



GEN

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 02576 9537

Gc 977.2 Ed36h
Edgerton, Walter, b. 1806.
A history of the separation
in Indiana Yearly meeting

✓

JUL 15 1953

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Allen County Public Library Genealogy Center

H I S T O R Y

OF THE

S E P A R A T I O N

IN

INDIANA YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS ;

WHICH TOOK PLACE IN THE WINTER OF 1842 AND 1843,

ON THE

ANTI-SLAVERY QUESTION ;

CONTAINING A

BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE RISE, SPREAD, AND FINAL ADOPTION BY THE
 SOCIETY, OF ITS TESTIMONY AGAINST SLAVERY ; TOGETHER
 WITH A RECORD OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL FACTS AND
 CIRCUMSTANCES RELATING TO THAT SEPARATION ;

EMBRACING THE

DOCUMENTS ISSUED BY BOTH PARTIES RELATIVE THERETO ;

AND

Some Account of the Action of other Yearly Meetings of Friends,
 touching the Controversy, especially that of London, etc.

BY WALTER EDGERTON.

BLACK GOLD

CINCINNATI:

ACHILLES PUGH, PRINTER,

120 MAIN STREET.

1856.

Allen County Public Library
900 Webster Street
PO Box 2270
Fort Wayne, IN 46801-2270

815667

P R E F A C E .

It is now (the summer of 1855) between twelve and thirteen years since the Separation took place in Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, on the Anti-Slavery question. Owing to the peculiar position which Friends, especially in the United States, occupied at and near the time of the difficulty, the true state of the case was very little known among them, nor could it be brought before the mass of the members of Society as then controlled. I trust that the feeling is now somewhat different among them; that prejudice has so far given way, that a larger number, at least, will be willing to hear. Such need to see the documents, and to look into the matter for themselves.

Added to this, those who were children then, even in our midst, but who had no hand in the proceedings, have now attained to maturity; they see the parties, but know nothing in a manner as to the real cause of the division. Many of them have *no means* of knowing what caused the Separation, nor where the blame should rightfully attach. And such as may possess some means of knowledge in this respect, have only detached portions of the controversy, and, therefore, are very inadequately furnished. To supply this defect, by placing the means of a correct understanding of the case within the reach of all, as well as to serve the cause of Truth, in preserving a faithful record of the transactions alluded to, for the information of posterity, has been my object in the compilation of the following history.

The plan of the work is to give both sides of the question—to present what each party said for itself—leaving the reader, in most instances, to decide for himself, and draw his own conclusions. It is true, I have in the Introduction exhibited the conduct and practices of our early Friends on the Anti-Slavery question, and, to some extent, contrasted them with the pro-

ceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, as connected with the history of the Separation; but my object has been in this, to fix the attention of the reader on the points at issue between the parties, more than anything else.

I have omitted no document issued by either of the Yearly Meetings, or their representatives, bearing upon the controversy, that I could reasonably obtain; indeed, none of any particular importance.

In perusing the work, the reader may discover what may seem to him as tautology, but he should bear in mind, that in following out the plan which I have adopted (which, I think, must meet the approbation of the impartial reader), of giving what each party said in the controversy, it could not be otherwise, so far as a repetition of the same thing occurs in the documents inserted.

It may be objected by some, that the publication of such a work will be likely to harrow up those unpleasant feelings which attended the parties at the time of the controversy; but I feel confident that none will be hurt by it, who sincerely desire that a knowledge of the truth should prevail. No good can result to any Church by covering up its wrongs, or by suffering the impression to remain, that those who were really in the right were the transgressors, when a plain, unvarnished exhibition of historical facts can remove it, even if such exhibition should unfold grievous errors in the Church. Indeed, we cannot believe that the All-powerful One, He who is holiness, mercy and truth, and who is no respecter of persons, will always suffer his cause and truth to remain prostrate.

“Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again—
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshipers.”

The work was commenced several years back, but various circumstances conspired to prevent its completion till the present season. I trust, however, it will be none the less interesting on account of the delay.

WALTER EDGERTON.

CONTENTS.

Introduction.....	9
-------------------	---

CHAPTER I.

The origin of the scheme of Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation, and the Anti-Slavery movement based thereon—The approval of that movement and its advocates by the Yearly Meeting—Its change and opposition to that cause, etc.....	33
---	----

CHAPTER II.

“Report of a Sub-Committee of New Garden branch of the Committee, on the Concerns of the People of Color.....	44
---	----

CHAPTER III.

Free Labor Convention at Spiceland—Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting against the Abolitionists.....	47
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

Address of Joseph Sturge to Friends in the United States.....	50
---	----

CHAPTER V.

Completion of the measures by the Yearly Meeting in 1842, which produced the Separation.....	57
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

First move of the Anti-Slavery party looking toward the Re-Organization of the Society.....	60
---	----

CHAPTER VII.

“Address of a Conference of Friends, held at Newport, Wayne County, Indiana, First month 4th, 1843; to the Members of Indiana Yearly Meeting.”.....	63
---	----

CHAPTER VIII.

- Remarks on the subject of the Call by the Editor of the Free-Labor Advocate—Letter and declaration of Charles Osborne..... 66

CHAPTER IX.

- Proceedings of the Convention to consider the subject of Re-Organizing the Society—Its Declaration..... 73

CHAPTER X.

- An Epistle to London—One to Anti-Slavery Friends..... 92

CHAPTER XI.

- The Policy of the Leaders in the Opposition to A. S. F. changed—Address of their Meetings for Sufferings, touching the Separation. 100

CHAPTER XII.

- Reply to the Address of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting 107

CHAPTER XIII.

- Some corroborative Remarks—Origin of the Use of the Term "Body"—Anonymous Review of the Declaration of A. S. Friends..... 128

CHAPTER XIV.

- Defense against the Attacks of an Anonymous Reviewer..... 149

CHAPTER XV.

- Declaration of Sentiment of A. S. Friends..... 186

CHAPTER XVI.

- Address of the Indiana Yearly Meeting to the Christian Professors, etc..... 192

CHAPTER XVII.

- "Review of an 'Address of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting to the Christian Professors in the United States, and to the Citizens generally, on the subject of Slavery.'"..... 199

CHAPTER XVIII.

- The Epistles issued by the Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, unnoticed by other Yearly Meetings, except London—Letter to the Editors of the “British Friend,” by Elijah Coffin and others of Richmond208

CHAPTER XIX.

- Reply to Elijah Coffin and others by the Editors of the “British Friend.”217

CHAPTER XX.

- Remarks by the Editor of the Free-Labor Advocate on the Correspondence between E. Coffin and others and the Editors of the British Friend—A Review by Daniel Puckett and others of certain Positions and Proceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, etc.227

CHAPTER XXI.

- Exposition of the Sentiments and Principles of leading Members of Indiana Yearly Meeting relative to Slavery.....239

CHAPTER XXII.

- “An Expostulation to those who have lately seceded from the Society of Friends.”.....242

CHAPTER XXIII.

- “A Reply to a Document entitled, ‘An Expostulation to those who have lately seceded from the Society of Friends.’.....257

CHAPTER XXIV.

- Address to the Meeting for Sufferings of London.....304

CHAPTER XXV.

- Address to the Members of the Society of Friends individually constituting London Yearly Meeting—Postscript touching the treatment of Dublin Yearly Meeting.....311

CHAPTER XXVI.

Committee appointed by London Yearly Meeting to endeavor to heal the Breach—The Address of that Meeting to those who had left Indiana Yearly Meeting.....	324
---	-----

CHAPTER XXVII.

Epistle of Advice and Statement of Facts, etc.....	327
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Account of the Proceedings of the English Committee in Iowa....	337
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIX.

Proceedings of the English Committee at Nettle Creek.....	343
---	-----

CHAPTER XXX.

English Committee at Newport—A Response to the Address carried round by that Committee.....	347
---	-----

INTRODUCTION.

IN order that the reader may more fully comprehend the brief history here presented, I deem it important to spread before his view, a concise account of the origin of the testimony of the Society of Friends against Slavery ; its progress toward that of perfection ; the part which the Society, *as a body*, took, at an early stage in its history, against that system ; and also, of the action of individual members, in behalf of the oppressed African, at the same and subsequent periods.

None, I apprehend, who are acquainted with the leading principles of the Society, can fail to see that they are necessarily and pre-eminently Anti-Slavery in their tendency, hence, to understand them thoroughly, and be governed by them completely, is to be an *Abolitionist*.

George Fox, as early as the year 1671, while on the island of Barbadoes, bore his testimony against the sin of Slavery in the following language :

“ Consider with yourselves, if you were in the same condition as the poor Africans, who came strangers to you, and were sold to you as slaves ; I say, if this should be the condition of you or yours, you would think it a hard measure, yea, and very great bondage and cruelty. And therefore, consider seriously of this, and do you for them and to them, as you would willingly have them or any others do unto you, were you in like slavish condition, and bring them to know the Lord Christ.”

Again, speaking of the advice he had given to Friends of that island, he says : “ I desired also, that they would cause their overseers to deal mildly and gently with their negroes, and not to use cruelty towards them, as the manner of some had been, and after certain years of servitude, they should make them free.”

Notwithstanding, the sinfulness and cruelty of Slavery are here recognized, yet there is an evident lack of that fullness

and thoroughness in his testimony which the principles of the Society necessarily embrace, when fully comprehended, and for which, considering his character for clearness of perception, we should naturally have looked. But we have reason to believe, that he, as well as other Friends of that day, were under an erroneous impression, in regard to the manner in which the Africans were obtained from their native land. Let us imagine for a moment, that Friends had been induced to believe, through the representations of artful and covetous men, that the negroes brought from Africa were such as had been rescued from death—prisoners of war, who would otherwise have been destroyed, and their actions in purchasing such assume the character of benevolence, especially should they act in accordance with the advice of George Fox, above quoted, to “deal gently and mildly with them,” “bring them to know the Lord Christ,” and after certain years, to make them free. Clarkson, in his history of the abolition of the Slave Trade, in allusion to the early settlement of America by Friends, and their action in regard to the matter before us, remarks: “In these days, indeed, the purchase of them (negroes) was deemed favorable to both parties, for there was little or no knowledge of the manner in which they had been procured as slaves. There was no charge of inconsistency on this account, as in later times.”

This circumstance, in connection with the fact, that the principal mission of our early Friends, was to correct the errors and abuses which had crept into the Christian Church in regard to doctrine, discipline and religious performances, closely occupying their time and attention, may readily account for so little being found on record relating to the subject of Slavery, and especially so, when we reflect that they, our first Friends, lived in a land far removed from the scenes of oppression connected with the system.

As regards Friends beyond the Atlantic, I find but one other beside George Fox, who expressed a sentiment touching the matter for many years, and that was William Edmundson, a minister and resident of Ireland, who, coming to the same island of Barbadoes, and where he had an opportunity of witnessing the evils of Slavery, interested himself in behalf of the sufferers. This seemed to irritate the governor of the island, who appeared to think, that to make the negroes Christians, “would make them rebel and cut their (masters’)

throats." W. E. says : "I told him it was a good work, to bring them to the knowledge of God and Christ Jesus, and to believe in him who died for them, and for all men, and that that would keep them from rebelling or cutting any man's throat. But if they did rebel, and cut their throats, as he said, it would be through their own doings, in keeping them in ignorance and under oppression, giving them liberty to be wicked ; and on the other hand, starving them for want of meat and clothes convenient, so giving them liberty in that which God restrained, and restraining them in that which God allowed and afforded to all men, which was meat and clothes."

Although there was doubtless some progress in the right direction experienced by individual members, in regard to this subject, yet the first testimony of the *Society* in Great Britain, which I find recorded, is embraced in a Minute of the Yearly Meeting, held in London, in 1727, in which they say, "it is the sense of this meeting, that the importing of negroes from their native country and relations, by Friends, is not a commendable nor allowed practice, and is, therefore, censured by this meeting."

To those who have from infancy been accustomed to hearing "the importing of negroes from their native country," to be bartered like cattle in the market, denounced as piracy—as a crime demanding the utmost rigor of law for its punishment and suppression, the language here used by a Yearly Meeting of Friends, is somewhat astonishing ; but we should bear in mind, that education and the *customary* routine of action in the surrounding country, have a powerful tendency with the most of men, to bar reflection and critical investigation.

Although the principles of the Society embrace a full, complete and energetic testimony, not merely against the Slave Trade, but *Slavery itself* ; yet, the want of ardor and perception manifested in this instance, is not more strange than that the apostle Peter, after hearing the command of the Lord Jesus to him and the rest of the disciples, to "go teach *all* nations," should still act upon the principle, that *none* should be taught but the *Jews*, the people of his *own* nation.

With regard to Friends in America, it appears that some were uneasy with the practice of trading in their fellow-men, from its first introduction amongst them, and bore their

testimony against it; but for a time it was done in a private manner, yet, eventually, the subject was by this class, introduced to the notice of Friends as a body. And it should ever be borne in mind, as a useful and profitable reflection, that *individual* action must necessarily precede that of a general, united, or congressional character.

If we turn our attention to the manner in which the Society of Friends became so entangled with Slavery, we shall find it was through *unobstructed individual agency*, and that through this medium alone, the Society in America gradually became so completely and lamentably involved. So, also, it was through *individual* zeal and effort, that the different Yearly Meetings, in process of time, were brought to see the sinfulness of the practice, and to prohibit it among their members.

Notwithstanding the truth of these remarks appears to be almost self-evident, yet its *rejection* is a matter intimately connected with the history of the Separation, and will be presented in its proper place, and I would press it upon the reader, to keep this fact in view.

It appears that the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, thirty-one years previous to the date of the Minute of London Yearly Meeting, above quoted, or in 1696, advised its members to "guard against future importations of African Slaves, and to be particularly attentive to the treatment of those who were then in their possession.

Fifteen years after this date, or in 1711, we find it but little, if any, improved on the subject; it then renewed the same advice as given before; but an Epistle issued by the same meeting in 1754, exhibits a marked change of feeling and sentiment. Let an extract or two suffice to show this.

"It hath frequently been the concern of our Yearly Meeting to testify their uneasiness and disunity with the importation and purchasing of Negroes and other Slaves, and to direct the overseers of the several meetings, to advise and deal with such as engage therein. * * * * *

"Now, dear Friends, if we continually bear in mind the royal law, of doing to others as we would be done by, we should never think of bereaving our fellow-creatures of that valuable blessing, liberty, nor endure to grow rich by their bondage." * * * * *

Between the two dates last mentioned, flourished a number of Friends in this Yearly Meeting, who labored zealously and

faithfully for the removal of the evil referred to from Society, which accounts for the happy change of feeling we have noticed. Among these were William Burling, Ralph Sandiford, John Woodman, and Anthony Benezet.

The first of these took the opportunity to bear his testimony, not merely against the Slave-trade, but against the system of Slavery itself, in their annual meeting; and continued the practice, at each similar recurrence, for years.

Ralph Sandiford published a work in 1729, entitled, "The Mystery of Iniquity in a brief Examination of the Practice of the Times." This he circulated gratuitously wherever he thought it might be of use, it being "a valuable appeal in behalf of the African cause." "He was very earnest," it is remarked, "in endeavoring to prevail upon his friends, both in and out of the Society, to liberate those whom they held in bondage."

The labors of John Woolman, in this cause, would require a volume fully to rehearse. He was probably the first Friend who bore a complete and consistent testimony against the sin of slave-holding, by endeavoring to avoid a participation in the gain of oppression; or in other words, by abstaining from the use of the produce of the slave's toil. A few extracts from his Journal may serve to show a little of the character of his labors.

In attending the Yearly Meeting in 1758, he remarks, "The case of slave keeping lay heavy upon me; nor did I find any engagement to speak directly to any other matter before the meeting. When this case was opened, several faithful Friends spoke weightily thereto, with which I was comforted; and feeling a concern to cast in my mite, I said in substance, as follows: In the difficulties attending us in this life, nothing is more precious than the mind of Truth inwardly manifested; and it is my earnest desire that in this weighty matter we may be so truly humbled as to be favored with a clear understanding of the mind of Truth, and follow it; this would be of more advantage to the Society than any medium not in the clearness of Divine wisdom. The case is difficult to some who have slaves; but if such set aside all self-interest, and come to be weaned from the desire of getting estates, or even holding them together, when Truth requires the contrary, I believe way will open that they will know how to steer through those difficulties."

“Many Friends,” he continues, “appeared to be deeply bowed under the weight of the work, and manifested much firmness in their love to the cause of Truth and universal righteousness on the earth. Though none openly justified the practice of slave keeping in general, yet some appeared concerned, lest the meeting should go into such measures as might give uneasiness to many brethren; alleging that if Friends patiently continued under the exercise, the Lord, in time to come, might open a way for the deliverance of these people.”

The striking similarity of these remarks, with those used by leading members of Indiana Yearly Meeting during the course of the events, which it is my present purpose to record, the observing reader cannot fail to discover. “If Friends,” it was frequently observed, “will keep in the patience and in the quiet, the Lord will, in his own good time, set the slaves at liberty.” But let us hear John Woolman’s reply to this class :

“My mind is often led to consider the purity of the divine Being, and the justice of his judgments; and herein my soul is covered with awfulness. I cannot omit to hint of some cases, where people have not been treated with the purity of justice, and the event hath been lamentable. Many slaves on this continent are oppressed, and their cries have reached the ears of the Most High. Such are the purity and certainty of his judgments, that he cannot be partial in our favor. In infinite love and goodness, he hath opened our understandings from one time to another, concerning our duty toward this people; and it is not a time for delay. Should we now be sensible of what he requires of us, and through respect to the private interest of some persons, or through a regard to some friendships which do not stand on an immutable foundation, neglect to do our duty in firmness and constancy, still waiting for some extraordinary means to bring about their deliverance, it may be that God may answer us in this matter by terrible things in righteousness.”

