

Elizabeth Pease,

Darlington,

Eng.

3 Favoured by Wm. W. Brown.

96

Slaveholding
which should
from our church
thing can justify
in continuing
ship with such
Christianity.

is a sin
be eradicated
ches, and no-
ly Christians
their fellow-
an outrage on

96

Extrait of a letter (dated Boston, June 20th)
from William Lloyd Garrison to a friend in
England in reply to some templer expressed
96 by herself and others against circulating the
Liberator newspaper, in consequence of the manner
in which certain subjects are treated in its columns.

To Elizabeth Pease

I have now written so much [on various
domestic and public matters] that it
must weary you to read it; and yet I have
not even alluded to a subject of special inter-
est and importance on which I should like
to dwell at considerable length; but at pre-
sent, time will not permit. I refer to the
Public discussion and other matters which
have appeared in the columns of the Liberator,
during the present volume, and which appear
to have caused great grief and clamor to you
and other cherished friends abroad, though not to
me at home that I am aware of. One excellent
friend has discontinued the Liberator for conscience
sake, being unwilling any longer to receive or to
circulate it! Another also declines taking
the paper on the same grounds, and you in
various letters to Henry C. Wright, Wendell Phil-
lips, and myself, ~~say~~ say that while the Libe-
rator is the most interesting paper you receive,
you feel it is a serious thing to circulate it,
should it contain so much which appears to
you dangerous and, as you believe, "false doctrine."
Now, you are deeply concerned when you think

2/ of leavins, copies of it behind you, to fall into your
know and whose hands, but their everlasting
salvation should be perilled by a parcel of
of such heresies!

My dear friend, I admire your piety;
I appreciate your friendly concern for my welfare
and that of the Liberator, shown so often both
by word and deed; I greatly respect your
conscientious scruples; I praise your circum-
spection; which leads you to desire to avoid
the very appearance of evil; I am sure you
will to do nothing, to say nothing, that looks
like ungodly proscription or sectarian intol-
erance; and yet I confess that your grief
is inexplicable to me, and your alarm per-
fectly unaccountable. In vain I read what
I have written and published - in vain I
ask, of what sin or error I have been guilty
- in vain I strive to ascertain precisely
what it is in the Liberator that you so seri-
ously object - I am only more and more
perplexed, and find no end in wandering
more lost." What! the Liberator so bad
a publication, (in spite, too, of the confer-
sely good things it contains) that its sup-
pression, not its circulation, is deemed
a duty by — and — and — and I
know not how many others! What! are

you alarmed at honest investigation, at
 free discussion, at the maintenance of a
 free press, at the disposition to prove all things
 and hold fast that which is good - and
 shocked to find that certain theological
 opinions, which are everywhere held by
 us, are not universally received as too
 sacred to be examined, and too self-evident
 to admit of doubt. Well, this is strange,
 wonderful, almost incredible. My dear friend
 I should be quite as much amused as sur-
 prised if I did not believe that you have spoken
 from the depths of a sincere heart; and
 therefore I proceed to reason with you a
 little, with becoming gravity and earnest
 consideration.

Henry Vincent, too, it appears is disturbed
 at what has appeared in the Liberator, and
 intends writing faithfully to H.C. Wright on
 the subject.

My dear friend, you, and — and —
 and Henry Vincent are certainly wrong in
 this matter. You are troubled where you
 ought to be serene; you are alarmed at
 what ought to make you rejoice; you
 are not acting naturally; you occupy

Ms. A. 9. 2. 96

4

in regard to these things, a sandy pro-
duction; and therefore your anxiety, tro-
pidation, grief. Come, now, let us
rejoin together," and see if it be not
so.

are religions to be lenient towards evil⁽¹⁷⁾
practices, (and to sanction them if they are
popular) and intolerant in their feelings
towards those who reject their mysterious
and untheistic creeds? For mere religious
speculations I care nothing; they decide
no main character; they determine no
main duty; but I am concerned to see
removed from the earth whatever tends to
degrade, oppress, and curse mankind.
I judge of men by their fruits, not by their
professions, believing that a corrupt tree cannot
bring forth good fruit. I am for the extension
of peace and liberty throughout the world, by
grappling with the war spirit, and overturning
every hold of tyranny. This I think was the
message of Jesus; thus his mode of re-
solving a hostile world; and thus the spirit
by which he was animated.

