made, to appear to admit the moral justice of the original claim.

cipator, the organ of the Society, and which had cost it more than twenty thousand dollars, *for nothing*, to a society of young men in New York, (themselves under another name) because they could not raise a sum less than THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS to pay its expenses for three weeks, until the annual meeting of the Society, when they would provide for it themselves; although they had, at that very time, assets at their disposal amounting to ELEVEN THOUSAND, THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS, EIGHTY-SIX CENTS! This fact Mr. Leavitt does not attempt to deny, but he says that on this amount of assets, most of it publications, THEY COULD NOT RAISE ONE DOLLAR!! * * * * Why, the very trunk-maker would have advanced them more than three hundred dollars upon them. This was an astonishing circumstance, but nothing to what followed. At the very time when they could not raise enough to pay the expenses of the paper *for three weeks*, with assets amounting to more than eighteen thousand dollars, they found a society of young men willing to undertake it *for a year*, FOR NOTHING! Could not these youths have furnished 300 DOLLARS *for three weeks*, secured by assets amounting to EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS, that the integrity of the Society's property might be preserved, when they were willing to assume the whole expense FOR A YEAR *without any security at all*? Would they not have done it, had the design not been to strip the American Society of its property? Ten thousand dollars could have been raised in a week, in Massachusetts alone, to prevent the sacrifice of the Society's property, had the facts been truly stated, and could the money have been disbursed by persons whom the donors could trust. Of course, they could not trust that Committee with a farthing. And this the Committee knew perfectly well. So much for the pretended poverty.

"Another reason, rather intimated than implied, was that the Emancipator and the other property of the Society was bought with money given by Mr. Arthur Tappan, and that, therefore, he and his Committee had a right to do what he pleased with it. Were the fact as here implied, the last proposition does not seem to flow necessarily from the first. When the money left Mr. Tappan's pocket, and came into the treasury, it became the property of the Society on any ordinary principles of business. But in 1836, the impression which had got abroad to this very effect, was publicly corrected in one of the publications of the Board, by a reference to its receipts, which showed that out of a sum received in about six months, of about *eighteen thousand five hundred dollars*, Mr. Tappan's contributions amounted but to *seventeen hundred and fifty*. This was a truly honorable munificence, but it covered a very small part of the receipts of the Society for that time. That was the period of Mr. Tappan's greatest liberality. Soon afterwards, in consequence of commercial embarrassment, he was obliged to discontinue his contributions, and gave little or nothing for the last three or four years previous to 1840. The treasury was filled by the donations of thousands and tens of thousands of persons, and in sums of every variety of amount. So much for that argument."--*National Anti-slavery Standard*, Oct. 24, 1844.

"The Committee had, to be sure, as Mr. Leavitt states, full *power* in the intervals of the meetings to do what they pleased with the property and funds which the Society placed in their hands. His fallacy lies in confounding the *power* with the *right* of doing what they pleased with them. The Directors had the *power* to do what they pleased with the funds of the United States Bank, but if Mr. Leavitt will take the pains to ask the opinion of any of the shareholders, he will find that the two things are not necessarily identical. Mr. Leavitt speaks of the large sums contributed by members of the Committee in the first years of the Society. If they had given every cent that was ever

received, did it not become the property of the Society the moment it came into the treasury? I mean, of course, on the ordinary principles which govern bodies corporate, not on those laid down by Mr. Leavitt; for, according to him, the funds they contributed only became the property of *the Committee*, and, like whatever else was placed in their hands, became THEIR OWN! Mr. Leavitt also speaks of the energy of the Committee, and of the unanimity with which they were supported by the Society for several years. This is all true. The abolitionists had implicit faith in those men, and it took a long time to convince them that they had become unworthy of their confidence. At last, however, it was too plain that the religious public of the Committee having presented the distinct issue to them, of choosing between their sectarianism and their Anti-Slavery, they had taken their part, and were devoting the funds placed in their hands not for the abolition of slavery, but for the destruction of the Anti-Slavery movement. When the Abolitionists were at length convinced of this, they first stopped the supplies, and then came up to the annual meeting to dismiss their unjust stewards. Mr. L. makes this extraordinary assembly of the members of the Society, on this most extraordinary occasion, a cause of great complaint! They did precisely what Mr. L. in a previous paragraph says it was their right to do—the members ‘who thought proper, or could make it convenient to attend the annual meeting’—to choose officers and do their other business.

“The ‘extraordinary means’ of which Mr. L. speaks, were merely the public appeals to the members to attend, and an arrangement by which they could go at a reduced expense. Mr. Leavitt forgets that the friends of the Committee in Massachusetts did precisely the same thing, and that Mr. John Jay, as President of the Young Men’s Society, to which the *Emancipator* had been conveyed, issued an address, virtually calling upon all New York to come to their rescue. It will be remembered that the Committee had so managed, in anticipation of their dismissal from office, that the organ of the Society and every stiver of its property remained in their own hands, and in those of their tools; that nothing was left it but its name and its honor.

“The American Society, finding itself stripped of its organ, and of all its other property, went to work anew. It immediately established this paper, at a great expense, which has been issued weekly, without interruption, ever since. It has employed many agents, and has carried on an extensive agitation in all parts of the country. The discarded Committee, on the other hand, in its new shape of Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Society—consisting of *the very same men* who had composed the old American Committee, with two exceptions, who adhered to the Society—have not employed a single agent, or carried on any operations, and even were unable to support a *monthly* paper for one year, but virtually expired of inanition before that time! Their organ has just, I believe, completed its *first volume of monthly numbers*, in *four years* from its inception! These men, who had received from the Abolitionists previous to the secession more than TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS—since that time have not received enough to sustain a monthly publication, probably not involving an expense of a thousand dollars.

“Mr. Leavitt reproaches us with not having paid the debts which the old Committee contracted, and to secure which they carried off all our property. It may be, or it may not be, that the Committee have not realized the amount of their liabilities from the assets in their hands. But these debts would all have been paid, for the honor of the Society, had not the Committee assumed them, and seized upon all its property to indemnify themselves. The Society has had to raise a larger sum than those debts amounted to, for the establishment and support of an organ to supply the place of the one of which it had been deprived.”—*National Anti-slavery Standard*, Nov. 7, 1844.

If the reader have given these statements a careful perusal, he will be much better qualified to estimate the likelihood of Mr. Tappan's giving the whole story in his pamphlet. It will be observed that Mr. Scoble promises a full statement on Mr. Tappan's behalf; that Mr. Tappan jumps at one bound from 1833 to 1840; that he speaks of the transfer and the confiscation of the books as in some degree contingent on the meeting that followed these transactions; that he ascribes the secession, partly to the conduct of some women who attended at the annual meeting, and voted against him, and partly to irregular means having been resorted to, to obtain a majority—whilst he fails to prove their irregularity; and it is certain that his own party made similar efforts without success, that some women voted against the admission of women to a seat among the officers of the annual meeting, and that *their* votes were received on behalf of his party.

MR. TAPPAN'S SACRIFICES.