As we have already seen, many Friends at this time kept slaves, especially in the then Southern Provinces, where he sometimes traveled. When among them he was careful to endeavor to keep clear of the gain of oppression, even in the hospitalities received at their hands. In regard to this subject he remarks: “When I expected soon to leave a Friend’s

house where I had had entertainment, if I believed that I should not keep clear from the gain of oppression without leaving money, I spoke to one of the heads of the family privately, and desired him to accept of some pieces of silver, and give them to such of the negroes as he believed would make the best use of them; and at other times I gave them to the negroes myself, as the way looked clearest to me."

He published two articles or treatises, entitled, "Considerations on the keeping of Negroes;" the first in 1754, and the second in 1762; both excellent documents, and well calculated to arouse the dormant sensibilities of the human mind to a sense of the great injustice and cruelty of the practice.

Clarkson, in his history already referred to, remarks "that Anthony Benezet (the last-named Friend, and prominent laborer in the Yearly Meeting at the time to which I have called attention,) may be considered as one of the most zealous, vigilant, and active advocates, which the cause of the oppressed Africans ever had. He seemed to have been born, and to have lived for the promotion of it, and, therefore, he never omitted any, the least opportunity of serving it."

It appears that he voluntarily chose the humble situation of a schoolmaster, in preference to the flattering prospect of wealth by entering into mercantile operations, for which he had already been prepared by an apprenticeship; deeming "wealth of no importance when compared with the enjoyment of doing good."

As a means of promoting the cause of the slave, he endeavored to give his scholars a correct knowledge, and just impressions concerning it; thus instilling into their susceptible minds his own benevolent principles, and eventually bringing forth many advocates into the field.

Had his bright example been generally followed by teachers, and those having the care of the youth, what a world of suffering, sorrow, and crime would have been prevented! It is evident a very important change in public sentiment and feeling is absolutely necessary to secure the triumph of the Anti-slavery cause. Many of those advanced in years are entirely hopeless: it is to the youth, therefore, mainly that we must look for recruits to freedom's hosts; and hence it is of the first importance to diffuse a thorough Anti-slavery literature throughout the country, and, by imitating the example of our friend, impart that kind of instruction to the youth, which

will, under the blessing of Providence, make them Abolitionists.

But to return from this digression ; I will observe that he also wrote various articles on the subject of Slavery, and procured their insertion in almanacs and public newspapers.

In 1762, he published a work entitled, "A short Account of that part of Africa inhabited by the Negroes."

About five years after this, he published another work, entitled, "An Historical Account of Guinea, its Situation, Produce, and the General Disposition of its Inhabitants, with an Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of the Slave-trade, its Nature and Calamitous Effects."

The last-named work seems to have been eminently useful, exceeding anything previously published on the subject, in spreading a correct knowledge, and in exciting a just abhorrence of the Slave-trade.

We have here presented a historical outline of *individual* action in the Anti-slavery cause, of an important character. It was *individual* zeal and effort, under the blessing of the Head of the Church, which eventually purged the Society from slave-holding. Individual members moved in *advance* of the body, or there could have been no progress or improvement.

Let us now again glance at the progress of London Yearly Meeting on the subject. We have seen what it was up to the year 1727. Thirty-one years after this date—that is to say, in 1758—we find them using very different language. They say, "We fervently warn all in profession with us, that they carefully avoid being any way concerned in reaping the unrighteous profits arising from the iniquitous practice of dealing in negro, or other slaves ; whereby, in the original purchase, one man selleth another, as he doth the beasts that perish, without any better pretensions to a property in him than that of superior force ; in direct violation of the Gospel rule, which teacheth all to do as they would be done by, and to do good to all. We, therefore, can do no less than, with the greatest earnestness, impress it upon Friends everywhere, that they endeavor to keep their hands clear of this unrighteous gain of oppression."

Notwithstanding the above contains warm and energetic counsel and caution, yet it is still not positively prohibitory, or, in other words, it does not make such "dealing" a dis-

ownable offense. But three years afterward, in 1761, this was effected, as will be seen by the subjoined Minute of that year.

“ This meeting having reason to apprehend that divers under our name, are concerned in the unchristian traffic in negroes, doth recommend it earnestly to the care of Friends everywhere to discourage as much as in them lies, a practice so repugnant to our Christian profession, and to deal with all such as shall persevere in a conduct so reproachful to Christianity ; and to disown them if they desist not therefrom.”

In 1763, the line appears to have been drawn a little closer. They say: “ We renew our exhortation, that Friends everywhere, be especially careful to keep their hands clear of giving any encouragement in any shape, to the slave-trade, etc., etc.

Had this advice been strictly obeyed, it would have prevented, not merely the furnishing of materials for the construction of ships, and the accommodation of their crews, for such voyages, by Friends, which probably was the matter here alluded to, but also the *holding* of Slaves (which many of them were then in the practice of,) as well as prevented the use of the produce of the bondman's unrequited toil ; for to many of us it is now as clear as noon-day, that the use of such produce is not simply an “ encouragement,” but the very spring of life to *Slavery*, and the *trade* in the bodies and souls of men, with all their concomitant horrors. But the Yearly Meeting probably never thought of the essential and necessary dependence of this unchristian traffic ” upon the holding of slaves, and the use of products of the labor of men and women “ bought and sold ;” for, up to this date, its advices on the subject, appear to have been confined to the *traffic*, without referring to the moving causes. But in the course of the next nine years, some progress seems to have been made, as will appear by the following Minute of the meeting of 1772 :

“ It appears that the practice of holding negroes in oppressive and unnatural bondage, hath been so successfully discouraged by Friends in some of the colonies, as to be considerably lessened. We cannot but approve of these salutary endeavors, and earnestly entreat they may be continued, that through the favor of Divine Providence, a traffic so unmerciful and unjust in its nature, to a part of our own species, made, equally with ourselves for immortality, may come to be

considered by all in its proper light, and be utterly abolished as a reproach to the Christian name."

Notwithstanding all that is said in the above is strictly true, yet it is evident, that they were under the same erroneous impression which has ever since prevailed, till within a few years, both in England and America, viz: that the foreign slave-trade, rather than Slavery itself, is *the great evil*, and the *first* object for the attack of philanthropists. It was an error of judgment in this respect, that led the British abolitionists, with the renowned Granville Sharp and Thomas Clarkson at their head, to abandon the only true and consistent position; that is, of opposition to *Slavery and the slave-trade*, and to attack the latter only.

It is now generally admitted by those best acquainted with the subject, that there is no hope of doing away the African slave-trade, while Slavery itself is allowed to exist; and that human suffering is rather increased than diminished by the enactments against it. Such is the influence of gold upon the cupidity of man, that as long as slaves can be sold, especially under the sanction of law, men will be found, who will supply the market at any hazard; no law that can be enacted, will prevent.

But to return: hitherto the Yearly Meeting appears to have directed its labors on the subject exclusively to its own members, but this was a field too circumscribed for the benevolent principles of genuine Quakerism, or Christianity. The evil was rife around them; their country was involved in it, and their fellow-men suffering its unspeakable cruelties; a more public testimony must be borne. Accordingly, that meeting in 1783, caused a petition to be drawn up and presented to the House of Commons, in which they represent the suffering situation of the enslaved, as a subject "loudly calling for the humane interposition of the Legislature," and requested an embargo placed upon the traffic in human beings.

This appears to be the first act of the Meeting having a *general* bearing on the subject, and indeed, the *first* petition ever presented to Parliament against the slave-trade.

The same meeting recommended the subject to its standing committee, the Meeting for Sufferings, which, before the close of the year, issued an address to the public, in which they endeavored to enlighten the minds of their readers in regard to

the cruel nature of the traffic, and ordered two thousand copies printed for distribution.

An example is here presented worthy of imitation. Here we see a Meeting for Sufferings performing the labor, and attending to the duties of an "Abolition Meeting," in the strictest sense of the terms: that is, endeavoring to enlighten the public mind in regard to the evils of Slavery.

This zealous and hearty action of the Society, *as a body*, which it was now prepared to take, no doubt made way for, and gave encouragement to, another very important movement.

This was the formation of an association, called the "Quaker Committee." The first meeting of this noble little band was held on 7th of Seventh month, of the same year, 1783.

"They assembled to consider what steps they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave-trade on the coast of Africa."

Their names were: William Dillwyn, George Harrison, Samuel Hoare, Thomas Knowles, M. D., John Lloyd, and Joseph Woods. These, it should be remembered, were all Friends. There was no jealousy entertained by the Yearly Meeting, or the body of Society, that *some* Friends entering into an association for the abolition of "Slavery, would imply that the rest were not Abolitionists, that the body was defective in principle, in regard to the matter—" far from it. The exhibition of this kind of feeling was left for after ages, which will perhaps be better understood in the sequel.

The result of their first consultation, was a conviction of the necessity of adopting some measures for enlightening the minds of the people respecting those evils. As the most feasible, they agreed to make use of the public papers, appointing first one, and then another of their members to write articles, and have them inserted therein.

They kept regular minutes of their proceedings, and in the course of the same year in which they organized, held several meetings, and secured a place in no less than nine periodicals, for the insertion of such matter as they deemed suitable to the purpose.

In 1784, they followed the same plan, except that in addition, they began to print books on the subject; and in the year following, continued their labor as before.

While these events were transpiring, the Society itself, was actively engaged in the same work ; for the Meeting for Sufferings in 1785, recommended Quarterly Meetings, to distribute a work entitled " A Caution to Great Britain and her Colonies, in a short Representation of the calamitous state of the enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions," and which was written by Anthony Benezet, in America.

This book was accordingly distributed, and was sent to many persons of note throughout the kingdom.

It is true, the work was written and published by a Friend, but there was not only no objection in those days of candor and simplicity in the Society, to an individual publishing an article, advocating " one of our important testimonies," without first submitting it to the examination of a Meeting for Sufferings, but, as we have seen, the strongest kind of encouragement was given to it—to this " activity " and zeal in the advocacy of their principles. It is clear that it was to them a source of great pleasure, to see such lively interest manifested by a brother, in so good a cause, instead of chagrin, as similar efforts of later time seem to have been, to some, connected with the history of the events hereafter to be presented.

On the 22d of Fifth month, 1787, those Friends constituting the committee referred to, who associated together to promote the liberation of the negroes in the West Indies, except Thomas Knowles, who was then on his death-bed, met together, and they, with other Friends, united with Granville Sharp, Thomas Clarkson, and Philip Sansom, in an organization for the promotion of the cause of the oppressed Africans. In the Sixth month following, they came to the conclusion, to confine their opposition to the slave-trade alone, and to adopt this title : " The Committee instituted for effecting the Abolition of the Slave-trade."

Thus, an association was formed, composed of *Friends and others*, which continued its labors, truly arduous, for the space of twenty years, and until it effected its object, the abolition of the legalized traffic in human beings in Great Britain. Friends, at the time of which we are speaking, appeared to entertain no fears of lowering their testimonies and the standard of Truth, by uniting with those who were not members, in pleading the cause of humanity. And it is a fact worthy of notice, that this very circumstance gave the Society one of its

most able advocates, and one whose works have scarcely been of less importance to the Society, than those of its most gifted members. This is familiar to all who are acquainted with "Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism," a work which the venerable author was induced to prepare in consequence of his becoming so intimately acquainted with Friends through the medium above referred to. (See his introduction to the work.)

The above remarks, and their application, will be better understood in the sequel, as the events to which they refer are unfolded; I must, therefore, beg the reader to bear them in mind.

We will now return to Friends in America.

I have already given a sketch of the proceedings of the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, on the Anti-slavery question, up to the year 1754. I do not find a record of any advanced step taken by that meeting for twenty years, or till in 1774. By a Minute of that year, all members concerned in importing, selling, purchasing, giving or transferring negro or other slaves, or otherwise acting in such manner as to continue them in slavery beyond the term limited by law or custom, were directed to be disowned.

In the year 1776, the Yearly Meeting adopted the rule that those who owned slaves, and who refused to execute suitable instruments for their liberation, should be disowned from the Society.

Much less appears on record concerning the labors and exercises of other Yearly Meetings in America, in regard to the subject. In respect to them, Clarkson observes: "And as the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania and the Jerseys set this bright example, (that is, to allow no member to hold slaves,) so those of New England, New York, Maryland, Virginia, and of the Carolinas and Georgia, in process of time, followed it." Other accounts, however, state the matter a little different; that those of New England and New York, at least, did not *follow*; that New England adopted the rule some five or six years previous—that is, in 1770, or 1771—and that New York Yearly Meeting adopted it in 1774. The Anti-slavery reformation was, however, pretty much simultaneous throughout the Society. Active, zealous, and faithful Friends were found in all the Yearly Meetings: and although these met with much opposition from *individuals*, yet I apprehend but few *meetings* interposed a barrier to their labors; an instance or two, how-

ever, of this kind, I will introduce as bearing some, though a slight resemblance to that which produced the Secession, the circumstances of which it is my purpose to record.

It appears certain faithful Friends of Chester Monthly Meeting, within the limits of the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, had, for some time, been laboring to convince their friends that their conduct, in regard to Slavery, was wrong, and the subject was introduced by Minute from that Monthly Meeting to Chester Quarterly Meeting, and thence forwarded to the Yearly Meeting, in 1775; upon the presentation of which, the following Minute was adopted:

“If any Friends are concerned in the importation of negroes, let them be dealt with and advised to avoid that practice, according to the sense of former meetings in that behalf; and that all do forbear judging or reflecting on one another, either in public or private, concerning the detaining or keeping them servants.”

This, it seems, was all the meeting could do at that time, because the controlling influences were in the practice of slaveholding themselves, or indifferent as to its existence.

How true it is, that those who are in the practice of a wrong, and in measure sensible of it, yet having not the moral courage to live in unison with the secret intimations of Divine Truth, are ever ready to invoke the spirit of forbearance and charity in that matter. Even as a Yearly Meeting they can exhort “to forbear judging or reflecting on one another, either in public or private” for holding slaves; and simply because they do not wish to be censured for it themselves.

As soon as Friends of this Yearly Meeting, or its controlling members, became in earnest to put away the evil of their own doings; they could then, not only censure for the practice, but finally disown such as would not desist; and be sensible, too, that they could do it without any breach of charity, or want of “forbearance.”

The opposition to the reformation and its advocates, was not, in every case, as mild even as the one referred to above.

“Among the first of those who opposed the practice of slaveholding was a female Friend, residing in Virginia, and for this opposition she was disowned from her religious society. When on her death-bed she sent for the committee who had treated with her, told them that the near approach of death had not altered her mind on the subject of Slavery; and then gently

waving her hand toward a very fertile and beautiful tract of country that lay before her window, she said, with great solemnity, 'Friends, the time will come when there will not be Friends enough in this district to hold one meeting for worship, and this garden will be turned into a wilderness.' There were, at the time, seven meetings of Friends in that part of Virginia, but they have all long since been deserted, and the country literally desolated."

The above narrative is taken from the *British Friend*, of 12th mo., 1854.

The whole circumstance is calculated to impress a lesson of deep instruction, and to fix upon the mind the necessity of *individual* faithfulness, even if it be at an expense of union with the body, and to show clearly that meetings have greatly erred; and hence that implicit confidence in their decisions is a dangerous position to occupy.

In the year 1774, the formation of an association took place in Pennsylvania, "for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and the relief of free Negroes, unlawfully held in bondage."

This society was composed of *Friends and others indiscriminately*. James Pemberton, one of the most conspicuous Friends in the Yearly Meeting, and Dr. Rush, a man of eminence, belonging to a different denomination, were the principal agents in effecting this organization.

In 1787, the association had Dr. Franklin for its president; James Pemberton and Jonathan Penrose for vice-presidents; and Dr. Benjamin Rush and Tench Cox for secretaries.

Societies similar to that of Pennsylvania, were established in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and other States; in each of which, Friends and others were similarly united in promoting the great and excellent work.

We have now taken a concise view of the Rise and Progress of the testimony of our Society against the Slave-trade and Slavery, up to the time when its members were prohibited from taking any part in the trade, or holding their fellow-men in bondage; and have seen Friends, both in England and America, uniting with those not of the Society in organizations for promoting the cause of the Slave in the world at large. It remains to give a further sketch of their proceedings in regard to this matter, and particularly of such as relate to their connection with organizations of the above description, down to a more recent period. But before proceeding it may be proper

to state, that the most remote hint of objection to Friends uniting with others in associated action, to promote the liberation of the slave, cannot, so far as I have been able to ascertain, be found in the records or documents of the Society of those days—a time when their *actions* proved the sincerity of their professions—when it cost them something to be abolitionists;—not merely a good name and honorable standing in the world, but, in many instances, a considerable portion of their estates also.

How long the Society for Pennsylvania “For Promoting the Abolition of Slavery,” and others of a similar character in other States, remained *efficient* bodies, I have, at present, no means of determining. In answer to a letter of inquiry, addressed to my friend, Arnold Buffum, of New York, on the above and other subjects, I received the following, which I deem proper to insert at large, as his testimony to certain facts and circumstances relative to the matter in hand.

NEW YORK, *Fifth Month 29th*, 1851.

WALTER EDGERTON:—

My Dear Friend.—Thy letter making some inquiries relative to the position which the Society of Friends have occupied on the Slavery question, came duly to hand, and was read with pleasure. I very much regret, that by two fires, I have lost a large portion of the documentary evidence which I once possessed on this subject.