You fear that others, whose minds are less
strong than H.C. Wright's and my own may be
led astray by our sentiments. Not unless
those sentiments are uncheerous when re-
duced to practice. Besides we should
up to the necessity of keeping our mouths
closed, lest some weak or youthful minds
may misinterpret or pervert what we say?
Then all discussion is wrong, and dissent
leads to error!

are we wrong in intending that was its purpose ~~purpose~~? and therefore that it was never com-
manded by god, any body to the contrary?
Is this to sap or to recognize the foundation
of moral obligation? "The head and front
of our offending hath this extent - no more.
Besides, you will remember that the Publ has
had its able champions in the Liberator -
such men as Henry Jew and William Good-
ell. If the truth be with them, why is my
friend so alarmed "lest such should be led
astray."? I beseech you to review this whole
matter as sensibly as you would the Anti
Slavery or Con Law question; and I am
confident we shall not differ widely in
the result.

I doubt not that a sincere concern for the
welfare of the Anti Slavery cause, and the
usefulness of the Liberator, as its advocate
may give rise to the enquiry in your mind
- why discuss the merits of the Publ. or the
question of the holiness of the first day of
the week, in the Liberator? Is it not need-
less, to deter persons from taking the paper,
who otherwise would be disposed to subscribe
for it, being desirous to promote the abolition
of slavery?" My dear friend, it would
give me great satisfaction to enter the

(16)

Subscriptions but of the ~~Liberator~~ my paper much
bequeathed what it is at present; and most sheets
are I to see every slave free, and to join in singing
the song of jubilee. But I beg you and my other
English friends to bear constantly in your minds
the fact, that the discussion of these questions
has been forced upon us by the enemies of the
anti-slavery and non-resistance movements.
Their constant cry has been, that we are de-
stroying the Sabbath in pleading the cause of the
slave on that day, and mixing up secular with
holy affairs. Thus circumscribed, we have natu-
rally been led to see how the doctrine of the
holiness of days affects every reformatory
enterprise, and to inquire into its origin and
nature. We are enlightened as we proceed in our
investigations, and led to perceive not only that
there is no scriptural authority for the observance
of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, but
that time is sanctified only as we use it right,
without regard to particular days ~~and~~ or seasons.
We shall, that holiness pertains to the spirit
to its acts, not to any external arrangements
or observances; and that whatever it is right
to do on one day, it is right to do on every other
day of the week. That this discussion has
already proved highly serviceable to our cause,
we have the clearest evidence.

again, in advocating our more reputable doctrines, our opponents have resorted to the Bible, and thought to convince us by triumphantly referring to the earliest mentioning war recorded in the Old Testament, as expressly commanded by Jehovah. It was not conclusive for us to reply that what was obligatory on us is not necessarily so now — that Christ has superseded Moses, and now forbids all war; for the answer was, if we say a theft, or is like slavery, idolatry, and the like, inherently wrong, a malum in se, how could it be enjoined by a debating God in the days of Moses, unless his moral character is mutable? Our answer to this is, whoever or whatever asserts that the Creator has required, and may still require one portion of his children to butcher another portion, for any purpose whatever, is libelling his goodness, and asserting what every thing in nature contradicts. This position we believe to be irrefragable.

So, too, the controversy with the American church and clergy has all been predicated on by those who love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. We are not the aggressor in any of these instances. Ought we to have abandoned our ground, and avoided the conflict? What would have been gained by it, either to the cause of the slave in particular, or of mankind universally?

But I must stop. I am sorry, dear friends, to have caused you any grief or uneasiness, but I must be true to my convictions of duty, and trust you will ever be true to yours. This is a hastily written letter, without revision or amendment, and you will kindly overlook any thought or expression in it that may appear improper or harsh. Yours faithfully & affectionately Wm Lloyd Garrison

~~Extract of a letter from Wm Lloyd Garrison to a friend
in reply to some objection, made by several
of our friends, to circulate the Liberator's newspaper, in
the city of New York, at the present time.~~

"The Liberator is a free soil paper, is not
the organ of any Anti Slavery Society. For its
views on any subject, I believe you will refer
to the content that I write & answer them; hence,
it is a perfectly independent journal, and the
Anti Slavery cause, in general, is not responsible
for it. Some of the money contributed to the
American Anti Slavery Society is used to sustain
the Liberator: therefore it is not to be identified
with that Society, any further than those who
to be a consideration of views on regard to the
abolition of Slavery; and to them alone there
can be no objection in any man's mind.
If therefore any of our English friends cannot
consent to contribute to the Liberator, they
need not do so, but they must not be
responsible on that account.