Mr. Scoble eulogizes Mr. Tappan; and I have no desire to depreciate his talents, his energy, or his early services and sacrifices. But has he not more than counterbalanced them by his hostility to the American Anti-slavery Society in later years, and the part he took in disposing of its property? His surrender of "a lucrative business," three years ago, "that he might devote the remainder of his life to the abolition of slavery, and other kindred and Christian objects," is given solely on Mr. Scoble's authority. But from information derived from another informant, I doubt if Mr. Tappan's retirement from active and lucrative business be so complete, or of such a remote date as his friend represents it.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

It is sometimes asked, with an appearance of impatience, by those who have been only lately enlisted in the anti-slavery cause, How does it happen that we hear so much of William Lloyd Garrison? Who is this Mr. Garrison? Did not Lay and Sandiford, Woolman and Benezet, Jay and Franklin, advocate the slave's cause before William Lloyd Garrison was heard of? These enquiries are natural and reasonable. It is true that these philanthropists laboured long and faithfully in opposition to slavery; but the idea of the absolute sinfulness of slavery, and the consequent duty of its immediate abolition, had not yet been publicly propounded. This was done for the first time, in a pamphlet published in 1824 by Elizabeth

Heyrick, a young Englishwoman long since deceased. About the year 1821, Benjamin Lundy of the United States, a working saddler, became deeply interested in the anti-slavery cause, and continued for some years labouring to promote it, with much disinterestedness and under very great difficulties. His personal appearance was mean, he was deficient as a public speaker, and neither his natural endowments nor his view of the question were at all calculated to arrest the public attention. About six years after Lundy commenced his labours, some numbers of his paper, *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, happened to attract the notice of William Lloyd Garrison; who, though not more than twenty-one years of age, was already editor of the *National Philanthropist*, the first paper ever published for the suppression of intemperance. His attention was so powerfully arrested by the contemplation of slavery, that he at length accepted an invitation from Mr. Lundy to join him in Baltimore as an assistant on his paper. This engagement commenced in 1829, and continued till the following spring, when Garrison was cast into prison for an alleged libel on a Boston merchant, who employed one of his vessels in the domestic slave-trade of the United States. His imprisonment lasted for forty-nine days, and, as he has since stated, "the sun itself was not more regular day by day in visiting my cell with his cheering light, than was my friend Lundy. His sympathy, kindness, and attention were all that a brother could have shown." At what precise time Mr. Garrison's attention was first drawn to the importance of the principle of "Immediate not gradual abolition," and to the duty of an immediate abandonment of the sin of slavery, I do not know; but his prominent position as a philanthropist is due to the ability, force, and energy with which he has kept this idea before the view of his countrymen. People might talk till doomsday of opposing slavery, or of getting rid of it by some process of infinitesimal slowness; they might propose plans for preparing the slave for freedom, and of leaving off robbery and licentiousness by degrees. Nobody was disturbed by such propositions. But the call to cease at once from these gigantic crimes shook the land like an earthquake, and forced the preacher of this Gospel of Liberty into a position of prominence which he has maintained to the present hour. All the great political parties, all the great religious organizations, a vast majority of the clergy, the lawyers, the merchants, the traders, the votaries of fashion, were of course hostile to one who so powerfully rebuked the hypocrisy and guilt of the nation. Faithful to duty and to the slave, he and his devoted

fellow labourers have been and are still the objects of countless calumnies. All who are rebuked by their faithfulness, and their impartial condemnation of cant, hypocrisy, avarice, and ambition, are their enemies; and every one who has some lingering interest in any of the respectable pretences with which the support of slavery is identified, abuses and slanders the abolitionists. Mr. Garrison's name is therefore a symbol of that adherence to principle which is the essential element of abolitionism. As such, it is a tower of strength to the friends of liberty, and an abomination to her enemies. From early youth to mature age, his life has been devoted to the slave with unsurpassed ability, constancy, and obedience to the pointings of duty. He has been the tool of no party—the bondsman of no sect. Any man in the United States, with such natural gifts and such unbending resolution, might have achieved wealth and power without difficulty; but he has cast all such temptations beneath his feet, and though poor in worldly goods, he is rich in the blessings of those who are ready to perish, in the affectionate respect of a large circle of friends, and, as I believe, in the still greater reward of an approving conscience.

In confirmation of these views, I shall give an extract from a letter just received from Samuel May, jun. of Leicester, Massachusetts. This gentleman visited Dublin some years ago, and struck me as one of the most sweet-spirited, gentle, and courteous persons I had ever known. He has been for years a devoted labourer in the anti-slavery cause, and I place entire reliance on his testimony:—

“To sustain the cause faithfully, and yet keep a calm and placid temper; to guard our spirits against bitterness, and yet keep the true fire of love to God and love to man burning in our hearts, amidst such damps, miasms, and choking vapours; is doubtless very difficult, and may be considered our spiritual trial. But, if I am not utterly blinded and perverted in perception and in spirit, it is a trial which our friends Garrison, Jackson, Phillips, and scores more I could name, have not only borne successfully, but one from which they have come forth purified, lifted up, tenfold the men intellectually and spiritually they were before, and without the smell of fire on their garments.

“I reiterate my testimony about Mr. Garrison. Every year and every month give new proofs of it; that he possesses one of the most gentle, affectionate, kindly natures I ever met with. He never tires of meeting and relieving, with words and deed, the oft-recurring cases of suffering and perplexity. That which would disturb and ruffle another, he meets with calmness and patience; and it is a fact, that as one and another become personally acquainted with him, they never fail to express their surprise that he is so unlike what he has been represented to be, and what indeed, from an occasional perusal of his writings, (coupled with preconceived ideas) they had supposed him to be.”

And the following anecdote may not be thought inappropriate in the same connection. It is taken from the proceedings of

the Convention which established the American Anti-slavery Society in 1833, and was related on that occasion by Mr. Lewis Tappan:—

“An anecdote is related of a gentleman—a Colonizationist—which is worth repeating in this Convention. That gentleman had purchased, without knowing whom it represented, a portrait of Mr. Garrison, and after having it encased in a splendid gilt frame, suspended it in his parlour. A friend calling in observed it, and asked the purchaser if he knew whom he had honoured so much? He was answered ‘No—but it is one of the most godlike-looking countenances I ever beheld.’ ‘That, sir,’ resumed the visitor, ‘is a portrait of the fanatic, the incendiary William Lloyd Garrison!’ ‘Indeed!’ concluded the gentleman, evidently much disconcerted. ‘But, sir, it shall remain in its place. I will never take it down.’”

Mr. Tappan is careful to inform us that Mr. Garrison was *not* the founder of the American Anti-slavery Society, but that it was founded by Evan Lewis of Philadelphia. Let us see. I have before me a resolution submitted early in 1833 by Mr. Garrison, at an anti-slavery meeting in Massachusetts, proposing the establishment of a national society; and the American Anti-slavery Society *was* established, by a convention assembled for the purpose in Philadelphia, in the autumn of that year. Amongst the proceedings on that occasion, I find a long speech of Mr. Tappan’s, in reference to the name of Mr. Garrison, and delivered in his presence, from which I make the following extracts:—

“The first time I ever heard of him was when he was in gaol in Baltimore, where he was incarcerated like a felon, for pleading the cause of the oppressed, and rebuking iniquity. When I saw him, appearing so mild and meek as he does, shortly after he was liberated by a gentleman in New York, I was astonished. Is this the renegade Garrison? thought I, as I grasped his open hand. Is this the enemy of our country? I shall never forget the impression which his noble countenance made on me at that time, as long as I live.

“Who that is familiar with the history of Mr. Garrison, does not remember the determination expressed in the first number of his paper—the *Liberator*—to sustain it *as long as he could live on bread and water*? And, sir, I am informed that he has really practised what he so nobly resolved in the beginning.

“He is not perfect. He is frail, like the rest of human flesh. But if God had not endowed him as He has, and smiled propitiously on his *imprudencies*, we should not now be engaged in the deliberations of this most interesting and important Convention. God has raised up just such a man as William Lloyd Garrison, to be a pioneer in this cause. Let each member present feel solemnly bound to vindicate the character of Mr. Garrison. Let us not be afraid to go forward with him even into the ‘*imminent breach*,’ *although there may be professed friends who stand back because of him.*”

Benjamin Lundy was present on that occasion, and his services to the anti-slavery cause were likewise warmly acknowledged; but as I have shown from Mr. Tappan’s own mouth, the existence of the American Society was then attributed by

himself to the labours of Mr. Garrison, whom he expressly calls "a pioneer" in the cause.