It has been to me a most sorrowful reflection, that the time ever was, when a religious body making the high and holy profession which we do, should have tolerated “trading in slaves and souls of men.” Such, however, was the fact, and many “Friends” were slaveholders; and when, in the progress of light, there was raised up in our religious body one individual, who saw, felt, and proclaimed that it was a sin for a man to claim and exercise a chattel ownership of another man’s body, and to take from him the God-given right of pursuing his own happiness, this holy apostle of freedom, for having proclaimed this truth, was repudiated by his brethren, and excommunicated from the fellowship of the Society, furnishing undisputable evidence, that a high profession is not a sure indication of high attainments, in moral perception or in a Christ-like life.

But the attention of the disinterested and conscientious portion of the Society having been drawn to a contemplation of the sin of oppression, the conviction became established in their minds, not merely that it was a sin to hold men in slavery, but that it is equally sinful in the sight of God, to *witness* these abominations existing around us, and to make no effort for their abolition. The subject was brought up and discussed in all the Yearly Meetings, and the friends of humanity kept up a constant and active agitation, until the whole body was brought under the power of Divine truth, and freedom was proclaimed to all their slaves. Blessed be the memory of those faithful followers of Him who came to preach deliverance to the captives, they persevered in their labors of love—organized abolition societies in connection with the friends of humanity of other sects—poured out the thunder of truth upon the sin of oppression, until the public sentiment of the whole community was so regenerated, that Slavery was abolished in a majority of the original slave-holding States of this Union. In England too, individual members of our religious Society commenced the Anti-Slavery movement; there, too, they united with others, in anti-slavery organizations, and many of the purest and most eminent Christians that the Society of Friends has ever produced, devoted their untiring energies to the great cause of Slavery abolition; and the first movers in the cause, lived to witness the blessing of God upon their labors of love, in the emancipation of a million of bondsmen.

The Yearly Meeting of Friends in London, in 1830, in their General Epistle, after commenting on the wickedness of Slavery, Intemperance, and War, gave the following advice: “We recommend to our members individually, to unite with their fellow-countrymen in the measures now in progress, for the removal of these evils.” A more rational or Christ-like sentiment never emanated from any body of men on the face of the earth. It is in perfect accordance with all the preaching and all the example of our Holy Redeemer. He always practiced and directed administration to the relief of the distressed, with no toleration for any delay. The orthodox Yearly Meetings of Friends in this country, all adopted and re-printed that Christian Epistle from London, and it was sent out through all the branches of the Society in this land. I read it, and having had my Anti-slavery feelings somewhat warmed into life, by a considerably extensive intercourse with

Friends in England, I felt it to be my duty to *act* in accordance with the counsel thus put forth by the whole body of orthodox Friends, both in Europe and America ; and without hesitation, and I am happy to say, without any subsequent regret, I united myself with eleven of my "fellow-countrymen," in organizing the first of the modern Anti-slavery Societies. The old Rhode Island Abolition Society, of which my father was a member before I was born, and of which I also had been a member, had been consigned to the tomb, by the influence of cotton and Colonizationism during my absence in Europe, and at the commencement of the year 1831, we were able to find only twelve persons prepared to unite in reviving the Anti-slavery agitation. We remembered what God had caused it to be written, that "whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, but shall not be heard ;" and we were led to contemplate the mournful fact, that there were two millions of our countrymen suffering under the most cruel oppression—that they were so poor, that they owned no tongues or lips to tell the story of their sufferings and wrongs ; or to send up their cry to the ears of the people ; and we felt that God had blessed us with voices to utter their cry, and we dared not "keep in the quiet," in view of this awful wickedness. My friends tried to persuade me, to "keep out of all excitements and commotions," and threatened me with excommunication, if I persisted in pleading the cause of the enslaved ; but I remember with joy, the reply which I gave them, when I decided that I would persevere in advocating the cause of those who were not permitted to plead for themselves. I regarded my responsibility toward the slave, as similar to that of Dives toward Lazarus, and I felt that if I left them to the mercy of dogs, I must cry in vain, for the poor slave to come from Abraham's bosom to cool my tongue. I saw a field open in the West, and I heard a voice saying to me, "Go into the field and labor ;" and in my compliance with this command, my only regret is, that I was not better qualified for so important a mission, and that I was not more devoted and faithful to the cause. I bless God, that I found there a chosen few, who received me as one that had come to bring to their ears the cry of the poor ; and who regard the command of Christ, to love our neighbor as ourselves, as of higher obligation than any rules of expediency adopted for the sake of popular applause or of worldly gain.

The Society of Friends in England, as a body and individually, continue in active co-operation with their fellow-countrymen, for the advancement of the cause of the Redeemer's kingdom among men, laboring in accordance with the true faith, that when the obstructions which men have interposed shall be removed, God will grant that holy prayer which Jesus instructed his disciples to pray; and His kingdom will come, and His will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. In this faith, Friends in England feel the responsibility resting upon them, to persevere in untiring labors for the abolition of violence, oppression, and wrong; regarding this as man's portion of the great work, preparatory to the coming of that glorious day, when "all men shall see eye to eye, and God shall be all and in all."

In America, I am sorry to say, the position at present occupied by the "Friends as a body," is very different. The love of popular approbation in a sinful slave-holding nation, has closed the hands and the mouths, and I fear, the consciences of a large portion of those who still use the language and wear the garb of Quakerism; and they seem to have adopted the idea, that being themselves well off in the world, they are under no obligation to trouble themselves with the sufferings of others, and therefore, they have resolved to "settle down in the quiet, and keep out of all excitements and commotions." It is more in accordance with their faith, to follow the example of the by-passing priest and Levite, than to go like the good Samaritan, to the relief of the three millions of their own countrymen who have fallen among thieves. They seem to regard their Church organization, as the builders of Babel regarded their tower, merely as a ladder to carry themselves to Heaven, instead of an organization of united strength for warring upon the abominations which abound in the world. I thank God, that there are noble exceptions to this general rule, and I pray that the faithful ones scattered over the land, may never falter. The day will soon come, when the language will come to us individually—"Inasmuch as ye have done it, or have not done it, unto one of the least of these, ye have done it, or have not done it unto me."

We have, in the signs of the times, abundant encouragement to persevere. Twenty years ago, no man in Congress dared to open his mouth against Slavery. Look at the change; senators and representatives are now elected in various states,

expressly on the ground of opposition to Slavery; and every day the abominations of that "peculiar institution," are becoming more observed and more abhorred; the slaves are fleeing to a land of freedom, in the dominions of Queen Victoria; and the slave-holders are becoming terribly alarmed, lest, becoming civilized and educated, they shall return to the South armed with power to demand the liberation of their enslaved brethren.

Slavery or freedom for the laboring population of America, has become the great agitating question of the press, the stump, the legislative halls, and the pulpit; and no subtlety or contrivance can stop this agitation, so long as any portion of the American people are held in bondage. Let us give no sleep to our eyes, nor slumber to our eyelids, until we feel that we have done our day's work, for the advancement of this holy cause. If we never meet again in this world, let us secure to ourselves an abiding hope, that we shall meet with all the friends of humanity in that better world, where there is no oppression, nor any disposition to cover up or tolerate crime; and to God be all the glory.

With increasing affection and love, I remain thy friend,
ARNOLD BUFFUM.

That those original Anti-Slavery societies continued for a considerable time to exert a salutary influence upon the public mind, is quite evident. Indeed, the manumission movement of Tennessee and North Carolina, may be considered as having emanated, at least in some degree, from the Anti-slavery feeling thus engendered.

The manumission organization took its rise in Tennessee, in the year 1815; and the next year was extended into North Carolina. This organization was likewise composed in part, of Friends, and those too, of the most worthy in the Society.

Shortly after the establishment of this organization, that is, in the year 1816, the American Colonization Society was formed, having for its object the removal of the free people of color from the United States, to some distant part of the world. The institution of this society, was one of the severest blows the cause of the poor African had ever received. It was originated by slave-holders, and for the purpose of draining the country of its *free* colored population; and in order that they might be the more secure in the possession of their human

chattels. It however was, and still is, a Janus-faced institution. In the South, it claimed not to interfere in the least, with the relation of master and slave; but in the North, it claimed to be the only feasible means by which our country was eventually to be purged from Slavery, and heathen Africa Christianized! Thus, with its false pretenses, many honest and philanthropic, but short-sighted individuals, were induced to give it their countenance and support. Many *Friends united with others*—even with slave-holders in the effort; and North Carolina Yearly Meeting itself, at a certain time, contributed largely to its funds.

The object, with its original projectors, as we have seen, was to clear the country of its *free* colored population; and as they were of a class that had robbed their fellow-men of *all* their rights, they were not such as would be likely to be very scrupulous in what way they effected their object. Accordingly, we find the most prominent men in that organization, engaged in venting bitter denunciations against that oppressed people, stigmatizing them as the “vilest of nuisances,” a “pest to the country,” etc., etc. Thus, through its agents and its public men, this Society labored assiduously to create a prejudice against this people, already so deeply injured: and having succeeded in imbittering the minds of the great mass of the American people against them, it then proclaimed, trumpet-tongued, that the prejudices in this country against the *poor negro* were so great, that it was impossible for him ever to be elevated here, and, therefore, he must be sent away! And now, while I write, this is the universal language and argument of Colonizationists. This idea, that the slaves must not be set free, and remain here, was, and still is, the grand foe to freedom, especially in the North. Some fifteen years back it could have been said, I believe in truth, that every party in politics, and every religious denomination in the United States, were more or less contaminated by this baleful influence, and many of them perfectly cold and lifeless, as to any feeling for the sufferers. It had much to do in producing the Separation, the history of which we are to trace, as the documents I shall introduce will clearly show. In some of these documents, the character and purposes of the Colonization Society will be, incidentally, more fully examined.

But to return from this digression; as before stated, many *Friends* of Tennessee and North Carolina were actively en-

gaged in the manumission enterprise. They appeared to have no fear of compromising their principles by associating with others in the good work, or by allowing their meeting-houses to be used by such an organization. There are now living witnesses who will testify, that Friends were so completely identified with, and in favor of, the manumission cause in those days, that meetings of the organization were appointed to be held in Friends' meeting-house; without the least idea of even asking for them; and it is distinctly recollected that, at a certain time; a meeting for Ministers and Elders left the meeting-house in which they were assembled, and retired to a school-house in order to accommodate a meeting of this description.

Before leaving this part of the narrative, I will record one other circumstance.

The Manumission Society at first adopted a rule to exclude all slave-holders from membership therein. Some of the slave-holders, as has since been evident, in order to defeat the project, professed to wish to become members of the association. The case was brought before that body, and a change in constitution advocated, as affording an excellent means of increasing their usefulness by increasing their membership; and, finally, was adopted and slave-holders admitted. This done, another proposition for innovation soon followed, and that was to change the name, and, consequently, the character of the Association—that it should be denominated the “Manumission and Colonization Society.” This project succeeded also, which soon terminated the existence of an institution which was originally designed to promote the unconditional emancipation of the slave; the moral power of which, slave-holders and their allies, were astute enough to comprehend, and comprehending, most ingeniously to overthrow—a verification of the Scripture declaration, that “the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.”

Charles Osborne, now no more, being a member of the organization, was in the meeting when the proposition was made to change its name and character. He was not deceived by the false pretenses of the colonization scheme, and its interested and heartless advocates. He stood up against it, and voted against it alone; of the people none were with him.

A number of Friends having removed from those states and settled here in Indiana, brought their Anti-slavery principles and feelings with them, and, consequently, meetings having for

their object the liberation of the slave, were held in different parts of the country; some as early as between the years 1815 and 1820.

Friends' meeting-houses were used for such purposes, at White Water and other places, without the least hesitation. No one then appeared to have any apprehensions for the consequences of such a course.

Let us now turn back and take a further view of the action of Friends on the other side of the Atlantic. We left them at the close of the struggle for the abolition of the slave-trade under the British government.

By a union of a number of philanthropists of Great Britain, in which were included eminent members of the Society of Friends, elders and ministers of the Gospel, the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society sprung into existence.

None who are acquainted with the history of the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies, can, for a moment, doubt the great good resulting from the united action of Friends and others in promoting that object. It was while Friends in England were engaged in these philanthropic efforts, that the advice quoted by Arnold Buffum, on a previous page, from the London Yearly Meeting's General Epistle, was issued. They were in the midst of a noble, though arduous struggle for the right: the liberty of a million of human beings was the prize to be won. They had toiled and labored in the cause; they had listened to, and thought of the wrongs of the slave, till their feelings were aroused, and they had remembered, at least in degree, those in bonds as bound with them; and calling to mind that in the United States alone, more than two millions of Africa's children were in a like degraded and suffering condition, no marvel they gave that advice. It was but the outpouring of benevolence and sympathy for the sufferers, from the deep fountain of their heart which, like the pool of Bethesda, had received that agitation from a heavenly hand, which made it a fountain of life and health to those poorest of the poor, (more forlorn than "halt, lame, or blind,") who were within the sphere of its influence. By its benign power, eight hundred thousand souls in the West Indies, were in one day, the 1st day of Eighth month, 1838, lifted from this horrible pit of pollution, the degraded condition of things, of property, chattels personal, and exalted to the station of men and

women, to a condition a little lower than the angels, to be crowned with glory and honor. This work, let me repeat, was effected by the cordial co-operation of such Friends as William Allen, William Forster, Josiah Forster, Joseph Sturge, George Stacey, etc., etc., with other Christian professors. And they labored, too, as we have already seen, not merely with the consent of London Yearly Meeting, but in accordance with its advice and earnest recommendation.

We have now presented a concise history of the action of Friends from the first, both in England and America, touching the subject of Slavery. The reader, I trust, will now be enabled, understandingly, to peruse the following pages, embracing, as they do, a history and record of some of the principal facts and circumstances which produced the Separation, together with the arguments used, and the positions taken on both sides, and thereby be prepared readily to decide who were and are the separatists, and who contending for the testimony of the Society of Friends; who had precedent and ancient usage on their side, and who opposed it; who were contending against spiritual wickedness in high places, and who connived at it.

A HISTORY

OF THE

SEPARATION IN INDIANA YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

CHAPTER I.

The origin of the scheme of Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation, and the Anti-slavery movement based thereon—The approval of that movement and its advocates by the Yearly Meeting—Its change and opposition to that cause, etc.

THE Anti-slavery movement which seems to have occasioned the difficulties in the Yearly Meeting, had its origin in the year 1832, in Boston.

The American Colonization Society, through its agents and emissaries, in the fifteenth or sixteenth years of its existence, had, by this time, so far succeeded in accomplishing its object, that twelve individuals were all that could be found who were willing to unite in an Anti-Slavery organization. In 1833, a national organization was founded in the city of Philadelphia, under the denomination of "The American Anti-Slavery Society." This organization and that alluded to, formed in Boston the year before, took an important step quite in advance of any previous Anti-Slavery organization. While all others had advocated a system of *gradual* emancipation, these boldly took the ground that nothing short of *immediate* and unconditional freedom to all, could satisfy the demands of justice, and fulfill the righteous law of God—that as slavery was a sin, it was the duty of all engaged

in it, to cease immediately, and that there could be nothing to fear from the consequences of so doing.

In order that the reader may have a clear understanding of what may be presented, it will be proper to remark, that this doctrine, and the Colonization scheme, each had its advocates in the Yearly Meeting for some years previous to the Separation. Not that any willingly owned themselves in favor of driving from the country the free colored inhabitants, yet they favored the Colonization Society, and contributed to its support; and we have already seen what was the tendency of the policy of that society. Hence, those who supported that institution, supported the cruel work of expatriation, however ignorant they might have been of the fact. Yet all were not entirely ignorant; there was undoubtedly a feeling coincident with that engendered by the society, which manifested itself in such expressions as these, which were not unfrequently heard: "I am opposed to the slaves being set free here amongst us;" "would it not be better for them to have a place somewhere to themselves," etc., etc.

The first public expression of the Yearly Meeting which I find on record, shows the advocates of unconditional emancipation in the ascendancy at that time. It was in the year 1836, and in the following language:

"We feel ourselves called upon at this time, affectionately and tenderly, to caution our dear Friends to take no part in, nor render any aid to, any political association on the subject of African Slavery, which is, or may be founded on principles either directly or indirectly, having a tendency to promote the unrighteous work of expatriation, it being our settled conviction, that this work as a condition to the slaves being set at liberty, is unjust and oppressive."

This clearly and emphatically condemns the Colonization scheme, and sanctions unconditional emancipation.

As the above shows the leading influences of the Meeting at the time to be against the efforts of colonizationists, the following extract from the same epistle, will give

the reader an idea with what class of our fellow-countrymen they sympathized, and who they wished to encourage :

“ It is a satisfaction to us, to learn that there are many now in our much beloved country, who, though not members of our religious society, are awakened to a lively sense of the iniquity and horrors of Slavery, as now existing in these United States, and are made willing to become on gospel principles, the open advocates for suffering and degraded humanity, and are laboring on the ground which we as a religious society have for many years occupied, in relation to this subject; and we desire to encourage them in the good work of promoting mercy, righteousness and peace in the earth; and we do most affectionately desire that all our dear friends may be so alive to our testimony against Slavery, that none may through prejudice or otherwise, cast any discouragements in the way of such as are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation, whether such laborers be found within or without the pale of our Society.”