The Liberator always allows both sides of
every question that it may start to be fairly
discussed in its columns; it maintains
and exemplifies the right of free discussion;
it holds with Thomas Jefferson, that "every
opinion may be safely tolerated where truth
is left free to combat it; it believes and acts
on the belief, that truth is mighty, and will

6/ prevail; it appears that the righteous are as
set in a line, but the wicked flee when no man
pursueth; I maintain that there is nothing
so likely to be interpreted, examined, and proved
through it does not undertake to interrogate,
summon, and press all things questionable, as its
distinctive purpose is the abolition of Slavery, to
which it has unswervingly adhered. Do you, do
Henry Vincent, object to such a course of discussion
to such a course of action? If not, why then do
- much regret and uneasiness at my maintaining
a free press? Are such papers to numerous
that one can be advantageously spared? You
do not desire to see both sides of the Slavery
question presented; and you would smile at
the idea of secretory the Liberator, because it
contains many proslavery articles, which
might injuriously affect some minds. You
are not troubled in seeing both sides of the
press or in substantial questions argued in
its columns, but object in proportion to the
activity of its discussion - do you not? You
are not alarmed when you see a highly public
advertiser, pro and con, into a publication on
the subject of temperance. Neither you nor
Henry Vincent would think of remonstrating
against the free utterance of sentiments in
favor of religious intolerance, provided no
war was put into the hands of the advocates of
religious liberty. You both would exclaim
- "There is no reason that both his quarrel with
and he but wailed though looked up in steady

who is the creature of hypothesis or supposition, who is
afraid to reason and investigate, who does not dare
to burst a single traditional tenet, who cries
out, "This is too sacred to be examined - too
mysterious to be examined - and has been too
long received to admit of scepticism!"

But why are you willing that these things
should be freely discussed? Simply because
you are persuaded that your views of anti-slavery,
purity, temperance, religious liberty, &c. are
based on a solid foundation, and cannot be
successfully overthrown; nay, the more they are
attacked, the more triumph you think they
will appear. Just so! when you write, exhibit
discuss, the more thoroughly you inquire into
their validity. But the drunkards, the wor-
shippers, the slave drivers, the hypocrites do not like
to see these views on slavery, war, temperance,
and religious liberty brought into the arena of
free debate; they are one-sided, and dread
nothing so much as "a fair field and a
square." Why? because

"his conscience that either one or of them shall
be a bad one, and they either know
it, or suspect it; and to change their opinions
might cost them their reputation, and friends.

ventures the means by which they live."

Now what is true with regard to one subject or question
 is equally true in regard to every other. Whoever holds
 to an opinion or sentiment which he is not pleased
 to see dealt with boldly and searchingly give evi-
 dence that he is conscious that it will not bear such
 treatment, or that he has taken it upon himself, ~~any~~
^{parental, educational, transitional authority} ~~and~~
~~not~~ upon his own clear intellect, ~~independent conviction~~
 to stand so! Who shall presume to lay to another,
 in regard to the examination of any creed, book, ~~or~~
~~doctrine~~, degree of ~~service~~ of any ~~kind~~
 spiritual or ~~temporal~~ ~~service~~ ~~where~~ a ~~man~~ ~~finds~~
 "that there is, but no further." ~~But~~ ~~his~~ ~~point~~
~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~in~~ ~~fact~~ ~~that~~ ~~these~~ ~~studies~~ ~~of~~ ~~science~~ ~~in~~ ~~regard~~ ~~to~~ ~~cer-~~
~~tain~~ ~~subjects~~, ~~the~~ ~~dis~~ ~~reputation~~ ~~of~~ ~~which~~ ~~you~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~de-~~
~~plora~~! How is this to be accounted for? I will tell
 you.