For the last twenty-three years, the origin of the abolition movement in the United States has been universally attributed by friend and foe to Mr. Garrison. Before he commenced his career, the whole nation was sunk in apathy respecting it. He has compelled them, *nolens volens*, to take it up, and now they cannot lay it down, (although it burns their fingers dreadfully,) until it has been settled in one way or another. It is the question upon which the fate of parties, the election of presidents, and the existence of the republic depend. It mixes itself up with every public question, and overshadows them all. Slavery knows she is engaged in a struggle for existence, and the battle is fought with all the fury of desperation. This agitation dashes sects and parties to pieces. It troubles synods, conferences, yearly meetings, political conventions. It cries to the nation, "Sleep no more!" All whose property, policy, pelf, and sectarian tranquillity are invaded, lay the blame at Mr. Garrison's door. No wonder they are 'grieved,' 'irritated,' and 'indignant' with him. And yet Mr. Tappan has at last discovered that this is a stupendous blunder; that Lundy, not Garrison, should bear the blame; for it was he, and not 'the best-abused man in the United States,' who set all this mischief brewing.

I have now before me a long and circumstantial biographical notice of Lundy, who died in Illinois of bilious fever on the 22nd of August, 1839. It is published in the *Liberator* of the 20th of September following, and gives a deeply interesting account of Mr. Garrison's own first introduction to the anti-slavery cause, for which he was indebted to Lundy. An eloquent eulogy is pronounced on the devoted self-sacrificing labours of this eminent philanthropist. I regret that the length of this document prevents me from copying it here; but I have said enough to show that Mr. Tappan has exhibited a deficient memory in his attempts to depreciate the reputation of Mr. Garrison.

Mr. Tappan speaks of those "who idolize Mr. Garrison." Amongst all the American abolitionists I have personally known, I never knew one who "idolized Mr. Garrison," in the sense implied in Mr. Tappan's taunt. I never knew one of them who was disposed to give up his own opinion on any subject, from mere deference to Mr. Garrison. Independent and intelligent themselves, they had no occasion to "idolize" any body. The insinuation is unfounded, and this no one knows better than he who made it. I refer the reader to

Mr. Tappan's testimony in a preceding page, given at a time when he was more inspired by anti-slavery zeal than sectarian animosity. He then spoke of Mr. Garrison with cordial respect and affection, in terms as laudatory as I have ever known employed by any of that gentleman's present friends, yet without "idolatry" or servile adulation.

Every one admits that the commencement of Mr. Garrison's anti-slavery career was remarkable. It was remarkable that a poor, unfriended, obscure young man, with few advantages of education, should have been so filled with the sense of a great national evil, as to attempt straightway, in spite of all but universal apathy, the gigantic enterprise of its overthrow. Amidst countless discouragements, much has been gained in the improvement of public opinion. There are hundreds of thousands of immediate abolitionists, where there was but one. "The pioneer" is as earnest as ever; and the last number of the *Liberator* is as full of anti-slavery life and zeal as was the first. Is it any wonder, then, that those who witness his fidelity, consistency, guilelessness, and unblemished character, should respect him; or that no difference of opinion on speculative points in the least degree lessens their confidence and affection? If disinterested respect for great moral excellence be "idolatry," the more we have of such idolatry the better.*

THEODORE PARKER.

Again: Mr. Tappan informs us that "Theodore Parker is a man of ability and of infidel opinions." He omits to say that Mr. Parker claims to be a Christian; that he is one of the most consistent, courageous, and laborious abolitionists; that his life is above reproach; that he holds up the light of Christian truth and duty to the sordid pro-slavery clergy, politicians, and merchants of the United States; and that in his writings and habitual ministrations he never forgets the slave. The Romish priest thinks he has said his worst against a man when he calls

* The following testimony from the 19th *National Bazaar Gazette*, Boston, 1850, is from the pen of an orthodox member of the American Anti-slavery Society:—"It is said: 'As individuals, the American abolitionists, by their sympathy and subscriptions give support to the *Liberator*, and by their expressed love and admiration of its editor, mark their recognition of him as the leading and guiding influence of the anti-slavery movement.' To the truth of this statement we joyfully agree. The religious differences that *divide* some of us from Mr. Garrison sink into insignificance when compared with the great issues on which we *agree*. As for Mr. Garrison's position it was long since settled, and the voice of friends or foes is comparatively unimportant but as their decision affects themselves. 'They that are wise shall shine as lights in the world, and they shall turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.' Disinterestedness, unwearied self-sacrifice, indomitable perseverance in behalf of human rights, the most extreme purity of life and conversation—the light that irradiates from these cannot be quenched by party strife or sectarian bitterness."

him a heretic. Mr. Tappan levels all distinctions when he imputes infidelity. The excitement of the *odium theologicum* is more important to both than justice or humanity. No wise man would be guided in his estimate of other men by such authority. Neither the priest nor the Secretary of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society is a competent witness. No man's doctrines are a guarantee for his life. "By their fruits ye shall know them." How often in the world's history has the cry of "infidel" been raised, to obscure the real character of good men, and blacken spotless reputations!

EDMUND QUINCY.

As it is important that the names and characters of those who bear the burden and heat of the anti-slavery struggle, should be better known and appreciated by their friends and fellow-labourers in these countries, I will give a short sketch of Mr. Quincy, to whom we are indebted for the preceding information. It is taken from the *Liberator* of January 7th, 1848. His disinterestedness, moral courage, and devotedness are vividly, and, as I have reason to believe, faithfully portrayed. It is needless to say that one who possesses these qualities in an eminent degree, may be depended upon as an honest and trustworthy witness:—

"Among the many individuals who have espoused the cause of the despised black man in this country, there is no one, to my knowledge, who has given evidence of greater moral courage and disinterestedness than Edmund Quincy. Considering his education, family prospects, the circle in which he moved, the powerful conservative influences with which he was surrounded, the strong inducements he had to stand aloof from companionship with the 'ultraists' of the day, and to give unlimited indulgence to his natural taste for literary pursuits, no man has sacrificed more in the cause, or shown more real independence, or displayed greater heroism of soul than himself. Few, very few can comprehend how difficult it must have been for one, thus situated, openly to take his place by the side of those who were every where branded as 'fanatics and incendiaries;' to forsake 'father and mother and brother and sister,' and peril 'houses and lands' in prospect, for the sake of a class too ignorant to appreciate his sacrifices in their behalf, too impoverished to offer the slightest compensation, and too feebly befriended to make the advocacy of their rights even a matter of decency.

"It was in the very darkest hour of the cause, when the madness of mobocracy had become contagious all over the land, and all parties and sects were thirsting, as it were, for the blood of the abolitionists; when Boston, refined, enlightened, benevolent Boston, was for ever disgraced in history by the lawless conduct of 'five thousand gentlemen of property and standing,' on which it is not necessary here to dilate; it was at such a crisis, the mind of Mr. Quincy was aroused to the investigation of the subject of slavery, and the principles of the abolitionists. Unmoved by popular clamor, uninfluenced by family ties, unterrified by the certainty of losing 'caste,'—having satisfied his judgment

and conscience in the premises,—he boldly avowed himself to be an abolitionist, the determined foe of slavery under all circumstances, the glad associate of men who were without reputation, for bleeding Humanity's sake! Since that hour, the anti-slavery cause has passed through many vicissitudes; had many extraordinary phases; been betrayed on the right hand and on the left; lost many of its earliest adherents, through shameful apostacy; but at no time has Mr. Quincy faltered in his course, or swerved one hair's-breadth from the straight line of uncompromising abolitionism.