The next year, 1837, the Yearly meeting went further, and *urged* its members to Anti-Slavery action, thus :

“ And a concern has been felt to arise, that Friends generally may be stirred up to renewed diligence, in faithfully maintaining our testimony against Slavery, not shrinking therefrom on account of opposition or the fear of persecution; but that we may individually be willing in true simplicity, to inquire whether there is not something for us to do for this suffering portion of our fellow-creatures. We do not wish any to engage in active measures on any other ground than a sense of duty, and in accordance with our well-known principles, yet we would encourage all to a close examination as to what is required at their hands, and how they may employ the talents committed to them for noble purposes in the advancement of the blessed work of emancipation, by meekly, yet boldly, either publicly or privately pleading the cause of the oppressed.”

The Anti-Slavery party, as will appear in the sequel,

very naturally took this, not merely as permission, but as earnest advice, to labor in the Anti-Slavery cause, and claimed that in so doing, they were strictly in the order of Society, even in not shrinking therefrom on account of opposition, which arrayed itself so powerfully against them when the colonizationists gained the ascendancy.

At the Yearly Meeting in 1838, the condemnation of the Colonization scheme was received even in more energetic and decisive language, and a just admonition administered to Friends, not to give it countenance or support.

“Fearing,” say they, “that there are those of our members occupying and contending for grounds that are not in full accordance with our well-known testimonies on this important subject, by too much countenancing the policy of the day, which denies to that class of our fellow-beings (colored people,) the capacity of enjoying the natural rights of man, only on terms of expatriation, or some tedious plan of preparation, we earnestly invite Friends to renewed exertion on behalf of suffering humanity, by endeavoring to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people, by giving circulation to such publications as are calculated to advance the cause of immediate emancipation on Christian principles.

“Our religion is a pure and holy religion; it is founded on principle, and not on expediency; it is founded on the policy of the gospel, and not on the policy of the world; it requires us to do unto others as we would they should do unto us. Hence, we admit, without any conditions, the full enjoyment of liberty to be the right of all. And we cannot consent upon any contingency that the bondage of a fellow-being shall be prolonged for a single day. We cannot say to him, he must go to Hayti, to Liberia, or any other place, to entitle him to the full enjoyment of his freedom.”

In 1839, the same subject was brought to view. After expressing a belief that there was an increasing interest and concern felt in the minds of many Friends to promote the entire abolition of Slavery, the Yearly Meeting

said: " Yet, we believe there are amongst us in almost every department of Society, those whose minds are too indifferent on this important concern, and some others who are more actively engaged, who are obstructing the progress of our testimony by the doctrine of expediency, and that policy by which it is proposed to remove the colored population from our country, thereby contributing to the support of that unchristian prejudice which denies to the colored man privileges that we claim for ourselves; professing much opposition to Slavery, and at the same time attaching burdensome conditions to their plan of emancipation.

" We desire, in brotherly love, to remind such, that our testimony against Slavery is purely a religious testimony, founded on the principles of the Gospel, which requires that we should do unto others as we would that they should do unto us—that we should break every yoke, undo the heavy burden and let the oppressed go free.

" We would affectionately exhort all our dear friends everywhere, to zealously maintain our Christian testimony against Slavery, embracing every suitable opportunity to strengthen and encourage the friends of this most righteous cause to stand firm and fear not, although the enemy may boast himself for a season; for if the Lord be for us, who shall be against us?"

Clearly as the foregoing extracts show the friends of immediate and unconditional emancipation to have held a controlling influence in the Yearly Meeting at the time of their adoption, yet it was well known there was a large number of Friends opposed to the views and sentiments therein contained—with them they went down roughly. Hence, every opportunity was improved to change the current of feeling in the Society, against that "most righteous cause," unconditional emancipation. Some of the friends of this cause entertained the idea, when the subject was first brought before the Meeting, that is, in 1836, that it would not be best for Friends to associate with other people for its promotion. Charles Osborne was one of this number. It was proposed at that

time that members be advised to refrain from such connection. Other friends of the cause, aware of the use which would eventually be made of such advice, opposed its adoption. They saw that it would in all probability be converted into a weapon against the cause itself.

The Colonization party, no doubt aware of the advantage that might be taken of that advice, to sink the Anti-Slavery cause in public estimation, especially as it was, if not in direct terms, in fact against Friends becoming members of Abolition societies, joined in advocating its adoption, and thus it carried. The language used however, was very mild.

“It is with feelings of much tenderness that we venture to suggest to your consideration whether the time has not arrived in which it will be most safe for members of our religious Society to refrain from becoming members of other societies, though their object in relation to this important subject (universal emancipation), may be in strict accordance with our own.”

Had the advice in relation to associating with others, remained in the above form, the Anti-Slavery party claimed that no difficulty would have arisen. But this, as was foreseen, was only the starting point. In 1838, at the instigation of the Colonization and anti-Abolition party, it was placed in more objectionable language.

It says: “our standard of morality and religion is a high and holy standard; in associating with others not of our Society for promoting benevolent objects, this standard has often been lowered;—something objectionable may have been adopted—some peculiarity we deem it important to maintain, may have been abandoned. We deem it best for these and other reasons, that our friends abstain from mixing in these associations.

As the above extracts from the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting at the different dates, are more or less discussed in the documents hereafter inserted, the reader is referred to them for further information relative to the different views and positions of the parties.

About this time, that is, in 1838 and 1839, the rapid

increase of Anti-Slavery associations excited the special attention of the ever-watchful eye of Slavery. The intercourse existing between the slave-holders of the South and the non slave-holders of the North, was various and complicated; and especially in the eastern cities, among the wealthy and influential. But the commercial intercourse between the parties had, without doubt, the most powerful influence. Slave-holders began to manifest a most inveterate hatred toward the movement; and it became a matter of interest with the merchants, manufacturers, etc., of those cities, as they thought, to denounce the Abolitionists in order to ingratiate themselves into the special favor of their southern customers, and thereby secure their patronage. This class comprised a number of Friends of wealth and influence in the Society, in that part of the country.

If one wished to encounter a bitter opponent of the Anti-Slavery movement, he had but to go to a Friend, a proprietor of a large manufacturing establishment, to be sure to find one. Friends, as well as others of the mercantile and manufacturing community, looked upon that movement as one calculated to deprive them of the means of amassing wealth. They looked to the slave-holders for their supplies of cotton, rice, sugar, etc., and in return to furnish them with their manufactured articles and goods of all descriptions; and fancied that if the project of the Abolitionists was not arrested, "their craft, by which they had their wealth," would be in danger. Their opposition to the Abolitionists was much upon the same ground as that of the craftsmen of Ephesus to the apostle Paul and his companions. True, they did not so much cry out "great is Diana of the Ephesians"—great is American Slavery, as "abominable and fanatical" were all those who labored to turn the American people against this wicked institution. Nothing could be said too hard against them—nothing too false to put in circulation about them. And this opposition, as before intimated, originated in the higher class of community, among "those of property and standing;" but it met with a

hearty response from the low and vicious rabble, in numerous acts of mobocratic violence, in the destruction of halls and printing-presses devoted to the cause of freedom. This influence or prejudice, in the Eastern States, at the time of which we are speaking, was so strong and so overwhelming that our transatlantic Friends on Gospel Missions were completely duped thereby, and made to believe that the "Abolitionists were men of blood" and violence, and that they designed to involve the country in a servile war, etc., etc., and were induced to give currency to these slanders in the course of their travels through the country: and this, too, from those whose duty it was, according to their profession, instead of so doing, to do all in their power to bind up the broken hearted, proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that were bound. They all, either joined in this, the very same hue and cry with which the venerable Clarkson and his noble compeers were assailed, or took side with those who did. There is no exception to these remarks, that I am aware of, among Friends in the ministry who visited us from beyond the water. Joseph Sturge and John Candler, who were not of this class, to their honor be it recorded, stood above the reach of this cruel and withering influence. Some demonstration of this, in regard to the former individual, will appear anon. This, then, was the general character of public sentiment both "within and without the pale of Society" in the East, in 1838 and 1839, and for several years after.

In 1840 Arnold Buffum came to this State for the purpose of holding meetings among the people, to talk about the wrongs and sufferings of the slave, and to endeavor to excite an interest in his behalf.

The opposition which he encountered in the East, as one of the little band who dared undertake to revive the Anti-Slavery agitation, was made to follow him to the West, in the shape of letters of a personally defamatory character; and this could have been for no other purpose than to prevent his having an influence with the people.

Abolitionists, among whom he was a prominent one, were represented to Friends here, by their eastern brethren, as the most odious of characters.

It may be proper to state, that a number of Friends who were in favor of unconditional emancipation, had, as early as 1836, joined with others in the formation of the State Anti-Slavery Society of Indiana, and were well acquainted with the principles and aims of the Abolitionists; hence these aspersions were keenly felt by them, yet they felt that the Yearly Meeting was on their side, or at least, had been for years past. The opposition party, however, was greatly strengthened by this foreign influence, and accordingly, feeling somewhat emboldened, in the Sixth month, 1840, it so far succeeded in carrying out its designs as to procure the issuing of an Epistle of Advice by the Meeting for Sufferings, against Friends participating in the *Anti-Slavery enterprise*, as well as that of Colonization; thus placing them on the same ground. As it was well known that the Yearly Meeting had openly condemned the Colonization scheme, the friends of that project could look for no retraction in that case; hence they contented themselves with trying to obtain a like condemnation of the Anti-Slavery movement, which they did; and Friends were now advised not to join with others in Anti-Slavery associations.

It ought to be borne in mind that there was a third party, if we may so speak, in the Yearly Meeting—a kind of neutrals, many of them very goodly Friends, but who, for lack of firmness or judgment, or perhaps both, were ready to turn any way to be with the current—to be in unity with what they conceived to be the leading influences of the Society. This may account, in some degree, for the strange phase the Society now so suddenly exhibited.

The Anti-Slavery portion of Society witnessed this change with deep sorrow and concern. A number of them, however, confidently believed that when the Yearly Meeting convened, it would disapprove the proceedings of the Meeting for Sufferings. They could not

think that body could act, as they conceived, so inconsistent with its former professions as to indorse that document. But in this they were disappointed.

Charles Osborne, who was one of the most prominent of the Anti-Slavery party, was absent on a religious visit to the East in the forepart of this year, 1840, and did not reach home till after the Meeting for Sufferings had issued the document alluded to above. From his own account he saw, while on this visit, the storm gathering thick and dark around him. Many of his brethren there could not brook the testimonies against Slavery which he felt called upon to bear, and essayed to put him to silence. Silence, then, was the watchword. They could find no fault with his principles, but "such preaching strengthened the Abolitionists;" he must, therefore, desist. But it appears he was preserved in faithfulness to his divine Master, amidst it all.

That his testimonies had a tendency to strengthen the hands of Abolitionists, as anticipated, is very evident. The following stanza, from a poem written by J. G. W. on another occasion, was copied at the time into one of the journals of the day, as expressive of the feelings excited in this class, on hearing, in a public meeting, the bold and unflinching testimony of our dear friend.

Thank God for the token!—one lip is still free—
 One spirit untrammelled—unbending one knee—
 Like the oak of the mountain, deep-rooted and firm,
 Erect, when the multitude bends to the storm;
 When traitors to Freedom, and Honor, and God,
 Are bowed at an idol polluted with blood;
 When the recreant North has forgotten her trust,
 And the lip of her honor is low in the dust,—
 Thank God that one arm from the shackle has broken!
 Thank God that one man, as a *freeman*, has spoken!

When he reached home, he found the current had completely changed. The advocates of Colonization and opponents of the Anti-Slavery movement seemed in a most unaccountable manner to have entirely gained the ascendancy. Submission to the advice, not to join with others in Anti-Slavery associations, was now strenuously

demanding by this class; but a number of the other party resisted it as altogether wrong, and hence, as they thought, could not yield obedience thereto. Their reasons will be found in documents inserted hereafter.

The subject of abstaining from the productions of Slavery, is one that had claimed the attention of some of the more conscientious among Friends, from the days of J. Woolman, down to the period of the events under review. Charles Osborne was one, who, as early as 1818, advocated the propriety and necessity of such abstinence, in a periodical which he edited in Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, under the title of "The Philanthropist."

In the course of the investigations consequent upon the revival of the Anti-Slavery agitation, the duty of abstaining from articles produced by the extorted labor of the slave, presented itself in a forcible manner to the minds of many of the friends of unconditional emancipation, so much so, that in 1841, a monthly periodical denominated "The Free Labor Advocate and Anti-Slavery Chronicle," was started at Newport, in this State. A number of Free Labor societies of a local character had been formed, and much interest in the cause seemed to have been awakened in different places. The standing committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting, and the different Quarters, known as the Committee on the Concerns of the People of Color, had the subject before them in 1840, and recommended Friends of the different branches of said committee, to endeavor to ascertain what facilities existed for obtaining free labor goods, and report to the next general meeting of the committee. This, to some extent, was attended to in one of the Quarterly meetings, and a communication was produced to the committee the next year, from Abraham L. Pennock of Philadelphia, detailing to some extent, the opportunities for obtaining such goods. But the change in the ruling influence to which I have already alluded, was such, that even the reading of this document produced according to instruction, was obtained

with difficulty, and the whole movement on the subject endeavored to be quashed.

A document was produced to this meeting of the committee, from one of its branches, showing in a forcible manner, the necessity of Friends avoiding the purchase and consumption of articles produced by slaves. Its being introduced and read in that body, produced a most astonishing state of excitement therein.

For further particulars, see the "Declaration" in another part of this work.

That the reader may be able to judge of the merit or demerit of a document that produces such a state of feeling, I present it below.



CHAPTER II.

" Report of a Sub-Committee of New Garden branch of the Committee, on the Concerns of the People of Color.

" The committee appointed on the subject of Abstinence from the use of Slave-labor Produce, having at different times had the matter under solid consideration, agree to report: that we find, by examining the history of our Society, that religious scruples in respect to the use of slave-labor produce, were entertained by some of the early advocates of freedom; and we believe that many Friends, both in Europe and America, have up to the present time, manifested a concern on this important subject; and some Friends have faithfully borne this testimony. And in a Society capacity, Friends have been advised to attend to their conscientious scruples on this subject. Yet, from some cause, it has never been so acted on as to bring it in as a testimony obligatory on our members.

" The principal reason may have been, the great diffi-

culties that have always opposed themselves to such a testimony, and the trials and deprivations that it would bring upon us. And notwithstanding we have long since forbidden our members the privilege of purchasing slaves, or of hiring them of their respective masters, we have continued to participate freely in the purchase and use of the produce of the extorted labor of the slave; and slavery has not only continued, but has increased many fold.

“And it appears to us, that our neglecting faithfully to maintain and carry out this testimony against Slavery in all parts, which would have led us to a refusal, as much as possible, of a participation in the spoils of oppression, has very much contributed to the rendering of our testimony against this unrighteous system less availing.

“It is evident that they who purchase the produce of oppression, supply the means by which it is kept in existence. It is the desire of money, that induces the master to drive the panting slave under the lash, to produce a supply of those articles for which he can find a market. And just so far as we contribute to the gratification of our desires, so far we hire the master to continue his deeds of oppression.

“Now, is it not clear, that the right of the slaveholder to the proceeds of slave labor, is founded in his claim to the person of the slave, which had its origin in robbery? And if the property claim to the person of the slave originated in robbery, is it not clear that its continuation through a succession of ages and generations can never divest it of its original character? And is it not equally clear, that the title to his labor is no better than the claim to his person?

“We are unable to perceive the difference in principle, between hiring from the slaveholder his slave, and compelling him to toil in our own fields, and purchasing the fruits of his toil, produced by extortion in the fields of his master.

“In practice there is this difference; in the former

case, the slave would be under our own treatment; and in the latter, we pay others for extorting his labor under the rigor of the lash of the cruel taskmaster.

“If these views are correct, it will follow that the time has come when Friends should be convinced that consistency of conduct with the principles we profess, will lead us to a careful examination of the cause or causes, why our testimony against Slavery has been so inefficient; and should it be found that it has been owing in a great measure to our continuing to give it sanction and support, by hiring others to do that which we refuse to do ourselves, we certainly shall feel bound to refrain as much as possible from further participation in the fruits of oppression.

“If, through inattention to our duties on this subject, our connection with the system has been such, that it is almost or quite impossible that we can entirely abstain from participating in the consumption of slave-grown produce, instead of its affording us an apology for a continuance in thus giving our support to oppression, it should beget in us much earnest solicitude, that we might be enabled, even if it should be through much trial and deprivation, to clear our hands of the stain of this wicked system.

“The committee feels something of the responsibility that should rest upon them in considering this important subject, but the importance of the occasion, seems to us, rather than otherwise, to demand of us an energetic and zealous examination, that we may be willing and anxious to know the depth of our guilt in this case; that we no longer endeavor to satisfy our troubled consciences, with weak and deceitful excuses, such as that, ‘I cannot see that my abstaining will do anything for the abolition of Slavery.’ The abolition of Slavery should not be the only consideration in the examination of this question. The inquiry should be, is it morally right, thus to obtain and use the goods thus fraudulently obtained from the rightful owners? And when we have fairly considered and answered this question, it will become our indispens-

able duty to act accordingly, leaving the consequences to Him who holds in his own hands the disposal of events, and who will do right. May we be enabled in the light of Truth, clearly to discover and faithfully to perform our duty to all parties concerned; and thus to stand acquitted in the sight of that just and Omnipotent Being who is no respecter of persons."

CHAPTER III.

Free Labor Convention at Spiceland—Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting against the Abolitionists.