You were born a member of the Society of Friends;
 your religious opinions were received upon faith, and
 you accepted them as a matter of course, sincerely
 and trustingly, as I did mine, and as
 our fathers of those who were born in Christendom
 do. Your theological views of man's depravity,
 the atonement, eternal punishment, the divinity

of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, &c. &c. I
receive as confidently as you did your such
views of peace, anti-slavery, temperance &c. only
the latter you have advocated and carried out
to an extent much beyond the ordinary
teachings of our religion on these points. But the
latter views are true and acceptable of the
clearest demonstration; and those views are
true you can't. The former are all things
(in my judgment, I mean - though I was brought
up to believe them) want of satisfaction, and a few
proofs are a few of demonstration; and a few
enumeration of these views are positive un-
deniable! Your peace and anti-slavery views
concern their loves to your understanding,
your assistance and your heart; perhaps I
will discuss that in the typical view, but
really little to do with your understanding,
my assistance, or your heart, which is the
absolutely like the other - (perhaps my father
was - for if they had, it seems to me, would
so can be strangled to be an important dis-
cussion of them in the Liberator; or any
other periodical connected with the same prin-
ciple, then you have to see proslavery &
anti-slavery peace &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c.
views are, along with those of our opponents
of it. Is there any place in the Liberator?

Is there any link in this chain of logic unbroken?
Is not the parallel perfect, the analogy exact, the
illustration pertinent, the conclusion warranted?

What, at that moment, was to lead the Liberator
from your friends? It cannot be that you have any
doubt as to their merit, from any harm, detrimental
to the peace, liberty, or happiness of mankind.
Is not its standard of rectitude exact, unswerving,
absolute? Is it not boldly and continually
advancing, true and sincere in high places, &
in low places? Is it not hated, feared, and
persecuted, by all that is parasitical, intolerant,
covetous, true loving, brutal, and deceitful?
Does it not advocate in practical life, love to God
and love to man - peace on earth - the brotherhood
of all mankind? Is it not the only way, ever known
to overthrow, by sublime moral instrumentalities,
that horrible system in this country, by which
millions of our brethren and sisters are reduced
to the condition of things? Is such a paper to
be secreted? Is its circulation to be a cause
of disrepute to any pure mind, to any pure
spirit, to any philanthropic heart? I have
seen all sort of hostile numbers of it to go forth, to
the world, with no feeling that it would do
something to redeem that world from its
evils. My mistakes and infirmities have
been numerous and utterly - for she is

unfettered! — but the result of my paper I am
confident, has been uniformly true and absolute.

To what do you allude, my dear friend? I hardly
know; and this is the reason I am not under the
impression of any paper, for want of a specific charge.
The subtle distinctions I believe you intend to allude
to; and the description of it in the Liberator
is interesting rather than unpleasant to me. We
hardly ever expect to hear our views supported on
any subject; but when they are called in
question, our complacency is not always in fact,
unless we have the utmost assurance in
our own truth of those assertions. My worthy
friend it — comes right to the point in his
letter, of which the following is the interesting
paragraph: — "My dear Sir, I am sorry to say
that I cannot read the Liberator any longer.
You will, therefore, not send any more papers to
my address. Ever since the Sabbath and
Scripture questions were brought forward, I
have read it only to wonder at it. I know
the truth and the worth of it so well (!?) that
I have not any fears for my own sentiments,
being exposed. But I cannot put it into
the hands of my family, because I consider its
sentiments on these points absolutely to be put
the paper of heresy and the office of heresy"

Is there found in him as careful to suppress in
 his family those political or religious prejudices
 which sanction was, the army and navy,
 a monarchical government, conquests in India,
 and the like — all which tend to degrade, and often
 prove a disqualification to the human race? Even then
 it would not be a parallel case of presumption
 because she does not complain of any thing
 in the Liberator as injurious to the cause of
 humanity. She believes in the holiness of
 the first day of the week; will she not allow
 Calvin's Institutes to be in her family, in which
 the Sabbath is declared to have been a purely
 Jewish institution? Does she repudiate Paley's
 Moral Philosophy, in which the same view of the
 subject is taken — that the Sabbath was exclusively
 Jewish in its origin and design, and is unknown
 to Christianity? Does she put under her
 Dependence Essays, in which the holiness of any
 particular day is denied? Is she careful
 not to let any of her family see a copy of the
 Augsburg Confession of Faith, drawn up by
 Melancthon, in which the Sabbath is classed among
 those shadows which vanished at the coming of
 Christ? If so, she is at least consistent.
 But is it more rational for her attempt to
 hold absolute mystery over the understandings