“Perhaps there is no one so violently hated and so vulgarly assailed by the enemies of the anti-slavery cause as Mr. Quincy. They perceive in him the most thorough detestation of knavery; an absolute regard for integrity of character; a sagacity amounting to intuition in the detection of hypocrisy and cant; a spirit that can neither be flattered nor intimidated into a compromise of principle; an ability and willingness to unmask imposition such as few possess; and an elevation of soul above that fear, awe, and favour of man, ‘which bringeth a snare.’ They rail at him as one who is an aristocrat by birth, and who ought to be scouted because he is the son of so highly honoured a man as Josiah Quincy, the late president of Harvard University. The name is an honoured one in the history of Massachusetts from an early period, but among all who have borne it, none deserves to be held in more grateful remembrance by posterity than Edmund Quincy.”

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

While alluding to a few of the more prominent labourers in the American Anti-slavery Society, I would not willingly omit the name of Wendell Phillips, the gifted and eloquent champion of the slave, who in early life, when wealth and distinction lay within his grasp, as a member of the Massachusetts bar, deliberately turned away his eyes from the dazzling bait, and devoted his talents to the despised cause of abolition. The following observations are from the pen of the Rev. T. W. Higginson, of Newburyport, and occur in a sketch which he gives of some addresses delivered by Mr. Phillips at an anti-slavery convention held in that place last year:—

“Wendell Phillips rises with the occasion, and I have seen him more brilliant and more impressive at more trying times. But he is always himself, and there was in this address the same moral nobleness, the same elegance of manner, the same pointed sententiousness, the same keen satire, the same wealth of illustration and allusion, which have always given him an easy pre-eminence over all other New England public speakers. * * * * *

“Said a Boston gentleman once to the writer, ‘I am no abolitionist, and yet, somehow, I never meet Wendell Phillips in the street, without wanting to pull off my hat to him. For I remember what he might have been, had he sacrificed, like the rest of us, his scruples to his ambition.’ It was true. All that the most ambitious young man in Massachusetts desires most to obtain, that Wendell Phillips had, at the very beginning of his career. The favourite child of Boston aristocracy, the idol of his classmates and friends, wealthy, accomplished, possessed of brilliant scholarship, of skill, energy, and unequalled eloquence; there was no prize to be gained at the bar, in the pulpit, among popular assemblies, or in legislative halls, which was not easily within his reach. These he has left all behind, left them to the Choates and the Curtises,

the Boutwells and the Wilsons, men of fair abilities and fair aims, perhaps, but not like his ; and calmly sacrificed on the altar of an unpopular duty more than any man of this age. For he has not only been identified with an obnoxious reform ; which sets him aside for ever from the one idol of his youth, political station and influence, and perhaps has limited even his usefulness thereby. Yet he has the satisfaction of knowing that he has contributed more to the anti-slavery agitation than any man, except Mr. Garrison ; and has done more than even he, perhaps, to remove the cruel hostility against the colored people in this commonwealth.

“ I have never heard any speaker in this town listened to with so much attention as Mr. Phillips, during his three addresses to large (and finally overflowing) audiences within the last two days ; and I regret that there can be no fuller report of his remarks.”

MR. THOMPSON'S TESTIMONY.

As to Mr. Scoble's opinion of the declining influence and small number of the American Anti-slavery Society, and of the importance and extent of the Liberty Party, the Free Soil Party, and the Christian Anti-slavery Association ; I may safely refer the reader to the counter-statements of Mr. Thompson. His knowledge of the cause, and his labours and courage in its promotion, entitle his evidence to more weight than that of Mr. Scoble. If Mr. Thompson had never given this testimony, there are many friends of the American abolitionists in Great Britain who are well aware of the facts he has stated, and of the extent and influence of the American Society. But the mere question of number is exceedingly unimportant.

Those who are familiar with the history of the anti-slavery cause in England, are aware that the parliamentary abolition of colonial slavery was obtained mainly through the instrumentality of public meetings, in which George Thompson, now M.P. for the Tower Hamlets, appealed to the public with extraordinary eloquence and effect. When this point was gained, Mr. Thompson, with the full concurrence of the friends of the slave in England, and by the earnest entreaty of the American abolitionists, visited the United States in 1835. He remained there for sixteen months, holding public meetings, lecturing on an average twice every day during that time, greatly encouraging the abolitionists, and arousing, by his powerful remonstrances, the opposition of that great majority who resist an onslaught on slavery as an attack on their political, social, and religious institutions. The gratitude, attachment, and respect which Mr. Thompson earned from the friends of the slave, were equalled only by the wounded pride and fierce hostility of the slave's oppressors of all classes and professions. He was called “ a foreign incendiary,” “ a fugitive from justice,” and so forth ; violent mobs were excited against him ; and he was finally obliged to remain for weeks in conceal-

ment, and to make his escape under circumstances of great danger to St. John's, New Brunswick, from whence he returned to England in a small trading vessel.

At the time of Mr. Thompson's visit to the United States, the friends of the anti-slavery cause in England and America were united as one man. There was no division in their ranks. The religious bodies in Great Britain had not yet formed those intimate relations with their American fellow-professors, which have since so identified them in their feelings and interests; shewing that the difference between them is merely one of position; and that the maintenance of the influence and stability of a sect is often a stronger motive than the precepts of Christ, a respect for consistency, or the claims of humanity.

One of Mr. Thompson's chief adherents and friends in America on that occasion was Lewis Tappan, whose activity, energy, and administrative ability were of great service to the anti-slavery cause; and who fully appreciated the genius, eloquence, and devoted services of Mr. Thompson. I have never read or heard of a shadow of disapprobation against Mr. Thompson's course in America at that time by any abolitionist; and yet his language was as plain, his remonstrances were as forcible, and his denunciations of the national crime as powerful then as they were during his recent visit in the autumn of last year; when Mr. Tappan's eyes were opened to see that the fidelity and eloquence which he admired so much in 1835, could only produce needless irritation and injury to the anti-slavery cause in 1851. The irritation must have been even greater then, than it could have been since; for at that time the American people had not become accustomed to those arguments against slavery, to which the perseverance of the abolitionists have since obliged them to give a respectful if not a patient attention.

I now proceed to make some extracts from an eloquent speech delivered by Mr. Thompson at Bristol, when he visited that city in September last year, to give an account of his recent anti-slavery tour in the United States. No other man on this side of the Atlantic has been so identified with the anti-slavery cause in America, or has given such proofs of disinterestedness in its advocacy, or has afforded more generous help to the fugitive. He is respected, beloved, and trusted by the American abolitionists; and with good reason; for by espousing the cause of the American Society, he has estranged powerful and wealthy adherents in England, whose friendship might have greatly promoted his personal interests. So far from his late course having excited the "irritation" Mr. Tappan has men-

tioned, his last visit to America was like an ovation for the greater part of the time—indeed, for the whole time, with the exception of the interruption of his first meeting in Fanueil Hall, and a mob at Springfield excited by some pro-slavery traders in that town. The progress of the public mind in the United States on this question was very plainly tested by the cheerful and respectful hearing Mr. Thompson obtained in 1851, contrasted with the furious riots excited by his “foreign interference” in 1835. It is probable the irritation Mr. Tappan complains of existed in his own mind—in consequence of Mr. Thompson’s adherence to the American Anti-slavery Society, which long experience and intimate knowledge of its faithful and strenuous labours had assured him was the only instrumentality upon which he could certainly rely.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. THOMPSON’S SPEECH AT BRISTOL.

“I cannot sit down without first telling you who *are* doing the great work of abolition in the United States. But, before doing so, I will tell you negatively who are not doing it, and who are therefore criminally guilty of the perpetration of the great sin of America.