NOTWITHSTANDING the Anti-Slavery portion of Friends were thus repulsed and frowned down, they deemed faithfulness in the cause a matter of vital importance, not only in order to clear themselves of a participation in the sin of slave-holding, but as a means of enlisting the public mind against the system, and therefore could not abandon it. A large convention of Friends of Spiceland Quarterly meeting, was held at the time of that meeting preceding the Yearly Meeting in 1841, and the subject of the consumption of slave-labor produce was there pretty fully discussed. Many Friends then appeared to be quite alive and zealous in their opposition to the practice. The convention closed with the full prospect of having a more general meeting of the Society, some time in the course of the week of Yearly Meeting. When, however, that time arrived, instead of there being a general meeting of this character held, the very idea of any such meeting was scouted, and its projectors indignantly frowned down. Were any to be appointed members of the Meeting for Sufferings, it was sufficient for disqualification of any one, to be known to be an Abolitionist, or in favor of joining with others to aid the cause of the slave.

The clerk of the Women's Meeting was one of this number, and therefore the place she occupied must be filled by another in whom the meeting had confidence; but she was required to sit by to render to the Meeting the aid of her experience as clerk; thus endeavoring to secure the advantages of her qualifications, while publicly and notoriously impugning her character as a Friend. All this, though keenly felt, was patiently submitted to by the individual.

Some of those who had been so zealous in the convention spoken of, when they saw the amount of influence arrayed against the cause, turned immediately round and joined its opponents. Many others staggered, faltered, and finally stumbled over on to the same ground; or at best, into a state of acquiescence.

But to go back a little; the Colonization and Anti-Abolition party now having gained the ascendancy, and not satisfied with having prohibited members of Society from making any efforts for the relief of the bondman, in the Meeting for Sufferings of this year, 1841, issued the following prohibitory advice to Friends against granting the use of their meeting-houses to accommodate Anti-Slavery meetings; and the Yearly Meeting, when it convened, sanctioned the document, and copied it into its Minutes. As the reasons for issuing the advice are therein offered, I give the article entire.

“ To the Quarterly and Monthly meetings of Friends in Indiana Yearly Meeting, and to Friends individually.

“ Information having reached this meeting that some of our meeting-houses have been opened for the purpose of holding Anti-Slavery meetings and delivering lectures, we feel concerned to advise against such a practice, as being contrary to the general usage of Society, and of hurtful tendency to our members.

“ The meeting has, also, been brought into painful concern on account of the publication and circulation by members of this Yearly Meeting, of a recent Address

written by a member of our Society, on the subject of one of our important testimonies, but which had not undergone the examination of a Meeting for Sufferings, agreeably to the requisitions of our Discipline. As such acts may affect the reputation of our religious Society, and may disturb its harmony, which has been the case in the instance before us, we feel called upon to express our disapprobation of such proceedings. There are, also, some periodicals within our limits, conducted under the character and style of Friends, whose object seems to be the promotion and advancement of our testimony against Slavery; but not being under our supervision, we cannot consistently give them our sanction, nor be responsible in any way for their contents.

“And as the subject of Slavery is producing great excitement in our land, we again tenderly advise our dear friends, not to join in association with those who do not profess to wait for divine direction in such important concerns; lest if we overact the part called for at our hands, we injure the righteous cause, and suffer loss ourselves; comparable to what is said of Ephraim of old, ‘he mixed himself among the people,’ ‘strangers have devoured his strength and he knoweth it not.’

“It is far from the wish of this meeting to induce, on the part of our members, an apathy of feeling on the deeply afflicting subject of Slavery. On the contrary, we desire that all may faithfully maintain this Christian testimony, and cherish a lively interest both for the oppressed and the oppressors. Thus maintaining our peaceable and Christian principles in unbroken harmony, we shall, we believe, be enabled, as way may open, more availingly to plead the cause of this much-injured race of our fellow-men, and retain the place and influence which, as a Society, we have heretofore had with the rulers of our land.

“Let us, therefore, abide under the weight of this concern, attentively watching for every right opening to move therein, in our united capacity, and thus, too, when clothed with the spirit of supplication, our petitions will

be put up to the great Ruler of the universe, that it may please him to hasten the day when Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands unto God, under the enjoyment of universal liberty."

It may be proper to state that the address here alluded to, written by a member of our Society, is the production of Joseph Sturge, of England. And in order that the reader may be enabled to judge whether it is of a character to produce such consequences as attributed to it, I will here give it a place. As respects the assertion that holding Anti-Slavery meetings in our meeting-houses was "contrary to the general usage of Society," the reader has already been presented with proof to the contrary in the Introduction to the present work.

CHAPTER IV.

Address of Joseph Sturge to Friends in the United States.

"To the Members of the religious Society of Friends in the United States of America.

"DEAR FRIENDS:—Having for many years believed it to be my duty to devote a considerable portion of my time and attention to the promotion of the abolition of Slavery and the Slave-trade, I have acted in cordial co-operation with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society since its foundation. The principles of that society may be briefly explained by the following extract from its constitution: 'That so long as Slavery exists, there is no reasonable prospect of the annihilation of the Slave-trade, and of extinguishing the sale and barter of human beings; that the extinction of Slavery and the Slave-trade will be attained most effectually, by the employment of those means, which are of a moral, religious, and pacific

character; and that no measures be resorted to by this Society, in the prosecution of its objects, but such as are in entire accordance with these principles.'

"My visit to this country had reference, in a great measure, to the objects for which this Society was established. But although I left my native land with the general approbation and full unity of my friends, they concurred with me in opinion, that any *official* document, beyond a certificate from my Monthly meeting, expressive of sympathy with my engagement, might rather obstruct than promote the end I had in view. I was desirous of a personal interchange of sentiment with many of the Abolitionists in this land, upon matters having an important bearing upon our future exertions. The warm attachment which I have ever felt to the religious Society with which I am connected, and the ready co-operation of its members with their Christian neighbors in promoting this cause in Great Britain, inclines me to embrace every suitable opportunity to communicate with Friends of this country, and I have been encouraged, not only by the great personal kindness I have received from them generally, but also by the lively interest expressed by most on the subject of emancipation wherever I have introduced it.

"A further acquaintance with Friends in the compass of three or four Yearly Meetings, in which my lot has been cast, and my inquiries respecting the state of other Yearly Meetings, has convinced me that a large number of their most consistent members, including many aged and universally respected Friends, are desirous of embracing every right opening, both individually and collectively, for the promotion of the abolition cause; and while they are fully aware that there are reasons growing out of the existing state of things, which render great circumspection necessary, they can see no good ground for believing that the manner in which Friends of this country of a former generation, labored for the liberation of the slave, was not under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth.

“This is, now, the course pursued by Friends generally in England. That there may be no misapprehension as to the conduct of Friends with regard to this subject in Great Britain, I may mention that I am the bearer of a document expressive of unity with my visit, signed by William Allen, Josiah Forster, William Forster, George Stacey, Samuel Fox, George W. Alexander, and Robert Forster, who declare themselves fellow-members with myself of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Committee; this committee is composed of persons of various religious denominations, among whom, it will be seen, are many of the prominent members of our Meeting for Sufferings. Upon the list of delegates to the late Anti-Slavery Convention in London, are the names of nearly one hundred well-known Friends, including those of four who are, or have been, Clerks of the Yearly Meeting; and the present clerk of that meeting, my esteemed friend, Geo. Stacey, took an active part, and rendered essential service in the convention. The meeting-house in Grace Church street, was freely granted by Friends in London, who have charge of it, for the use of the convention; and the concluding sittings of that body were held in it.

“In fact, Friends generally in England think it their duty to render every aid in their power to the Anti-Slavery cause, whether in their collective capacity, or individually, uniting with their fellow-citizens, when they can do so without any compromise of our religious principles and testimonies. I speak more explicitly on this point, because I have ascertained, with much concern, that there is an influential portion of the Society, including, I have no doubt, many sincere Abolitionists, who have been so fearful that the testimonies of the Society might suffer by any union with others, that they have not only avoided such a co-operation themselves, but have dissuaded those of their brethren who believed it incumbent upon them to act otherwise; and in one Yearly Meeting, at least, I have much reason to fear they have tacitly, if not actively, sanctioned the omission of the names of Friends on meeting appointments, however

consistent in their conduct and concern for the welfare of Society, simply because they have felt it their duty to act with persons of other denominations in promoting the abolition of Slavery. Thus, in appearance, at least, throwing the whole weight and influence of the Society in its collective capacity, against a movement which, although doubtless partaking of the imperfections attendant upon all human instrumentality, has already aroused the whole country to a sense of the wrongs of the slave, and secured to the nominally free colored citizens, in many of the States, rights of which they have been so long and so unjustly deprived.

“ Though I can hardly expect that anything from one entertaining my views of the subject, can have much weight with those Friends, who, with a full understanding of the heavy responsibility they were assuming, have discountenanced Anti-Slavery exertions, and the use of our meeting-houses, even by consistent members, for the purpose of giving information on the subject;* yet, as it has occasioned me no small degree of anxiety, both in reference to the Anti-Slavery cause and the Society of Friends itself, I believe I cannot return to my native land with peace of mind, without earnestly and affectionately pressing upon such Friends the great importance of a careful examination of the ground they have taken. Our unwearied adversary is sometimes permitted to lead us into the most fearful errors, when he assumes the appearance of an angel of light. And is there not great danger in encouraging the young and inexperienced to suppose that the maintenance of any of our testimonies may be neglected, except when we feel a Divine intimation to uphold them? And may it not open the door to great

* It is right to state that I was much encouraged by the lively expression of sympathy in the Anti-Slavery cause, in the Yearly Meetings of Philadelphia and New York. That at the former place, Friends opened a room in the meeting-house for my friend, John Candler, to give some information on the subject; and at New York, the large meeting-house was not only readily granted to him and me for the same purpose, but the Clerks of the Yearly Meeting kindly gave notice and invited Friends to attend.

laxity in our practice? While I fully believe that the true disciple of Christ will be favored with the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, whenever it is needful to direct his steps; it appears to me especially important that, in matters of self-sacrifice, and conflicting with our worldly interest or reputation, we should guard against being deluded into a neglect of duty, by waiting for this direct, divine intimation, where the path of duty is obvious and clearly understood, and when testimonies are concerned, which we have long considered it our duty on all occasions to support. If, under such a view of the subject, we do believe it to be our duty to cease to act ourselves, and discourage our brethren from laboring in the cause of the slave, a close examination surely is needful in order to ascertain if we are consistently carrying out the same principles in our daily walks in life—in our mercantile transactions—our investments of property—in our connection with public institutions, and with political parties.

“It should be borne in perpetual recollection that we are in no small danger of shrinking from a faithful maintenance of those testimonies which are unpopular with the world, as well as of not seeing our own neglect of duty, while censuring the real or supposed indiscretion of others. Beside, if this good cause be really endangered by popular excitement and the indiscretion of its imprudent advocates, the obligation of consistent Friends to be found at their posts, faithfully maintaining the testimony of Truth on its behalf, is greatly increased. And it is under such circumstances that I think I have seen peculiar advantage and protection to our young Friends in England, of having their elder brethren with them, aiding them by their sympathy as well as advice and counsel. I am persuaded that those who are called to occupy the foremost ranks in Society, cannot be too careful not to impose a burden upon tender consciences by discouraging, either directly or indirectly, a course of conduct which is sanctioned by the precepts and examples of our divine Master, lest they alienate from us some of

his disciples, and thereby greatly injure the Society they are so laudably anxious to keep 'unspotted from the world.'

"We are told on the highest authority, that 'by their fruits' we are to judge of the laborers in the Christian vineyard; and while I am aware of the greater difficulties in the way of emancipation *here*, as compared with Great Britain, I have been almost irresistibly led to contrast the difference in the results of the course pursued by Friends in the two countries. In America, during the last twenty-five years, it is evident that Slavery and the Slave-trade have greatly increased, and even where the members of our Society are the most numerous and influential the prejudice against color is as strong as in any part of the world;* and Friends themselves, in many places, are by no means free from this prejudice. In Great Britain, Friends by Society action and by uniting with their fellow-countrymen, not only contributed, under Providence, in no small degree to the passage of the Act of 1834 for the abolition of Slavery in the British West Indies, but when it was found that the system of apprenticeship which this act introduced, was made an instrument of cruel oppression to the slaves, a renewal of similar labors for about twelve months, resulted in the *complete* emancipation of our colored brethren in those colonies.

"In closing this letter, I wish to address a few words to that numerous and valuable class of Friends, previously alluded to, with whom I deeply sympathize, who are only deterred from more active exertion by their reluctance to give dissatisfaction to those whom they respect. The sorrow which I feel under the consideration that in parting with many of you we never probably shall meet again in mutability, is softened by the persuasion that the difficulties by which you are surrounded are

* I should, I believe, do wrong to conceal the sorrow which I have felt that the scheme of African Colonization, the great support of which at the present time appears to be hostility to Anti-Slavery efforts and an un-Christian prejudice against color, still has the sympathy and the active aid of some members of our Society.

lessening, and that some who are now opposing you will ere long join you in efforts which shall remove from the minds both of Abolitionists and Slave-holders the belief so generally entertained, that the Society of Friends in this country are not earnestly engaged for the *total and immediate* abolition of Slavery. No one regrets more than myself that any friends to the cause of Abolition should connect other topics with it, which however suitable to be discussed on their own merits must necessarily interfere with this simple and momentous object. You are aware of some of the circumstances which may have led to the state of feeling with many in our Society which we so much deplore. And it is my fervent desire that none of you, in any steps you may consider it your duty to take, may afford just cause of uneasiness by any compromise of Christian principle, any improper harshness of language, or by the introduction of any subjects not strictly belonging to the Anti-Slavery cause. Your situation is one of peculiar difficulty and delicacy. Both from a regard to your own religious Society and the suffering slave, you have need to exercise great watchfulness, and to cultivate feelings of brotherly love, and that 'charity which suffereth long and is kind.' The beautiful example of John Woolman, in this respect, is worthy of your imitation. His labors were for years far less encouraged by the leading influences of Society than your own at the present time. Yet we find, in reading his invaluable journal, no traces of bitterness or uncharitable feeling.

"Finally, dear friends of all classes, in thus freely addressing you I have written not only with a strong attachment to our religious Society, but I trust under a feeling of a degree of that love which is not confined to geographical boundaries or affected by color or by clime. The prayer of my heart is, that each of you may be willing to be made instrumental in the Divine hand in faithfully maintaining our Christian testimony against Slavery; bearing in mind that the labors of your ancestors have greatly increased your responsibility by separating you

from those influences which so deaden the feelings and harden the heart against the claims of our brethren in bonds. May these considerations, viewed in connection with the difficulties which obstruct the progress of emancipation in this land, stimulate you to increased exertion. And when you are summoned to the bar of that final tribunal toward which we are all hastening, may you have the inexpressible consolation of reflecting that you have performed all you could toward 'undoing the heavy burdens and letting the oppressed go free.'

"I am, very sincerely, your friend,

"JOSEPH STURGE.

"NEW YORK, *Seventh mo. 17th, 1841.*"

CHAPTER V.

Completion of the measures by the Yearly Meeting in 1842, which produced the Separation.

THE ISSUING of the advice to exclude Anti-Slavery meetings and lectures from our meeting-houses caused the deepest sensation in the Anti-Slavery ranks, not merely among Friends but all classes engaged in the work wherever Friends were located. The Anti-Slavery portion of Society had witnessed with very painful interest the first marked dereliction from correct principle by the Yearly Meeting; but this measure was far more poignant to their feelings, inasmuch as *Anti-Slavery meetings* were therein represented to be of "hurtful tendency to our members;" the opposition thus showing itself to be not merely against associating with other people, but against the enterprise which Friends had been endeavoring to promote by that association: and upon mature reflection they felt constrained to disobey the advice, knowing that the course urged was "contrary to the usage of Society;" being also well assured that it "would be of hurtful tendency to its members." Accordingly, wherever they had

the control of meeting-houses, Anti-Slavery meetings were admitted as previously had been the case.

It would seem now that the Yearly Meeting might have felt that it had cleared itself of the hateful stain of Abolitionism; as it had thrown the whole weight of its influence against the movement; but the proceedings of the next Yearly Meeting show the case to be different.

Meanwhile, Friends were urged to submit to the advice of the body by Ministers, Elders, and Friends of every description, except those truly Anti-Slavery; but with various arguments. By some it was held that unconditional submission was absolutely necessary to the existence of religious society. By others, if the Meeting was wrong in its advice, we must submit and throw the responsibility on the body. Others again contended positively that the advice was just right and in accordance with the Divine Mind, and that we had but to submit to the spirit of Truth, to submit to it. Many urged that we had no right to move in advance of the body; that admitting the Abolitionists to be correct, individuals should not move in the matter, till the Yearly Meeting was prepared for it—that we should not even name the subject of abstinence as necessary to be attended to because the Yearly Meeting had not taken it up, etc. These views were urged with pertinacity in different parts of the Yearly Meeting. Before the commencement of the Yearly Meeting for business this year, 1842, the plan of operation to enforce submission appears to have been projected in secret session by a portion of the leaders; which was in substance, that no person “opposed to the advice and travail of the body,” or in other words, who was an Abolitionist, should be appointed on any important business. At the opening of the Meeting, in order to carry it out, it was proposed and sanctioned, that names offered on committees should receive the sanction of several Friends before taken by the clerk.