and consequences of his family, by preventing them
 from seeing what in his eyes is one of heavey?
 Is this his way of teaching his children to obey the
 injunction, "Prove all things"? and may they give
 as a satisfactory reply to the injunction of Jesus,
 "Why judge ye me of your own selves what is
 right?" "and another thought it might end our
 our salvation to do so." God forbid that I
 should ever take such a responsibility upon
 myself - that I should ever bring my children
 up in this undecided manner! The one distinct
 and emphatic lesson which I shall teach
 them is, to take nothing upon mere authority -
 to dare to differ in opinion from their fathers,
 and from all the world - to understand, as
 clearly as possible, what can be said against
 or in favor of any doctrine or practice, & then
 to accept or reject it according to their own con-
 viction of duty. Mrs. H. says her ~~own~~
 sentiments are too strongly fixed to be swept
 away; but I am free to believe that she has
 not absolute confidence in them - else why
 should she refuse to read herself, or to allow
 her family to read, a paper in which the Sabba-
 tarian is welcomed with his brew as cordially
 as the Anti-Sabbatarian is with his? To say
 "I am sure I am right - I cannot be wrong - I will
 not read or hear what may be advanced in oppo-

14
situation to my views" — is, surely, not the way to "grow
in grace," or "in the knowledge of the truth." We have
all of us much to learn; for we are, to a lamentable
extent, creatures of circumstances — mere imitators
of others, simply because they did or did not do this
or that act, or accepted or rejected this or that
religious or political opinion. How many seek
for truth, or dare to follow her, independently? Alas!
how few!

But, agreeing in the ante-substantial views of the
Liberator, your complaint is not, my dear friend,
that the subject is all over to be poorly discussed
in its columns. If I understand the cause of
your dissatisfaction, it is the Bible discrepancy which
has been introduced by Henry C. Wright; it is the
avowal of his belief, that the Bible is not an in-
spired book, in the popular sense — and, therefore,
that God never sanctioned any of those enter-
minating wars and horrid cruelties recorded
in the old Testament and ascribed to him.
But is this a settled question? Is it not worthy of
serious thought and the most searching inves-
tigation? Do you believe that God is change-
able in his moral attributes; that he rules
arbitrarily and capriciously, without any fixed
law; that it is his prerogative now to sanction
war, and then to enjoin peace as a moral
duty — now to command lying and deceiving,
and then to speak the truth and deal honestly
with all men — now to indulge in licentiousness
and then to enforce purity? If so, then a lie may

(15)

be as good as the truth, and wrong is equal to right
under certain circumstances! What is your
reverence for the Bible but traditional? Why
should it not be examined, criticized, and
decided upon like any other book - according
to its own intrinsic merits? All that is
really good in it should praise, and its
evil attributes remain; whatever is discovered
in it to be either obsolete, erroneous, visionary,
or contradicted by fact and experience, let us
treat it accordingly. But to take it as
pure gold, credulously and to be in the fashion
- is neither to honor God nor man or the book.

In your last letter to Henry C. Wright you say,
"I am afraid that my thought are very severe in
the expression of my sentiments, but it arose
from the depths of my grief that the work should
be marred, and as I cannot but fear, truly
led astray [from what, dear friend? This lan-
guage is so technical and indefinite!] by the
personal questions of opinions on subjects which I do
not think we can fully understand in our present
state!" Pray, what can we not understand
that is essential to our welfare? And how
can any be led astray by that which neither he
nor his teacher can understand? Do you not
see that your "fear" is without foundation?

To say that a thing is mysterious, and too high
 for our finite minds, and yet must be implicitly
 accepted, that it contradicts reason, experi-
 ence, all the facts of history, is to advocate
 credulity, but not the use of our faculties. I
 will leave mysteries above human compre-
 hension, to take care of themselves; but will
 quarrel with any man concerning them; they
 constitute no part of my moral obligations
 or duties; they are of no value to me or to
 others; they are not tangible, and therefore
 not practical; they may or may not exist,
 they may or may not be true, but as they
 are incomprehensible, they are not within
 the sphere of the finite, but of the infinite.
 We may note them, dogmatize about them;
 we may not promise salvation or threaten
 damnation as they are believed or denied;
 we may not be uncharitable towards each
 other, because our speculations about them
 differ; toward bad manners, bad prin-
 ciples, bad practices, we may be intolerant, but in
 regard to all mysteries we must be entirely
 catholic. Instead of this, however, we shall

~~of his faith by these things
 which he has known of himself; in the
 way of teaching his children to obey the
 "I am with them" and never the
 "I am with them" and never the~~