“The *Legislature* of the United States is not doing it. The course of the general government of that country has been downwards ever since the Declaration of Independence. I say, emphatically, that for seventy-five years, while this country has happily been rising, and its people struggling on from one degree of liberty to another, under a superincumbent mass that would have crushed any other race but such an one as ourselves, the course of America has been invariably downward. Do you ask me the proof? The Declaration of Independence passed; a Constitution was adopted. The convention that framed that Constitution sent it forth with five distinct and separate pro-slavery provisions, out of one of which the Fugitive Slave-Law recently passed has grown. Then came the Fugitive Slave-Law of 1793. Then came the purchase of [slave-holding] Louisiana in 1803. Then the purchase of [slave-holding] Florida. Then the admission of [slave-holding] Missouri. Then the war upon the [slave-holding] Peninsula of Florida against the Seminole Indians, upon the question of affording protection to fugitives. Then after that came the piratical expedition of Texas. Then its annexation. Then the war in Mexico, with all its horrors, rapine and blood; and, finally, to cap the climax, and crown this pyramid of national atrocity, this infernal Fugitive Slave-Law. The *Legislature* then, it is clear, is not and has not been doing the work of abolishing slavery.

“The *Clergy* of America are not doing the work of abolishing slavery. The action of ecclesiastical bodies in their organised capacity and form is against emancipation. The churches of the United States are the chief strength of slavery.

“The *Politicians* are not doing it. Do not be led away by the idea that the work is being done by any particular sect of politicians. It is a gross misrepresentation. You may have heard a good deal said of what the Free Soilers are doing; what the Liberty-party are doing; what the Buffalo platform men are doing; what the Barnburners are doing; what the Loco Focos are doing; or what the Pewter Muggers are doing. (Laughter). No, it is not the politicians—nor even the professedly Anti-Slavery parties amongst them—that are doing the work. Who is doing it? Is it the American and Foreign

Anti-Slavery Society in New York? No, there is no such Society in that city *for the purpose of overthrowing Slavery in America.*

“But, sir, there is a society which is really doing the work of the abolition of slavery in America, and of that society I speak from personal experience. In the most public, solemn, and emphatic manner, I would bear my humble testimony to the character of the American abolitionists. For more than twenty years I have had peculiar opportunities of judging of the motives which lead persons to engage in the work of philanthropy and reform, as well as of observing the spirit in which they prosecute their object, and the principles by which they are sustained when their labours are unpopular, arduous, protracted, and perilous. I have mingled much with those who would better the condition of the world by the dissemination of the Scriptures—with those, also, who would send Christian missionaries to every part of the earth, to turn men from heathen darkness to the light of the Gospel; with those, also, who, prosecuting what may be called domestic reforms, have sought to ameliorate the condition of their own countrymen, by the removal of shackles on their consciences, their industry, their trade, or the exercise of their political rights. (Cheers.) I need not add that I have mingled much in this kingdom with those who have professed a zeal for the abolition of slavery throughout the British dominions, and throughout the globe. It has also been my privilege, once and again, to be united in labour and in hope with the Abolitionists of America.

“In respect of this band of reformers, my opinion of them rests upon no transient glance at their objects, their measures, or their character. For more than eighteen years, I have known them intimately. In 1833, I was the co-adjutor and constant companion of William Lloyd Garrison—(cheers)—during his first mission to this country. In the years 1834 and 1835, I was the representative of British Abolitionists in the United States, the agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and from time to time, in the course of my journeys, the guest by turns of almost every leading anti-slavery man in the country. From 1836 to 1840, inclusive, I was in constant communication with the Abolitionists of America, and was the recognised exponent of their principles and plans in this country. In the latter year I had the happiness to be identified with those devoted men and women whom the hateful spirit of sectarianism excluded from the World’s Convention. In later years I co-operated with the American Anti-Slavery Society, and did my best to preserve the Abolitionists of England and Scotland from being infected with that leprosy which had smitten those on the other side of the water who were known by the name of New Organizationists. In 1845, I joined the faithful representatives of the American Society, and laboured with Frederick Douglass, and Henry C. Wright, and James N. Buffum. In 1846, I had the happiness to welcome to England for the third time, my friend and brother, Mr. Garrison—(loud cheers)—and to co-operate with him successfully, in saving the religious bodies of this country from the consequences of the fatal error committed by the Evangelical Alliance, when they deliberately refused to make man-stealing a ground of exclusion from their body.

“Still more recently, and within the last year, it has been my high privilege to labour with the Abolitionists of America for more than eight months. I am justified then, I think, when I lay claim to an intimate knowledge of the character, the motives, and measures of the Abolitionists. No man I believe knows them better, or has enjoyed a larger measure of their confidence. (Hear, hear.) Having enjoyed these opportunities and advantages, I am here to declare that in my most deliberate judgment there does not exist a body of men and women associated for the attainment of any object, more single in their purpose, more pure in their motives, more lofty in their principles, or more truly Christian in

their spirit, and the character of the instrumentalities they employ. The truth compels me to go further, and to say that I do not know a body of individuals besides, who, to the same extent, exemplify the practical virtues of Christianity. (Cheers.) I speak now of the members of the American Anti-Slavery Society—a society formed under the most impressive circumstances in the year 1833—whose Declaration of Objects and Principles is one of the noblest documents ever penned. I speak of those who have stood by the great and dauntless leader of the anti-slavery host, William Lloyd Garrison—a man who, though he has not yet reached the meridian of life, has for two-and-twenty years toiled with unremitting ardour and unimpeached disinterestedness and unequalled heroism in the cause of the bleeding slave; a man who, though denounced by the State as a traitor, reviled by the Church as a heretic, and anathematised by the slaveholding conspiracy of America as an incendiary, is the truest patriot, one of the most devout imitators of the life of Christ, and one of the best friends of the human race. If I were asked to name the man of the present age, who has accomplished the greatest moral work of the age, and from whose labours the mightiest issues would flow, I should unhesitatingly pronounce the name of William Lloyd Garrison. (Cheers.) *There is in the United States of America but one efficient and uncompromising Anti-Slavery Society, which is that which has Mr. Garrison for its president.*

“Some persons on this side of the water, imagine there is another society called the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. I am here to declare that there is no *real* organization or society of that name, and that those who are aware of the facts of the case, and seek to lead the people of this country to believe in the existence of an American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, are practising an injurious and wicked fraud. It is with deep pain that I have this day read in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* of Monday, the 1st of September, a statement which is not merely a misrepresentation or a suppression of the truth, but the publication of that which is in itself absolutely false. This statement is the more inexcusable, inasmuch as on the 1st of August, at a public meeting in the city of London, and in the presence of persons connected with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, I stated that the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was a name, and no more—a nonentity. This statement of mine was published in the London daily papers, accompanied by a challenge at the time to meet any individual in print or on the platform, who was prepared to dispute my assertion. The statement of the *Reporter* to which I allude is the following:—‘The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is one of the most important of all the agencies in existence in the United States, for the destruction of the accursed system of Slavery.’ This statement was printed and published on the 1st of September—one month after I had deliberately made the assertion I have quoted, and fifteen days after Mr. Richard D. Webb of Dublin, who is now on the platform, had, in a letter printed in the *Bristol Examiner*, made a similar statement. But, more important than all, the *Reporter* makes this statement after the appearance in this country of an article from the pen of Mr. Garrison, gravely impeaching the character of that organ of the Anti-Slavery Society, and containing the following paragraph:—‘But it (the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*) is assiduous in its endeavours to make the British public believe that the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (the offspring of baffled priestcraft and vanquished sectarianism) is the great efficient instrumentality for the abolition of American slavery; when, in fact, that society holds in the whole country but one meeting in the course of the year—and that, too, as a matter of form; adroitly making use of the anniversary season in May to collect an audience together; when it keeps not a single lecturing agent in the field; when it is without an official organ; when it has no auxiliary associations; when its receipts and expenditure are too insignificant to be laid before

the public eye; and when its very existence and entire management are concentrated in one man, who lost long ago the respect and confidence of the true Abolitionists of the country.