In the course of its sessions, the Meeting for Sufferings reported eight of their number as disqualified to fill the stations they occupied in that body; because, as was

well understood, they were opposed to the advices and proceedings alluded to above. The Yearly Meeting approved its course, and addressed an "Epistle of Advice to subordinate meetings and to Friends individually," recommending those meetings, as will appear from the following extract, to carry out the same proscriptive policy to the remotest corner of Society:

"We are again concerned to warn all our dear friends against joining or participating in the excitement and over-active zeal of the Anti-Slavery Societies, and to be cautious about the kind of reading admitted into their families, as the effect of all those books and papers must be pernicious which have the tendency to set one part of Society against another, to lessen the value of our religious testimonies in our estimation, or to make us set light by the restraints of the advices or discipline of our Society. Let such beware, who perceive that the popular excitements of the day are producing these effects upon them, and seek quietness and retirement from these things before it be too late.

"Friends are advised to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to any of the important stations and committees in Society, so that faithful and trusty Friends may be chosen; as we believe that those who have distinguished themselves by opposition or disregard to the advices and travail of the body, are manifestly unsuitable for important services in it, while they remain in that situation."

The Anti-Slavery party alleged that if Friends were to follow the advice contained in a portion of the above, this Epistle could not be "admitted into their families," for nothing could be more certain, as they conceived, than that *it* would not only "have a tendency to set one part of Society against another," but that it did actually call upon one part to treat another as aliens and unworthy the name of brethren: not because they had violated any of the principles and testimonies of the Society, and thus become worthy of being treated as heathen men and publicans; but because they were

endeavoring to advance them, and that, too, by means in accordance with the general usage of Society and the former advice of the Yearly Meeting.

We have seen that eight of the members of the Meeting for Sufferings were to be removed and others appointed in their places. Some of these appointments were to take place in at least one of the Quarters where the Anti-Slavery feeling was strong; hence the necessity of appointing a committee to visit subordinate meetings with the aforesaid "Epistle of Advice." Twenty-two Friends, men and women, were deputed to attend to this business. The Select Yearly Meeting also drafted an Epistle of very similar import to its subordinate meetings, and likewise deputed a number of Friends to carry it down and endeavor to enforce submission to its requirements. Extracts from this Epistle will be observed in the course of the controversy, its insertion, therefore, I here omit.

CHAPTER VI.

First move of the Anti-Slavery party looking toward the re-organization of the Society.

SUCH was the condition in which the advocates of immediate and unconditional emancipation were now placed by the system of proscriptive measures, which the Yearly Meeting this year consummated. And let it be borne in mind that John Meader and Christopher Healy, ministers in attendance from the East, where the opposition to Abolition had been raging to a fearful height, and who brought a large share of it with them, had no small part in producing this lamentable state of affairs.

The following extract from an editorial in the "Free Labor Advocate," dated Tenth mo. 15th, 1842, will give the reader an account of the closing scene at this Yearly Meeting, and of what immediately followed:

“Anti-Slavery Friends being thus proscribed, and feeling themselves virtually cut off from all the benefits of religious society, found themselves in a very tried and painful situation. Thus circumstanced, it was perfectly natural and entirely reasonable that they should desire to confer together for the purpose of arriving at some conclusion, as to the proper course for them to pursue. With this view, a Friend arose during the last sitting of the Yearly Meeting, and proposed that those Friends who were favorable to the Anti-Slavery cause, and who felt aggrieved with the proceedings of the Yearly Meeting should remain in the house at the rise of the meeting, for the purpose of having such a conference. A considerable expression of unity with the proposition was made, and not one dissenting voice was heard.

“After the conclusion of the meeting, a large company assembled inside the house, many others having stepped out and not yet returned. Before any opportunity was had for conference, John Maxwell walked into the minister’s gallery, and in the name of the trustees, demanded of those present, an immediate evacuation of the house. He first called them Friends, then, as if correcting himself, he said he did not know whether they were Friends or not—he would call them people. A Friend immediately proposed, that as they were arbitrarily forbidden the use of the house for the purpose of conferring together, those favorable to such a conference, meet at Newport (ten miles north,) at 9 o’clock next morning. The proposition was united with, and the people retired.

“Next morning, notwithstanding many had from necessity started for home, a large assembly convened at Newport, and continued in conference till 11 o’clock, when it adjourned till 2 o’clock, P. M., to give place to the regular Week-day meeting. From 2 o’clock, the conference continued till near sunset. Entire harmony prevailed; the spirit of love and prayer overshadowed the meeting, under the influence of which, devout supplications went up to the throne of mercy and grace, for

Divine counsel and aid in this hour of sore conflict ; and the good presence of the Lord was sensibly felt to be with us, tendering our spirits together, and renewing our resolutions in the strength afforded us, from the source of all true strength to do battle against the great Juggernaut of Slavery, although in so doing, we may encounter the violence of mobocratic fury, the taunts and jeers of our fellow-citizens, and worse than all, the opposition and censure of our fellow-members of that Society whose principles we dearly love, and from whose bosom nothing but dire necessity can drive us. But dear as we hold the unity of the Church, we cannot sacrifice the Truth to maintain it ; and we pray for strength to remain true to the cause, though all men oppose it. If some of our opposers had been there, and heard what we heard, and felt what we felt, they would surely have been ashamed of the charge so often made against us, of working in our own strength.

“ It was unanimously agreed, to propose to Anti-Slavery Friends to be firm in the maintenance of their principles, and for the purpose of promoting harmony of action, to hold conferences in their respective locations.”

At the above meeting or conference, it was the conclusion of those present, to wait until it was known whether the committees to which I have alluded, from the Yearly Meeting and the Select body, would really carry out the proscriptive measures as enjoined upon them, in removing from their stations the Anti-Slavery part of Society, before any further action should be taken.

In the meantime, conferences at different places were held as proposed. At length Friends of Newport and vicinity, after witnessing the proceedings of those committees in New Garden Quarter, became thoroughly satisfied that they were determined to carry out their instructions to the very letter, met in convention on the 4th day of First mo., 1843, “ for the purpose,” as they say, “ of taking into consideration the anomalous and peculiarly tried situation in which we are placed by the arbitrary and proscriptive measures of a portion of the So-

ciety claiming to be 'the body,' [as] we are, on account of a practical adherence to our testimony against Slavery, cut off from all the beneficial privileges of membership in that religious Society whose principles we love, and whose testimonies are dear to our hearts; and for the purpose of adopting such measures as, in the openings of Truth, may appear to be productive of unity and harmony in our proceedings—the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause, and to secure to ourselves the privileges and benefits of religious Society, of which we have been unhappily deprived, contrary to the general usage, and established order and discipline of Society.

“After mature deliberation and a free interchange of sentiment, the following-named Friends were appointed to prepare an address to Friends generally, setting forth in a concise manner the result of our deliberation, embracing a call for a general convention of Friends at some suitable time and place, for the purpose of deliberating more fully upon the propriety of re-organizing the Yearly Meeting of Indiana upon the true principles, and in accordance with the discipline and usages of the Society of Friends, and in unity with the practice of the Yearly Meetings of London and Dublin.”

The committee appointed in accordance with the above Minute, whose names for sake of brevity are omitted, drew up and sent forth the following address.



CHAPTER VII.

“Address of a Conference of Friends, held at Newport, Wayne County, Indiana, First month 4th, 1843; to the Members of Indiana Yearly Meeting.”

“DEAR FRIENDS:—In deliberating at this time on the momentous subject which has called us together, our minds have been solemnly impressed with the very great

responsibility attached to the position we occupy in the religious Society of which we are members ; the influence of our conduct on the A. S. cause, and the duty which we owe to the community at large, as a component part of the fraternity of man, and especially as responsible members of the great slave-holding confederacy of the United States of America.

“ When we reflect, that in all probability the question, whether Slavery in this country, ‘ shall be abolished by peaceful legislation, or in the midst of bloodshed and violence,’ depends mainly, under Providence, on the success of the great A. S. enterprise now in progress ; as friends to the peace and happiness of our country, as well as the deliverance of millions of our fellow-beings from the unutterable horrors of ignominious bondage, we cannot but be alarmed at the persevering and increased opposition to the progress of the work, manifested in various ways, and under various pretenses, by the leading influences both in Church and State. In a particular manner, we deplore the opposition of the Church of Christ, so called, as presenting a greater obstacle to the peaceable termination of Slavery, than all other causes combined. And among the proscriptive measures of the various religious societies in our country, made use of for the purpose of preventing their members from active labors in the A. S. cause, none that we know of, have resorted to such a decided course of opposition as Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends ; and on account of the Anti-Slavery character of the Society established by the labors of our fathers, none, we believe, exert so powerful an influence to the disparagement of the work, to the lessening the probability of its acceptance by the nation, and of the peaceable accomplishment of the great work of emancipation, and consequently to increase in the same proportion the probability of a bloody termination of the evil.

With these views of the subject, it becomes us to inquire with deep concern what is required at our hands in regard to this great question, and to be very careful

that we do not, for the sake of 'retaining place and influence,' make a compromise with the opposition, and add the weight of our influence to that enormous load of guilt, which, like a millstone, is sinking Church and State into the vortex of ruin.

"In view of the proscriptive measures put in operation by our opposers, it becomes our duty to inquire what is required of us in order to secure the benefits of religious society.

"Without discipline, and contrary to the plain provisions thereof, eight members of the Meeting for Sufferings were reported disqualified, and four of them removed; the other four having been appointed by Quarterly meetings, are to be removed by them from their stations, without preferring any charge against them, or giving them any opportunity to answer for themselves, merely (as is well understood from the circumstances,) for bearing a faithful testimony against Slavery, in accordance with the practice of Friends generally of former years, and with the recent earnest recommendation of London Yearly Meeting, and the continued practice of our brethren in England. For our Anti-Slavery principles and practices, measures have been set on foot, and are being carried out in practice, to exclude us from participating in the affairs of Society; to remove Clerks, Overseers, members of committees, and Ministers and Elders from their stations, and to place us before the public under the character of offenders, lying under the censure of the Church.

"Being thus virtually cast out of the Society, so far as regards its benefits; it seems to us that our situation is very precarious; that in this position we are in danger, either of losing respect for religious society, or of compromising our principles, in order to produce a reconciliation with 'the body,' which is thus using all its influence to prevent the active exercise of our Anti-Slavery principles.

"Another consideration of importance is, that in our present situation our influence, as members of religious

society, is lost to the Society of which we are members and to the community at large. It cannot be expected that, censured and proscribed as we are, our testimony will be received by our opposers to the reformation of the Society, or that the people generally will be likely to pay that respect to our Anti-Slavery labors, which they might do under different circumstances.

“Under these views, and in accordance with the designs of the conference above-mentioned, we propose that a General Convention of members of Indiana Yearly Meeting be held at Newport, Wayne Co., Ia., on Second-day, the 6th of Second month, 1843, for the purpose set forth in the foregoing Minutes of our appointment.

“We hope that Friends, those in a particular manner who are favorable to the Anti-Slavery cause will feel bound to attend, if practicable, in order to aid by their counsels in coming to a correct decision on the momentous subject under consideration.”



CHAPTER VIII.

Remarks on the subject of the Call by the Editor of the Free-Labor Advocate—Letter and declaration of Charles Osborne.

THE object of the above call was justly deemed one of incalculable importance; and with feelings, no doubt, of this kind the editors of the Free-Labor Advocate at that time published the following additional, short, impressive, and very appropriate invitation in that paper:

“FRIENDS’ CONVENTION.

“We hope the Anti-Slavery Friends will not neglect to attend the Convention to be at this place on the 6th of next month. It is certainly an important concern; and those Friends who are not in favor of the measure proposed for consideration, should be sure to attend and

state their objections, that nothing may be done unadvisedly. It may be that the attendance of such will be a means of preventing an improper movement. Now is the time to make objections before any decisive steps are taken. If some of our friends believe we are about to pursue an improper course, it is certainly their duty to endeavor to show us our error before the final step is taken. Come, let us reason together."

The above exhibits the spirit that prevailed in the Anti-Slavery party throughout the whole struggle; that is, a manifest desire for a fair, full, candid, and impartial examination, without infringing on the rights and privileges of any. They would gladly have met their strongest opposers, and listened to every argument they could produce against their own principles and measures, or any course they thought right to pursue; but a directly opposite course was a prominent feature in the proceedings of the opposite party, both as regarded meetings and individuals.

Charles Osborne, who, as I have already intimated, was one of the most conspicuous of the Anti-Slavery party, and one which, as the present work discloses, was removed from the Meeting for Sufferings for his faithfulness to the Anti-Slavery cause, after witnessing to his great sorrow the course of the Yearly Meeting, thought it his duty to publish a declaration of his principles relative to Slavery, which, considering the position he so long occupied in the Society of Friends as an approved and highly esteemed Minister, I deem proper to insert at large. It was written, as will appear from the date of the accompanying letter to the editors of the Advocate (which I will also lay before the reader), previous to the meeting of the General Convention of Friends, and will, therefore, as regards the order of time, more properly come in here.

"YOUNG'S PRAIRIE, CASS COUNTY, MICHIGAN,
Twelfth Month 31, 1842.

"H. H. FAY AND B. STANTON:

"Dear Friends:—I forward, for publication, my principles relative to Slavery, with the cause why I have been

removed from the Meeting for Sufferings. Also a notice to the Indiana State Anti-Slavery Society, showing that I accept the appointment to the World's Convention; that all may see that I am still willing to serve the cause of universal emancipation as far as circumstances and my humble abilities will enable me to do. Short of this, I cannot conceive how I could stand clear of the sin of oppression in the Divine sight.

“The present is a time of deep trial to the friends of *this most righteous cause*; especially in our land. Most of our rulers, both in Church and State, are to be found uniting in, and helping to keep up, the popular outcry against Abolition; some openly and undisguised, others put on much sanctimony, and profess to be Abolitionists and real friends of the slave, yet by their acts clearly demonstrate that they cherish more than a common ‘*lively interest for the oppressor.*’ The influence of the latter class, I conceive to be far more deadly and better calculated to support the system of American Slavery than the former. Had it not been for such religious Abolitionists as these, who love the praise of man more than the praise of God, Slavery would long since have been banished from our boasted land of liberty, if not from the world. It is to this class of Abolition-Colonizationists—deplorers and supporters of Slavery—that we have to ascribe our unprecedented trials in the Society we love, the religious principles of which we have conscientiously received to hold and carry out in practice. It being for this we are deemed disqualified members, not fit to participate in transacting the affairs of Society, it cannot be otherwise than a close and deep trial to the friends of the slave. We willingly acknowledge it is to us the greatest we ever met with in Society. For pleading the cause of the oppressed, we ourselves are put in bonds. We mourn for the state of our religious Society—we lament because our chain and the chain of our brethren in slavery are made heavy—because of the attempts and exertions of our brethren to add afflictions to our bonds! We remember those that are

in bonds as bound with them, and mourn because of the oppressor.

“Where then is our consolation? I answer, in the God of the oppressed—the friend of the poor and needy. He saith, ‘Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.’ He further said to his faithful followers, ‘Ye shall be hated of all nations for my sake.’ ‘Marvel not if the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you.’ Yes, my friends, this is our joy—our consolation, that we are so far like our divine Master, despised and rejected of men, and not esteemed. If we are persecuted, and not only bound, but put out of the pale of society, we still have the consolatory evidence of his Holy Spirit, with his promise, ‘Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life,’ to cheer and animate us, as well as to strengthen us in the belief that the cause we have espoused and for which we suffer, is a righteous one. Indeed for my own part, when I reflect on the opposition and consequent treatment which I have met with from my brethren in society because of my Anti-Slavery principles and an unwillingness to denounce Abolitionists, I feel inclined to respond to the language of the Apostle Paul on the subject of the resurrection: ‘If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable.’

“And now, dear friends, I fervently desire that all who are like our divine Master in sufferings, may also be like him in spirit, in firmness, and prayer. ‘Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.’

“It is a lamentable fact, that among all the professed Christian churches in the United States, there are none to be found that are not in some way or other contributing to the support of Slavery. And who cannot see that such a Christianity has a strong tendency to prevent the advancement of righteousness on the earth, to cause the heathen nations to be slow in receiving the truths of the Gospel, and make infidels of many who have in degree received a Christian education? It would be a credit to the Christian name were there even one society bearing

a faithful testimony against Slavery. And we must be slow indeed if we do not perceive that on us it now devolves to say, whether there shall any longer be a Society of Anti-Slavery Friends in this land or not. Let all our Friends who are virtually cut off from the communion and fellowship of Society for their conscientious endeavors to carry out their testimony against Slavery, by abstaining from slave-labor and refusing to vote for pro-slavery candidates, still bear in mind that they are acting in strict accordance with the spirit of the Discipline and with the Gospel of Christ, and that they ought not to be terrified and driven back because of church censure, nor because of the cry raised against them of 'wild fanaticism,' 'disorganizers,' 'giving their strength to the Abolitionists,' etc. For it is plain that religious duty calls us to speak out and let all know that we do intend, through Divine assistance, to bear a consistent testimony against the sin of Slavery, as far as may be in our power. For what good, we ask, will our testimony do against any evil, while we continue to give it that support without which it could not exist?

"With a salutation of love to you and all our Anti-Slavery friends in your parts, I remain your friend,

"CHARLES OSBORNE."

A DECLARATION.

"Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed, to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey, and that they may rob the fatherless."—Isa. x, 1, 2.

"TO ALL TO WHOM THIS MAY COME.

"Grace be unto you, and peace from Him who came 'to preach deliverance to the captives,' and 'to set at liberty them that are bruised.'

"I have found it to be my indispensable duty to declare to the world my belief of the repugnancy of Slavery to the Christian religion. It, therefore, remains to be my continued concern to bear testimony against holding our fellow-men in bondage. And at the present time, I

apprehend it to be incumbent on each individual to deeply consider his own particular share in this testimony. The slow progress in the emancipation of the slaves, I lament; nevertheless, I do not despair of their ultimate enlargement.