—“ Yet, without a reference either to my public statement on the 1st of August, or to Mr. Webb’s on the 15th, or to Mr. Garrison’s formal indictment of this very paper, the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, in the present number, seriously informs its readers that this society, without funds, without an agent, without an organ, without an auxiliary, with only one public meeting in the course of a year—a society concentrated in one man—is one of the most important of all the agencies in existence for the destruction of slavery. I have, no doubt, subscribers to this paper before me this evening, and I will take the liberty of asking them what they have learnt from the pages of the *Reporter* during the last twelve years, of the operations of the genuine Anti-Slavery Society of America—the true American Anti-Slavery Society of America? I will ask them what their idea of it is at this moment? Are they aware of its extent, numbers, resources, agencies, publications, income, expenditure, influence? I believe they are utterly ignorant. Let me then say that from its formation in 1833 until the present time, it has pursued its course with a fidelity, steadiness of purpose, and devotion to its great object, which have never been excelled, if they have ever been equalled, by any body. Tried, tempted, tested in every conceivable way, the society has remained inflexibly and sublimely true to its principles. Again and again the inexorable truthfulness of the society has been the salvation of the slave’s cause in America, and it is now the salt that saves the mass from utter corruption. *It is the only anti-slavery association in the United States that is what it professes to be, an association for the deliverance of the slave from his bonds.*

“ Has this Society any organ? It has an official organ in the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, another in the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, another in the *Bugle*, published in Ohio, while at the same time it elevates and moulds, more or less, the anti-slavery views of every other paper in the Union. Has it any agents or lecturers? Their name is legion. There are some that are above their fellows conspicuous and influential. Every week sees Mr. Garrison in the field, pouring himself out like water. Every week and almost every day of every week Mr. Phillips—who has not his equal on either side of the Atlantic for eloquence, pathos, power, or beauty, as an anti-slavery lecturer—is to be seen electrifying New England audiences on the great theme. But time would fail to tell of the Quineys, Mays, Jacksons, Fosters, Pillsburys, Parkers, Putnams, Stones, Walkers, Treats, Buffums, and others, who throughout the year are preaching the great truths of abolition from the borders of New Brunswick to the Falls of Niagara, and far as the frontiers of civilization extend along the forests and prairies of the great west. Has the American Society funds? It has. The income of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society is about 9,000 dollars; but this is the income of a State society alone. I believe if the various State societies were to make a return of their several incomes, it would be found that not less than from 20,000 to 25,000 dollars are annually subscribed within the limits of the American Society. But when I attempt to estimate the gross expenditure of the members of this Society, by adding to their subscriptions what they pay for the support of newspapers—what they spend in travelling from meeting to meeting, and from convention to convention—what it costs them to practise a hospitality that knows no bounds—what they are constantly subscribing for local objects and special purposes connected with the Anti-Slavery Movement, I confess I am afraid to name any sum, for I know not whether it be 200,000 or 500,000 dollars.

“ While I remained in America I frequently spoke three times a day, and never did I receive an insult from an American audience in my life. There has been a little noise occasionally—once through the influence of a mercantile clique

who got into Faneuil Hall, and standing in the centre of the room, made noise enough not only to drown my voice, but the voices also of many of the most estimable and worthy citizens of Boston. I have addressed the Americans when I have seen the expressions, visible upon their countenances at the outset, of hatred, suspicion, and jealousy, give place gradually to attention and deep enthusiasm, and when I have, at the close of the meeting, had to shake hands with some 700 or 800 of those very men who were at first my enemies; and having entered the hall the object of general distrust and dislike, I have left it with the hearty ‘God bless you!’ of every individual present—and why? Simply because I had uncovered America to itself, and held the mirror up before the prejudiced men at the North, or before the slave-holder and practical abettor of slavery at the South. I am here, a living witness, after two visits to America, the first for sixteen months, and the last for eight months, making together two years, having spoken in language the most scathing I could find upon the subject of slavery, having—I trust I may say it very modestly—done some good in America, if I may judge of what I saw after the lapse of fifteen or sixteen years, of the converts that were scattered over that country, the fruit of the anti-slavery seed I had been permitted to sow so long before. I say, I may with modesty, yet with truth, say that I have done some good in that country. But how have I done it? By discarding compromise; by sinking nationality; by standing upon my right to be heard in the streets of Boston, equally with the American missionary in the streets of Constantinople; by declaring that God’s truth is not bounded by the Atlantic Ocean, or circumscribed by Mason and Dixon’s line; by maintaining that this is God’s earth, and not President Fillmore’s; that the three millions of bondmen in the United States are his children, and not their slaves, and that in the name of God and man I may plead, wherever I find a slave, for his immediate emancipation.”

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY TO THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The following testimony from one of the truest, ablest, and most devoted abolitionists is so forcible and pithy, that I cannot withhold it. Let it speak for itself. It will be found consistent with the other statements in this essay.

“All our sincere Abolitionists, whether whigs, democrats, liberty-party men, or free-soilers, are members or friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Ask such men as Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, one of the seven free-soil members of Congress, and a whig, what *they* think of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Mr. Giddings receives and cherishes its agents at his house, encourages its meetings by his presence and co-operation, and feels that all right political feeling and action have had their source in its teachings. Ask such men as the Hon. John P. Hale, of New Hampshire, one of the seven free-soil members, and a democrat, what *they* think of the American Anti-Slavery Society. They will tell you of their respect, confidence, and admiration for the consistency of its course. Ask such men as Samuel E. Sewall, Esq., a liberty-party man, what he thinks of the American Society. He was one of its members from the earliest date. He still continues to be one. All such men feel that the position of that society is one that commands and directs the divisions of the political battle. Ask the Honourable Charles Sumner, a free-soil whig, whether he thinks he should have been at this hour one of the seven free-soil members, but for the eighteen years of preparatory action of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Ask also Gerrit Smith, an early and constant friend of Mr. Garrison’s, though a liberty-party man, and of evangelical religious sentiments. But why do I

allude to any names? It is the testimony of the whole land from Maine to California, through all its press, Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery, that the 'Garrisonian' or 'American Anti-Slavery Society's' influence has been compulsorily powerful on the political action of the United States during the last eighteen years; and that its powers are continually increasing, and are only the more mighty because they are entirely spiritual.

"The American Anti-Slavery Society is composed, in fine, of men of every shade of political opinion, who look to its influence to mould and purify their parties. A majority of them have found that the truest and most prevailing policy, in dealing with a mighty evil that we wish to destroy, is to take our shoulder from its support. Therefore it is that the dis-union policy is adopted. Therefore it is we say, that to covenant with the slaveholder that we will 'restore his slaves when they escape to us; that we will take arms with him against them if they strive to throw off his bondage; and that we will allow him three votes for every five slaves, as a guarantee for the perpetuity of the slave system, is, in the impressive language of Hebrew prophecy, 'a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,' which shall, God helping us, be annulled and broken. It has sometimes been our habit in past years to say we were not a political body. 'Ah!' said a liberty-party man to me, after the passage of our first resolution urging the same ground to be taken with respect to the State, that had already been taken with regard to the Church—'you can never say after this that you are not a political society; for you have taken political ground which makes you part and parcel of the politics of the land.' It is true. Adhesion to moral and religious principle on *any* question will make it part and parcel of the politics of the land. From that time we amended a phrase that expressed but half our meaning, and have said 'We are not a *partizan* society.' We are neither a whig, democratic, liberty-party, or free-soil society. But we are labouring for HUMANITY. We are laying the foundation afresh for many generations. We are the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY; and as such we see and feel that we are changing the whole crooked politics of our nation.

"The following is a brief summary of the reasons which certain persons in England accept as sufficient for acting in hostility to the American Anti-slavery Society:—

"One publicly accused it of INFIDELITY, because, declining to depart (at the instigation of pro-slavery clergymen, urged on by slaveholders,) from its appropriate work of abolishing slavery, it refuses to excommunicate some of its most faithful members.

"A second publicly accused it of bringing forward women improperly, and thus becoming A WOMAN'S RIGHTS SOCIETY; because its female members, by the exercise of their right to vote, helped to defeat the machinations of some who attempted to destroy the usefulness of the society.

"A third publicly accused it of being A NO-GOVERNMENT SOCIETY; because, pointing to a higher law than the law of man, it teaches disobedience to the slaveholding requisitions of the United States Government, as an anti-slavery duty.

"A fourth publicly accused it of being A NO-CHURCH SOCIETY; because it branded the American church, the bulwork of slavery, as anti-christian.

"A fifth publicly accused it of being A DO-NOTHING SOCIETY; because it refused to sink its existence in the quagmire of political partizan strife; its treasures at the hustings; and its anti-slavery principles, by compelling its members to take oaths to the slave-holding provisions of the United States Constitution; whilst at the very time of making this accusation, the society was holding its hundred conventions a year, pouring its petitions by hundreds and thousands into the legislatures; and, by the arguments of its addresses to legislative committees, procuring the abrogation of pro-slavery laws, and promoting all the action that States can take, while united with the Slaveholding General Government.

“ Such are the reasons commonly offered for assailing the American Anti-slavery Society. To state them fairly is to give the highest praise that could be offered to that society ; for every one of them is a testimonial of its worth to the slave, and its fidelity to the teachings of Christ.”

A COMPARISON AND CONTRAST.

Objections against the “ bitter spirit” and the “ harsh language” of the abolitionists are of old date ; they began with the enterprise, and have continued ever since. They are now repeated by Messrs. Scoble and Tappan, as if they were difficulties of later years. Now let us contrast the position of these gentlemen, as opponents to slavery, with that of the American Anti-slavery Society, and we shall be better able to estimate the value of their objections.

The one is the Secretary and the virtual mouth-piece of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, which rarely comes before the British public from year's end to year's end, except in the pages of its *Reporter*, of which he is the editor and controller. If we complain that the paper is dry, common-place, unimpassioned ; that it is occupied with much that has little direct reference to slavery, such as interviews with ministers of state about sugar duties, courteous receptions, and satisfactory replies ; if you look in vain in its columns for vigour, earnestness, eloquence, spirit-stirring warmth or sympathy, or for the discussion of slavery in all its religious, political and social bearings ; if you meet no notice of the labours of those noble men and women whose time and talents have been freely and disinterestedly devoted to the American slave, amidst a thousand temptations to desert him ; under any of these circumstances, you know where to turn. Ask for the editor, and when you hear his views on the anti-slavery question, and on the character and measures of the abolitionists, you have a solution of much that has puzzled you in the course of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society,—the serenity of its indignation, its official, lifeless, cut-and-dry resolutions, and the comparatively small share of attention devoted in its *Reporter* to American slavery. It is clear that a society thus represented is completely controlled in the public manifestations of its temper. It works in a room, with paste and scissors ; its committee meet on extraordinary exigencies, to foot the bills and inspect the machinery—and the thing is done. Can it be, that such an instrumentality represents the living, earnest, anti-slavery spirit of England ?

Mr. Tappan is in pretty nearly similar circumstances as to the control of his spirit and his language. His pretensions,

however, are greatly more audacious, and his influence more insignificant. The British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society get some money; they have a paper; they are the delegates of a handful of subscribers, who commit to them the care of their anti-slavery consciences, who trust them implicitly, and take little trouble to do any anti-slavery thinking for themselves. This gives the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society that influence which their secretary wields. Mr. Tappan, like Mr. Scoble, is the head of a close borough; his committee is self appointed; he is subject to slight control; he does all the work; he manages the publication of the occasional pamphlet or anti-slavery almanac; he draws up the report; he is the mouth-piece of the society. The "spirit" of the society is Lewis Tappan's, and the "language" is his.

Now the American society is differently circumstanced. It comprehends those friends of immediate abolition in the United States, who prefer a wide platform to a close committee for the promotion of their objects; it includes persons of all opinions on other subjects, who, however they differ on political or religious dogmas, are clearly united in opinion that slavery is a sin and should be immediately abandoned. It includes men and women, old and young, rich and poor, the gentle and the vehement, accomplished scholars and men who have had few advantages of education, politicians and those who place no faith in party politics. Whatever be the constitution of the society, or its resolutions, every one of its members is at liberty to forward the cause in his own way; there is no excommunication, except that which is self-imposed by treason to the anti-slavery cause. Under these circumstances, it is inevitable that such a variety of persons, coming before the public in newspapers of a remarkably free-spoken, unexclusive character, or addressing public meetings, will exhibit every variety of temper, every intonation of feeling. They will be regulated by the natural character of each, their ideas of truth, their feelings of the necessities, the claims, and the wrongs of the slave. The American Anti-slavery Society is not like a puppet-show. Nobody owns it. No individual has the management of it, and pulls the strings.

The American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society has no newspaper of its own; the American Society maintains the *National Anti-slavery Standard* with its own funds, and several societies in connexion with it maintain papers of their own in the same way. The one holds a single meeting in the year; the other holds hundreds. The one is a close corporation, confined to *men* of orthodox opinions, and advocates of a "right-

eous civil government;" the other includes men and women of all shades of political and religious opinion. The one is a vigilance committee* throughout the year, with the exception of three hours of a single day; the American Society has numerous vigilance committees connected with it. The American and Foreign Society is a Missionary Society, numbering ninety agents in distant lands, by the simple expedient of assuming as its own the labours, funds, and instrumentalities of the American Missionary Association, through whose periodical, the *American Missionary*, it appeals for aid to publish its annual report. The other society is merely the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and has neither time nor funds to spare from the heathen and slaves in the United States, for the promotion of Christianity and the abolition of slavery in Siam. The American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society is formidable and respectable on paper; the American Society is a numerous, living, lecturing, subscribing, publishing, catholic-spirited, energetic society, wielding an influence which makes every American slaveholder tremble.

It is a remarkable characteristic of the abolitionists of the "Garrison stamp," above any other labourers in a difficult and unpopular cause, that they fearlessly publish in their own papers the vilest calumnies and the fiercest onslaughts of their enemies; so that if you wish to see Mr. Garrison painted in the blackest colours, or the abolitionists held up to ridicule or contempt, you have only to examine the first page of each number of the *Liberator*. For example, the recent warnings of the Rev. Mr. Guthrie of Greenock, as to the infidel tendency of that newspaper, will be found in two numbers of the *Liberator*; and left, like most similar accusations, without note or comment. In the *National Anti-slavery Standard*, the organ of the American Anti-slavery Society, a similar course is pursued. I do not see that a more striking proof could be given of conscious rectitude and moral intrepidity.

* The object of a Vigilance Committee is to assist fugitive slaves with food and clothing; to shelter them and forward them to Canada; to protect them from their pursuers; and, if overtaken and apprehended, to procure for them legal advice and assistance. Throughout the Free States there are many such Committees, as well as individuals scattered here and there, who form a cordon from the Slave Frontier to the British territory, who are always ready to shelter the fugitive and send him forward, often at great risk to their own persons and property. The slaveholders are excessively irritated by this combination, which is sometimes called *the underground railroad*. Thomas Garrett, a Quaker in the State of Delaware, was lately stripped in his old age of the greater part of his property for aiding the escape of a slave mother and her children. When cautioned by the sheriff against a repetition of the offence, he replied, "Whoever knows of a fugitive in distress, may send him to the house of Thomas Garrett."