“And I desire that the friends of humanity everywhere may not suffer the deplorable condition of our enslaved fellow-beings, to lose its force upon their minds through the delay which the opposition of interested men may occasion in this work of justice and mercy; but rather be animated to consider that the longer the opposition remains, the greater is the necessity on the side of righteousness and benevolence for their steady perseverance in pleading their cause.

“Amidst my sympathies for the sufferers, I do not forget to cultivate those sensations which direct the mind in pity toward the deplorable state of those men, whether in foreign countries or our own, who promote, procure, and execute the tearing away of the Africans from their native land, as well as those who detain them in *slavery*, remembering that they are men equally interested with myself in the rewards of futurity.

“Believing, therefore, as I do, that a just and dreadful retribution awaits the unrepenting and obdurate oppressor, at that awful tribunal where sophistry will not prevail to exculpate, I seek for, and cherish that disposition of mind, which can pray for these enemies of humanity, and fervently breathe for their restoration to soundness of judgment and purity of principle.

“I believe, also, that a proper regard to this testimony would lead all the friends of humanity to conscientiously avoid becoming accessory to any step whereby Slavery may be strengthened or prolonged, and consequently, to throw their influence in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation.

“The Gospel and Slavery are as utterly irreconcilable, and as much opposed to each other, as Christ and Belial, light and darkness. I, therefore, do believe, that it is

the imperative duty of every one that nameth the name of Christ, to depart from this *great* iniquity.

“As relates to Colonization, I believe the American Colonization Society is iniquitous; because it traduces the free people of color, sanctions and strengthens existing prejudice against them, discourages and opposes their elevation in this country, and countenances oppression, to induce them to leave their native land in quest of some more hospitable region, and, at the same time, proposes to secure the master in the possession of his *human property*; thus it tends to fortify and prolong Slavery.

“And now for the clearing of Truth; I believe it to be a duty that devolves on me thus publicly to state and make known that, for a conscientious adherence to the foregoing principles, I have been deemed a disqualified member, and removed from the Meeting for Sufferings, by the leading influences of the late Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends. And at the time when this business was before the meeting, I made a solemn appeal to them to have the cause of disqualification inserted in the Minutes, that wherever they might reach, the cause might appear also. But this request, however just and reasonable, was, after considerable discussion, denied me, contrary to the minds of many Friends.

“How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed! Lam. iv, 1.

“In the love of the truth, as it is in Jesus, remembering those that are in bonds as bound with them, I rest and remain as ever, a friend to religious liberty.

“CHARLES OSBORNE.

“*Twelfth mo., 1842.*”

It will be observed by the reader, familiar with the discipline of Indiana Yearly Meeting, that the writer of the above took a considerable portion of it from that book, from the Society's standing declaration relative to Slavery, and the duty of members in regard to it, and made it his own. In doing this, he appears to have had two objects

in view: first, to declare his own views and sentiments; and, secondly, to show that he was engaged in carrying out the very principles the Society adopted in former days; and that for doing this he was then under censure, and that the scale had so changed that the "opposition of interested men," which the framers of the Discipline endeavored to fortify the members of Society against, had been signally arrayed against himself *by members*, and those, too, who were leaders in the Society.

CHAPTER IX.

Proceedings of the Convention to consider the subject of Re-Organizing the Society—Its Declaration.

At the time and place proposed for the Convention which had been called, a considerable number of Friends assembled. The vast importance of the subject for the decision of which they had convened, seemed to spread a deep and solemn feeling over the congregation—a feeling clearly depicted in the countenances of the assembly.

After a very thorough investigation, which lasted the greater part of two days, and in which every side of the picture passed in review, the meeting came to the conclusion, as set forth in the following Minute:

“In consequence of the departure of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends from the true and genuine principles of the Society, in regard to our testimony against Slavery, and because of its arbitrary, proscriptive, and unchristian measures, a meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, convened at Newport, Wayne county, Indiana, and, after giving the subject a serious and deliberate examination, it was the unanimous conclusion that the circumstances under which we are now placed, render it indispensably necessary to separate ourselves therefrom. We, therefore, now, the Seventh day of Second month, 1843, associate ourselves together as a religious society, in the capacity

of a Yearly Meeting, under the title of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, embracing in its limits all those members of the Indiana Yearly Meeting, who adhere to the genuine principles of the Society, residing in the district described in the Discipline of the Yearly Meeting from which we now separate ourselves."

The meeting, then, entered into measures for a thorough organization, or rather re-organization of the Society of Friends. It issued various documents, including an Epistle to each of the Yearly Meetings, excepting, of course, that of Indiana; and, after transacting a large amount of business, all in much brotherly love, and in the blessed unity of the Spirit, (a desideratum with many Friends for years previous, without the possibility of its realization,) the meeting closed, with the conclusion to meet again on the first Second-day of the Ninth month of the same year.

Among the documents issued, the most important is a Declaration, setting forth the facts, which, in the opinion of the meeting, rendered it obligatory upon those who composed it, to take the steps they did. Here it is:

DECLARATION.

"We feel ourselves called upon, by the circumstances in which we are placed, in justice to ourselves, to the Society of Friends throughout the world, to the cause of truth and righteousness in the earth, and by a just regard to the feelings of the community at large, to make a public declaration of the causes by which we have been driven into our present position. It is reasonable to expect that the public should be desirous of information on this subject; and we believe it right that we should make them acquainted with the circumstances which have reduced us to the necessity of separating from those with whom we have formerly been in connection, and to organize ourselves into a Society of Friends, upon the true principles of that Society, in which we may enjoy those religious privileges and benefits which we highly prize, and of which we have been arbitrarily and unhappily deprived.

by the proscriptive measures of the ruling part of the Yearly Meeting.

“Before we proceed to the statement of the causes of separation, it will be proper to declare that we have not separated from the principles of the Society, nor from its testimonies and discipline, but from that body of members who have departed from our testimony against Slavery, and from a due respect to the Discipline. We wish it distinctly understood that we have adopted no new doctrine, nor any new system of church government; that we claim to be, in the strictest sense of the word, a *Society of Friends*, with no other nominal distinction in the title which we have adopted, than that which is necessary to distinguish us from those from whom we have separated, and to express our adherence to our well known testimony against Slavery.

“Although it is a humiliating consideration, yet by a reference to the history of the past, we find that there is a universal liability in all associations, both civil and religious, to deterioration and corruption. Even the first Christian church organization, the purest the world ever witnessed, departing little by little from the Truth as it is in Jesus, finally arrived at such a state of depravity, as to advocate or connive at all kinds of wickedness—at the very works of the devil himself, which the great Author of the religion it professed, came into the world to destroy.

“By yielding to the convictions of Truth upon their understandings, the primitive Friends were not only enabled to discover many of the corruptions which had gradually found their way into Christendom, but were, also, induced to bear a faithful testimony against them. They separated themselves from those religious communities with which they were formerly connected, and in order that they might have an opportunity to strengthen and encourage one another in the support of their religious principles and testimonies, they formed themselves into a distinct religious society.

“And although they seem to have taken the greatest

precaution in order to prevent a recurrence of similar corruptions and abuses in the Church, as appears by their various lucid declarations of sentiment, their powerful reasoning in support of their principles and doctrines, and their forcible and scriptural definition of the power and authority of the Church, as well as the duty and obligation resting upon its individual members, relative thereto, showing that without the aid and assistance of the power and spirit of God leading thereto, no decision or decree of the Church is available, and that "it is the duty of each individual member to assent to the judgment of Truth, whether pronounced by few or many, independent of any *worldly* or selfish consideration." Yet facts and circumstances connected with the Society in this country at the present time, sorrowfully demonstrate the inefficiency of all this, good as it is in itself, without a frequent and effectual recurrence to first principles, without that deep and heartfelt concern to ascertain the Truth, and to perform that which duty requires at our hands, which is the only conservative exercise calculated to prevent the influx of that natural depravity, as we before observed, to which all such institutions are liable.

"As the Society of Friends was first gathered, and that most emphatically under the influence of this concern and exercise, so by the descending of the same mantle upon their successors, it was enabled to see the entire sinfulness of various practices, which in its infancy, escaped attention; such as buying, selling, and holding slaves, the use of intoxicating drinks, etc.; and so long as it as a body continued in this situation, there was a gradual approximation to perfection in its testimonies. Through the unremitted labors of Woolman, Benezet, and kindred spirits, Friends of the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia cleared themselves from holding slaves, from whence the concern spread to the other Yearly Meetings on the continent with the same happy result. About this time, James Pemberton, Warner Mifflin, and many other Friends, eminent for their piety and virtue, apprehending that much advantage to the cause of the op-

pressed Africans might be derived from duly enlisting all classes of the community in their behalf, engaged in the formation of associations for that purpose, within the limits of several of the Yearly Meetings, and the most gratifying consequences were the result. Under the influence of these societies, feelings of friendship and commiseration for this oppressed and deeply injured people increased and spread through the country, until public sentiment became so changed as to abolish slavery by law in seven of the original states of this confederacy. But after much good had been effected, through the agency of these institutions, a combination of adverse circumstances conspired to change the current of feeling. The hand of cruel avarice became afresh nerved to its unholy grasp by the prospect of extensive gain, through the facilities offered by the invention of the cotton gin. This prospect and desire of gain was not confined to those immediately engaged in holding slaves, but extended with lamentable effect to many of those in the Free states inclined to enter into mercantile or manufacturing operations. This class included a number of the most wealthy and influential in the Society of Friends, in the middle and eastern states, and the natural and consequent intercourse between them and the slaveholders of the south, had a direct tendency to leaven them into the same lordly, pompous, and intolerant feeling.* This circumstance, taken in connection with that

* We believe it has been owing to a considerable extent to the influence and agency of this class in the east, that the opponents of the Anti-Slavery cause at present among us, have succeeded in so completely changing the character of the proceedings of our Yearly Meeting. It has also been through their representations, or rather misrepresentations, that some of our Trans-Atlantic brethren have been induced to join them in opposition to us. They have persuaded them that a difference of circumstances exist between England and America, and such as to render it altogether improper to engage in an enterprise in the latter, which it would be right to approve and promote in the former.

This difference, however, although repeatedly asked for, and recently, attempted to be given, has never been exhibited to us. On the contrary; their objections to Friends joining with others, are such as all must

of the formation and active operation of the Colonization Society, instituted mainly by slave-holders, and purposely for the removal of the 'free people of color' from the country, and in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us, almost sealed the fate of genuine Anti-Slavery feeling in the Society. Those associations, instituted for the purpose of creating this feeling, were suffered to go down, and the energies and resources of the people prostituted to that of sending out of the country, those who already enjoyed personal freedom, instead of their being applied to the alleviation of the distresses of the bondman. In short, the cold hand of apathy, and the still more withering influence of an inveterate prejudice, spread almost a universal gloom around the cause of African freedom. There were still, however, those in different parts of the country who bore a decided testimony against the spirit of the times. In 1832, a resuscitation of the Anti-Slavery cause commenced in one of the eastern states.

"But the appearance of animation being but small at first, but little apprehension of its becoming an efficient organization was entertained by many of its enemies until some time afterward. And although no Anti-Slavery society existed within the limits of this Yearly Meeting until several years subsequent to the above date, yet there were a number of those among us who bore testimony against the spirit to which we have referred. This number, holding an influence to some extent in the Society, the Yearly Meeting in 1836, issued the following Advice relative to the subject under consideration :

" " We feel ourselves called upon at the present time, affectionately and tenderly, to caution all our dear friends to take no part in, nor render any aid to, any political association on the subject of African Slavery, which is, or may be, founded on principles either directly or indirectly having a tendency to promote the unrighteous

see, upon moderate reflection, are equally applicable to the Society on both sides of the Atlantic.

work of expatriation ; it being our settled conviction that this work, as a condition to the slaves being liberated, is unjust and oppressive.' Advices similar to this, were issued at different successive periods, and much care taken to speak in an encouraging manner, in regard to those engaged in the present Anti-Slavery enterprise ; 'and Friends affectionately advised to be so alive to our testimony against Slavery, as, neither through prejudice or otherwise, to cast any discouragement in the way of those who are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation, whether such laborers be found within or without the pale of Society,' but to 'endeavor to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people, by giving circulation to such publications as are calculated to advance the cause of immediate emancipation on Christian principles.'

“ ‘ And a concern has been felt to arise, that Friends generally, may be stirred up to renewed diligence, in faithfully maintaining our testimony against Slavery, not shrinking therefrom on account of opposition, or the fear of persecution ; but that we may individually be willing in true simplicity, to inquire whether there is not something for us to do for this suffering portion of our fellow-creatures. We do not wish any to engage in active measures on any other ground than a sense of duty, and in accordance with our well-known principles, yet we would encourage all to a close examination as to what is required at their hands, and how they may employ the talents committed to them for noble purposes, in the advancement of the blessed work of universal emancipation, by meekly, yet boldly, either publicly or privately, pleading the cause of the oppressed.’ At the same time, however, some recommendations to consider whether the time had not come in which it would be most safe for members of our religious Society to abstain from mixing with others in benevolent associations, etc., were contained in the Minutes of the meeting ; and were no doubt the sentiments of some who were the real friends of immediate emancipation, and weightily considered by others of this

class, who like Pemberton and his worthy coadjutors in the cause, had joined with others in the formation of Anti-Slavery societies. But as they had become convinced of the necessity of 'endeavoring to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people,' and as they could not discover any plan which would so effectually facilitate the accomplishment of this desirable object, they could not for conscience' sake, abandon those societies which they had been instrumental in gathering; the good effects of which, had now become obvious, and thus cause the interest which had been excited in behalf of their suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, to languish or totally disappear; and seeing the work in which they were engaged, was so highly spoken of by the meeting, and that the advice on this head, was given on account of a fear that some of our principles might be compromised, and not in consequence of the actual existence of anything of the kind; they therefore continued actively engaged as before, confidently believing that preservation would be experienced in the performance of so necessary a work, although it might render them at times somewhat more exposed.

“ Here, it is worthy of remark, that ever since the issuing of the advices repudiating the Colonization scheme, there were some of our prominent members open advocates of that institution, who appeared to have been fired with indignation at the expression of such sentiments, evidently entertaining a settled purpose to prostrate the Anti-Slavery cause and its advocates in the Society, if ever a favorable opportunity should present. And now as this cause progressed, the main body of its enemies who had heretofore entertained but little apprehension of its success, and who had remained apparently in almost a state of indifference in regard to the subject, through the alarm taken and communicated by those of kindred spirits in the east, and by discovering the project so gratifying to their prejudices (the Colonization scheme,) to sink in public estimation, in consequence of the Anti-Slavery movement, together through the instrumentality

of the individuals above referred to, suddenly became aroused to action, and inspired with a determination to arrest its onward course. Hence, no time was lost at this favorable moment, in taking occasion from the circumstances in which we were placed by the Advices referred to, to cry out 'insubordination,' 'want of proper subordination to the authority of the church,' etc. Advice in regard to joining with others, from year to year grew more and more positive, gradually, however, becoming divested of the mask under which it was at first covered, and approximating as time advanced, and as the Anti-Slavery cause prospered, to the full development of that Pro-Slavery spirit which has so sorrowfully found its way into the bosom of Society, and which the following exhibition of facts and circumstances will serve more fully to illustrate.

"It should be recollected, that the advice of which we have been speaking, was originally intended by the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause, to refer to all benevolent societies without distinction. In 1840, in the renewal of the Advice, it was applied to two only, 'Abolition and Colonization Societies;' the latter of which, as before brought to view, had been specially condemned as being unjust and oppressive in its nature and tendencies, and hence it was artfully chained to the former, in order, if possible, to sink its character at least to an equal depth, without an open manifestation of special hostility thereto.

"In 1841, the opposition becoming more emboldened, it was again repeated, and confined to A. S. Societies altogether; and even the use of our meeting-houses was refused to such societies for their accommodation in the transaction of their business.

"At our last Yearly Meeting, in addition to this, not only those who had joined in these associations, but also such as had not, but yet could not for conscience' sake denounce others therefor, were by special act of the Meeting, deprived of any privilege in regard to the transaction of any of its important business, and subor-

dinate meetings were advised to pursue the same course of conduct down to the most remote and inferior branches ; and that ostensibly on account of their being opposed to the advice and travail of the body ; while at the same time, some who were the most forward in endeavoring to enforce submission to *this* advice, were of those who were actively engaged in mixed associations of a different character, and in supporting, both directly and indirectly, the Colonization scheme, which, as we have already shown, the Yearly Meeting not only advised against, but declared to be unjust and oppressive. In addition to this, it is notorious that many of the same class have for several years past, stood in open opposition to the Advices of the Meeting, on other important subjects.

“It may be proper here to state, that in order to avoid going contrary to the advice of the meeting by mixing with others, and at the same time, be engaged in spreading the concern, etc., agreeably to the requisition of the body, several associations were formed in different parts, composed of Friends only, for that purpose. But to our astonishment, as soon as we had taken this course, leading members of Society, active opponents to mixed associations, declared this to be more objectionable than the other. It was said that in Society, in Meetings for Discipline, were the places to labor in this cause.