Contrast the American Society's courageous, because unpopular, condemnation of Kossuth's recent time-serving policy in the United States, with the conduct of Mr. Tappan, and the committee of his society, who presented a laudatory address to the Hungarian exile immediately on his arrival in New York, following it up by an intimation that they had no desire to embarrass him by asking for a reply. If M. Kossuth was entitled to this forbearance for his country's sake, is not the emigrant, the trader, the politician, or the priest also entitled to plead the maintenance of a family, the claims of business, the interests of a party, or the progress of a sect, as exonerating him from encountering popular hostility by any serious opposition to slavery?

When we consider the infinite variety of ways in which the question of slavery affects American society, its legislature, its churches, its law courts, its resorts of business, its parlours, its hotels, its steam boats, and its railways; when we consider that every interest of humanity, every affection of our common nature is aroused by its discussion; it is the sheerest cant to object against the American Anti-slavery Society, that the spirit and language of all its members do not please us.

I have found in all the American abolitionists with whom I have been associated, a straightforward demeanor, purity of mind, punctuality in pecuniary engagements, a generous disposition, and freedom from hypocritical profession of any kind. When you meet with people of this stamp, you are fortunate in your company. When such people stand up for the right, I am not alarmed by their language, for I know that their hearts are in the right place.

CONCLUSION.

I have thus endeavoured to show the fallacious character of the charges against the American Anti-slavery Society, and the false pretensions and unfaithfulness of its opponents. My main object, however, has been to supply correct information respecting that Society, its labours, its claims, and the character of its principal supporters. This information has been hitherto withheld from the British public, or unscrupulously misrepresented in the meanest way, by those duty it was, as the official friends of the slave, to proclaim it with rejoicing and thanks to God. When known as they deserve to be, the American abolitionists cannot fail to be appreciated, and to secure the willing support and sympathy of all who honor adhesion to principle, and disinterested devotion to a noble but unpopular cause.

These statements must go for what they are worth. The reader's decision will depend on his preconceived opinions, his habits of thought, and the influences which surround him. Let no one accept my views without investigation. I am most anxious that the friends of the slave shall inquire for themselves; feeling thoroughly persuaded that in proportion as they prefer the interests of humanity, truth, and practical religion, to the interests and reputation of sects and parties, they will accept my conclusions. If I gain the attention of any earnest, whole hearted people, and awaken their minds to serious effort in this great cause, I shall feel amply rewarded. This is not a mere benevolent question. It is second to none in its importance to the best interests of humanity and civilization. It involves every question of moral reform, and cannot be followed up or adequately prosecuted without a constant reference and adhesion to first principles. Its solution must result in the peaceful abolition of slavery—in a bloody revolution—or in the establishment of despotism in the United States. Slavery must advance or recede. It must be swept away, or it will trample down all before it.

Dublin, April 4th, 1852.

APPENDIX.

THE British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society has taken no steps to redeem itself from the following grave charges, which have been brought against it in the London Morning Advertiser, the Bristol Examiner, and various other papers both English and American, as well as at several public meetings:—

- 1st.—That the general course of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society has been one of unfaithfulness to the interests of three millions of slaves in the United States of America.—(See London Morning Advertiser, July 19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31; Aug. 1, 6, 16, 26, 27; Sept. 22; Oct. 7, 23, 24; Nov. 5, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, April 12; May 10; Aug. 23, 30; Sept. 6, 27; Oct. 12, 19, 1851.—Bristol Mercury, April 7, 1850; April 12, 1851. Also reprints of these articles in the Boston Liberator and the New York Anti-slavery Standard.)
- 2nd.—That it omitted to take any action in anticipation of the visits of American pro-slavery clergymen to England, until it was compelled to follow the current of popular feeling, which had been created during the previous three months by other less influential associations.—(See London Morning Advertiser, July 19 to Aug. 16, and Sep. 22, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, April 12; Aug. 30, 1851.—Bristol Mercury, April 12, 1851.)
- 3rd.—That it subsequently claimed to have originated the anti-slavery measures taken in this direction by different religious bodies, though many had been adopted before it put forth any recommendation of them.—(See London Morning Advertiser, July 31; Aug. 1; Sept. 22, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, Aug. 30, 1851.)

- 4th.—That, although thoroughly aware of the real character and merely nominal existence of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, it has persisted in demanding for that society exclusively the support of British abolitionists.—(See London Morning Advertiser, Sept. 22; Oct. 7; Nov. 5, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, Aug. 23, 30; Sept. 6, 27; Oct. 5, 19, 1851.—Speech of Geo. Thompson, Esq., at the Hall of Commerce, London, Aug. 1, 1851; and at other meetings in the metropolis, reported in the London daily papers, and reprinted in the Boston Liberator and the New York Anti-slavery Standard.)
- 5th.—That it has studiously concealed from the public the unceasing exertions and great achievements of the “American Anti-slavery Society,” excluding from the Reporter all notice of its proceedings, and declining to insert, even as advertisements, any resolutions of sympathy with its labours, or any appeals for aid to its annual bazaar.—(See London Morning Advertiser, Oct. 7, 23; Nov. 5, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, April 12; Aug. 23, 30; Sept. 6, 27; Oct. 5, 19, 1851.—Mr. Thompson’s speeches above referred to, and reprints in the Boston Liberator and the New York Anti-slavery Standard.)
- 6th.—That it has taken no notice in the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Reporter of the most remarkable series of anti-slavery meetings ever held in the United States, at which George Thompson, Esq., M.P. recently addressed vast numbers of the American people, with singular eloquence, faithfulness, and success.—(See Mr. Thompson’s speeches above referred to, and reprints in the Boston Liberator and the New York Anti-slavery Standard.)
- 7th.—That it has assiduously kept back from the readers of the Reporter, accounts of interesting and important public meetings, held in different parts of the kingdom, to welcome those able and distinguished representatives of their brethren in bonds, William Wells Brown, and William and Ellen Craft; and has neglected and discouraged fugitive slaves bearing high testimonials from leading members of the American Anti-slavery Society, while commending to the sympathy of the British public such as are patronized by the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society.—(See London Morning Advertiser, Febr. 19; July 28; Sept. 22, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, April 12; May 10; Aug. 30, 1851.—Mr. Thompson’s speeches above referred to.—New York Anti-slavery Standard, Sept. 11.—Boston Liberator, Sept. 5, 1851.)
- 8th.—That for the last eleven years some of its more active members, without rebuke from the society, have industriously circulated sinister reports, prejudicial to the character and influence of some of the most virtuous, high-minded, and intrepid American abolitionists, while the Reporter has been closed to all statements calculated to remove such misapprehensions; thus evincing a want of candour and magnanimity utterly unbecoming the professed friends of the slave.—(See London Morning Advertiser, June 30; August 1, 26; Sept. 22, 1851.—Bristol Examiner, April 12; Aug. 23, 30; Oct. 5, 19, 1851.—Boston Liberator, Aug. 1, 1851.—New York Anti-slavery Standard, Aug. 7, 1851.—Collins’s “Right and Wrong among the Abolitionists of the United States,” Glasg. 1841.—Glasgow Female Anti-slavery Society’s Appeal for 1841.—Speech of George Thompson, Esq. at the Annual Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, Aug. 2, 1841. Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society’s Annual Reports for 1840, 1841, 1846.)



Nancy
Hanks
Lincoln
Public
Library