“This, we readily admit to be correct, so far as relates to a reformation in Society only. But recently, when this has been attended to, and the state of Society represented to the Yearly Meeting, although bound by discipline, and all previous usage, as well as the very nature and design of the regulation, to notice the deficiencies reported, laboring for their removal, and to form the summary answers to the queries of the materials received from the Quarters, and notwithstanding several of these reported considerable deficiency in regard to our testimony against Slavery, yet the meeting independently, and without any regard thereto, most extraordinarily said, that ‘Friends bear a testimony against Slavery *as far as appears.*’

“According to our Discipline relative to this subject, which had its origin under the influence of that feeling which instituted the first Anti-Slavery organization, not only were members prohibited from holding or hiring slaves, and advised to avoid becoming executors or administrators to estates where slaves are bequeathed, but also recommended not to be accessory to any step whereby their bondage might be prolonged. Thus evidently opening a door for, and inviting the exercise of a tender conscience in regard to any course of conduct whatever, which we might become convinced would have this effect. The African committee, it is known, were appointed to have the care of the concerns of the people of color among us, on account of the disabilities under which they labor, and their liability to be kidnapped and carried into slavery.

“Being aware, upon reflection, that the consumption of the proceeds of slavery was the very thing which had reduced this people to a situation, demanding the appointment of such a committee, many Friends, members of this committee, deemed it important, in order to carry out its object, as well as the spirit and design of the Discipline above cited, that Friends should endeavor to avoid the use of such articles. Accordingly, one branch of the committee forwarded a report to its general meeting, treating the subject at some length, showing the impropriety and inconsistency of Friends sustaining a market for such productions. But when it was read in that body, it was spurned, it was rejected with manifest bitterness and contempt, and the subject prohibited being introduced again into the committee upon the allegation that it was foreign to its object. Supposing that the subject demanded a serious examination, at least, in some departments of Society, one of the Quarterly meetings, in its reports, forwarded a proposition or request to our last Yearly Meeting, to take into consideration, whether the use of such products was not a support to Slavery and the Slave Trade, and whether they were not essentially prize goods: but when it came before that

body, it refused to take any action whatever upon the subject.

“Near the commencement of our last Yearly Meeting, a rule was adopted, that no person who stood in opposition to the advice and travail of the body, should be appointed on any important business in the meeting; but it was evidently intended to be applied exclusively to those favorable to the Anti-Slavery enterprise; for the next day when an important committee was to be appointed, a Friend was named who had recently contributed in a pecuniary point of view to the support of the Colonization Society, which being known to some of our Friends, the circumstance was referred to in a manner showing the inconsistency of confirming such a nomination with the rule adopted, seeing his conduct was not only altogether contrary to the advice of a former meeting, but also, unlike that of Anti-Slavery Friends, of such a character as to encourage that which had been declared thereby to be ‘unjust and oppressive.’ But the nomination was promptly sustained by those who still retain their place and influence — they wished the Friend to serve the meeting as proposed. It was then publicly observed, that if, with the information received, the meeting should persevere in the course it seemed to be taking, it must be taken for granted that its former advice against aiding the Colonization scheme was now rescinded; to all of which the meeting deigned not to reply, but immediately progressed onward with its business.

“Henry Clay, the great champion of the Pro-Slavery Whig party, and intended candidate for the ensuing Presidency of the United States — the President of the American Colonization Society — the slave-holder and duelist, while on an electioneering tour to the State of Indiana, attended a political meeting at Richmond, in the time of Yearly Meeting, word being given out that it was his intention to attend the public meeting of Friends on First-day. His meeting was held on the day immediately preceding this, at which time a petition was presented to him, with near two thousand signatures

appended, requesting him to give liberty to those of his fellow-beings whom he had long deprived of their just and inalienable rights. In the course of his reply to this request, he said: 'I own about fifty slaves. I consider them as my property. We have an idea that whatever the law secures as property, is property.' He owned that Slavery was an evil, but, said he, 'the slaves must be prepared for freedom before they can receive that great boon; they must have moral cultivation. The Society of Friends take the right stand in relation to this subject,' etc. After this, a few Friends in behalf of those who desired to 'retain their place and influence,' took an opportunity to inform him that 'the Society had no hand in getting up this petition — they had no unity with its presentation — it was the work of a few Abolitionists,' or words to this effect. The Clerk of the meeting, on First-day morning, took him in his carriage to meeting, Friends taking care to seat him in one of the most conspicuous places in the house. After the close of the meeting, men and women, Ministers and Elders gathered around him in the Ministers' gallery, giving the strongest evidence by their introductions and salutations, of the high estimation in which they held him; he in return taking care to return the compliment with all the etiquette for which he is famed.

"In order properly to estimate the whole of this transaction it should be remembered, that Henry Clay was only a private man. True, he was an office-seeker, but not an office-holder. We were under no obligation to him as a ruler. Impartial justice, therefore, would have required just such treatment toward him, when coming into our assemblies as we would mete out to the 'poor man in vile raiment' with the same grade of moral character, otherwise 'we are partial in ourselves and become judges of evil thoughts, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.' Now see the contrast.

At the time of Yearly Meeting in 1841, Charles C. Burleigh, an eminent philanthropist from the East, came to Richmond on a mission to plead the cause of equal

and impartial justice — to plead the cause of millions of our innocent suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, who are not permitted to plead for themselves. But this man was treated with indignity — with utter contempt. He wished to hold meetings in and about Richmond. Friends closed their meeting-house doors against him, the doors of the public houses in town were closed also, and he was mobbed in the open street while addressing the people. He is a man of irreproachable character.

Thus it is evident, so far as an extensive tissue of facts and circumstances can establish, and so far as the fruit of a tree can manifest its character, that the influence by which the Yearly Meeting is now governed is Pro-Slavery, and that unsoundness lies at the bottom of the opposition with which we have been assailed. Various, however, are the grounds of this opposition with different individuals, and much too complicated to be fully described in our limits. But that which we doubt not is occupied by the greater number, is plainly alluded to in the following extract from the Epistle of Advice of 1841: 'Thus maintaining our peaceable and Christian principles in unbroken harmony, we shall, we believe, be enabled, as way opens, more availingly to plead the cause of this much-injured race of our fellow-men, *and retain the place and influence which, as a Society, we have heretofore had with the rulers of the land.*'

"The rulers of our land being such as have been chosen by a Pro-Slavery community, are consequently opposed to the Anti-Slavery cause. They hate it — they despise it. Hence it is rightly judged impossible to retain a place and influence with such men, and hold any connection therewith—it is, indeed, too unpopular.

"This leads us to notice some of the circumstances said to exist in England and not in America, which renders it right to join with others in the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause in that country, while in this an opposite course is necessary. In order to carry out the proscriptive and disfranchising measures to which we have referred, a large committee was appointed in the

Yearly Meeting, and one in the Select body to attend Subordinate Meetings. These have made considerable progress in the work. In one of the Quarterly meetings, in their labors to prove a difference of circumstances between the two countries, it was observed that, in 'England, it was the wealthy and influential part of the community with which Friends associated—the reverse of what was in practice in this country.' And again, 'that it was those in the foremost ranks of society among Friends, who engaged in the work there,' and consequently that it was the opposite class who had undertaken it here. In all this do we not clearly see that the Cross has become a stumbling-block? Wealth and influence, or in other words, 'power makes right.' The full development of this principle, truly, is that upon which the whole system of American Slavery stands. What has become of the self-denying example and the uncompromising zeal of a Fox, a Barclay, a Penn, or of the whole band of pioneers, in the reformation they commenced, with these their highly professing successors in a reform of no less importance to the welfare of the human family?

"Is it by thus yielding to the prejudices, or accommodating ourselves to the corrupt views and sentiments of those around us, or by conniving at their unhallowed deeds, that we should seek to promote the cause of truth and righteousness in the earth? In an interview which some of us had with this committee, one who stands about at the head of the opposition, observed that 'The Anti-Slavery Societies were almost universally hated, especially in the South, and that if Friends should connect themselves therewith, ministers of our Society could have no influence with the slaveholders, nor even travel safely among them. In the exercise of his gift, if he should feel it his duty to go to the South on a gospel mission, he wished to be so situated as to have some influence, and be in no danger of molestation whilst there.'

"This objection is a very common one, and it seems to be deemed proof positive that it is well grounded, when

they can refer to the friendly reception of a visit from those who are opposed to these societies, evidently being unmindful of, or disregarding, the Scripture declaration, 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you, for so did their fathers to the false prophets.'

"In accordance with the sweeping system of virtual disownment, to which we have referred, eight members of the Meeting for Sufferings were reported to the Yearly Meeting as unfit for the station, under the vague charge of disqualification. And the committee continued, to make further report, if other obnoxious members should be found. It should constantly be borne in mind that the professed cause of the adoption of these proscriptive measures, was that of some Friends going contrary to the advice and travail of the body; and surely a disregard of the general code of discipline should not be considered of less importance. That discipline authorizes the Meeting for Sufferings to suggest the removal of members of that body, only in consequence of their declining or greatly neglecting the attendance of said meeting; and as the members alluded to were among the most regular attendants thereof, we cannot but regard these proceedings as altogether arbitrary; for admitting the Yearly Meeting to have the power to make or change discipline at pleasure (as was observed), yet nothing of the kind has ever been done without making such, a special object of consideration. And besides this, it should be remembered that the Meeting for Sufferings is a subordinate meeting, but yet it reported those members, as disqualified, contrary to the plain letter of Discipline, and was sustained therein by the Yearly Meeting.

"When this subject came before the meeting, one of those thus presented, made request in their behalf in a humble and feeling manner, that the Minute should state the cause of their disqualification—it was their due—justice demanded it. But this request, although reasonable as it was, was refused to be granted by the ruling party. Thus they were publicly charged with that which merited ejection from that body, and yet deprived of

knowing in what it consisted, as to any official information. But to return to our narrative respecting the Yearly Meeting's committee and that from the Select body: the work assigned them is now under rapid progress. Ministers and Elders who do not abandon the Anti-Slavery societies, or turn their hand against such as do not, or, in other words, unite with the 'advice and travail of the body,' are by special direction, to be removed from their stations. Agreeably to the course adopted and most strenuously adhered to by the Yearly Meeting, these committees have endeavored to prohibit any examination of the subject, except on their own side. They have invariably manifested a disposition in meetings, not to hear the reasons we would advance in our behalf. In short, like the poor victims for which we plead, we are not permitted to plead for ourselves.

"When we take into consideration the awful state of public affairs in these United States, produced through the predominance of the slave-holding principle, and when, by the visible signs of the times, we are warned that the period cannot be very distant when Slavery will be abolished, either by peaceful legislation, or in the midst of violence and blood ('for the needy shall not always be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever'), and when we turn in our minds to all the noble and mighty achievements wrought through the agency of Anti-Slavery Societies, from the first efforts of Clarkson and his coadjutors to the final completion of British West India emancipation, including the efforts of similar societies in this country, by which the foul institution was abolished in seven of the original States, and when we reflect upon the vast amount of Anti-Slavery feeling at the present time in the United States, created through these instrumentalities, and that the State Anti-Slavery Society of Indiana and its auxiliaries would be much weakened without our assistance, the question arises, Can we then abandon the cause and be clear of our brother's blood? We cannot.

"This question being decided, the next is, is it better

for us to suffer ourselves to be separately disowned, and scattered abroad, to be deprived of the comforts, consolations and preserving influence of church fellowship, or to avail ourselves of our indisputable right to form a religious society in which we can enjoy these privileges? The answer to this inquiry, we apprehend, must be obvious to every sober and reflecting person who has any confidence in the usefulness of religious society. Consequently we have deemed it our duty to adopt the latter alternative. Many of us have for a considerable time labored with much anxious solicitude for the restoration or conversion of many of our brethren in Society, to soundness of judgment and purity of principle in regard to this subject, and as long as any door of hope was left unclosed, that this object could be effected, we have been made willing to suffer all the contumely they have seen meet to pour upon us; but by the proceedings already referred to, we have from all appearances, been completely shut out from any access to the feelings and consciences of a large number of our fellow members, who have thereby been taught to look upon us as transgressors, lying under the just and merited censure of the Society, and of course unworthy of their confidence and fellowship. And now, taking into consideration the natural and legitimate consequences of the bondman's bleeding cause, which must result from this unceasing and increasing opposition to its advocates, and that by thus remaining in a formal connection, even if we could, under present circumstances, we should give countenance to its unrighteous and anti-christian course; and also reflecting upon the situation in which the Society here is involved through the prevalence of that spirit which rejects that most necessary and salutary advice of our Discipline, to manage the affairs of Society in the spirit of meekness and wisdom, with decency, forbearance and love to each other; which issues advices and renders them equivalent to positive injunctions, without listening to, or in many instances even suffering the exhibition of the evidence of Truth against the propriety of their adoption, by a fair

and candid examination thereof—which closes the ear against the claims of bleeding humanity, by refusing to look into the subject of consuming the produce of the slave's toil, and the necessary tendency which such a practice has to perpetuate his sufferings; which will not allow liberty of conscience in the performance of so obvious a duty as that of uniting with our fellow-citizens in endeavoring to interest the community in behalf of the bondman, and which tramples the discipline and order of society under foot, in order to carry out its purposes! therefore we feel bound in justice to this most righteous cause, and in order to clear ourselves from any participation in the evils and guilt which would be the unavoidable consequence of the influence which our remaining in connection therewith would yield against the cause of humanity, publicly, to separate ourselves from that body, to obey the Scripture injunction, 'Come out of her my people that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues.'

“We wish not to be understood as denying that there is any Anti-Slavery feeling among the members of the Yearly Meeting, from which we have now seceded; on the contrary we doubt not but that many of them are desirous to promote immediate and unconditional emancipation, and are only restrained from active labors in the cause by the proscriptive measures of the 'Body' so called; measures which have been brought about chiefly by the agency of those individuals who, we believe, are too anxious to 'retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land.' Our opposers have argued for, and some who have appeared to be strong Abolitionists, seem to have adopted, the doctrine, that it is the duty of members to yield obedience to the authority of the Yearly Meeting even when its requisitions are contrary to their own convictions of what is right. Such we conceive to be in a very precarious situation, and in danger of quenching the spirit, in order to obey the body; and we would recommend to their serious consideration an excellent saying of William Penn:

“‘I abhor two principles in religion, and pity them that own them. The first is, obedience upon authority without conviction; and the other, destroying them that differ from me, for God’s sake. Such a religion is without judgment, though not without teeth; union is best if right. Else charity.’

“With entire consciousness of our innocence and the justice of our cause, we, in humble confidence in the protection of the God of the oppressed, submit that cause to Him who judgeth righteously.”

CHAPTER X.

An Epistle to London—One to Anti-Slavery Friends.

THE Epistle sent to London Yearly Meeting, is also a document which I deem worthy of a place here.

“The committee appointed yesterday to draft an address to the different Yearly Meetings of Friends, prepared them as required, with the exception of one to that of Indiana, which was thought not necessary at the present time, which were approved, and the Clerk directed to sign them on behalf of the meeting.

That to London Yearly Meeting is as follows:

“To the next Yearly Meeting of Friends to be held in London.”

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“Under a feeling sense of the responsibility resting on us, in consequence of the peculiar situation in which we are placed, and the measures which we have believed ourselves obliged to adopt in order to secure the privileges of religious society, of which we have been deprived by what we consider to be the arbitrary proceedings of the Yearly Meeting of which we have

heretofore been members, we feel that it will be but an act of candor and justice to address you, in order to make you acquainted with some of the circumstances which have led us to the disagreeable necessity of separating from our former religious connection and associating ourselves together as a distinct religious organization. All we ask of you is, that you will hear us with that candor with which we address you, judge of the propriety of our conduct impartially, and in the light of Truth, and then to extend to us that treatment which you conceive to be due. We think that by a careful examination of the whole case, you will readily perceive that we were placed in such a situation that we could not enjoy our religious privileges in our former connection, except at the expense of our principles, and that in order to remain in that Society, we were required to cease to act in accordance with our conscientious belief of required duty. As we could not consent to these conditions, we were reduced to the necessity of choosing, either to suffer ourselves to be scattered abroad, and to lose the preserving and strengthening influences of religious society altogether, or to take the steps that we have taken, and establish a society among ourselves, in which we can enjoy those inestimable privileges.

“To us it appears clear, that we were not only justifiable in pursuing the latter course, but that it was our imperious duty so to do. We were evidently deprived of our religious privileges in, and about to be driven out of, our own house (to speak figuratively), and in order to shelter ourselves from the inclemencies of the weather, we have been obliged to prepare another. Let not this figure be misrepresented. It relates only to the organization of the Church, upon the true principles, testimonies and discipline of the Society of Friends.

“We feel, beloved Friends, that we have a strong claim upon you for sympathy, for countenance and encouragement, inasmuch as we have been brought into our present situation in consequence of pursuing a course of conduct which we believed was required at our hands,

and in which we have been encouraged by your repeated and earnest advice, and the example of the most prominent, virtuous, and influential members of your meeting. The Anti-Slavery cause throughout the world is identical. It is true, that its advocates do not all agree precisely as to the best measures to be used in carrying it forward; but we have no knowledge of any measures advocated by any body of Abolitionists, that are inconsistent with your practice. A large portion of them believe in the use of what is termed "moral suasion," to the exclusion of political action; while another class believe in, and practice both. And if we are correctly informed, our Friends on your side of the water also make use of both these instrumentalities. But if it were even the case, that a portion of the organized associations did advocate and practice measures which are impolitic, inconsistent, or immoral, would that be a sufficient reason for deserting the cause? The absurdity of this course will be evident, when we reflect that this objection would be just as strong against identifying ourselves with any of the Church organizations for the promotion of Christianity. For it is evident that some of *them* advocate and practice things which we believe are radically wrong.

"We earnestly desire that our dear brethren of your Yearly Meeting, may not be misled by the specious but absurd objection that circumstances in the two countries render it right for Friends in England to join in the Anti-Slavery enterprise, while it is wrong for us in America to do the same thing. You may rest assured that the objections and arguments used here, against the practice, are just as strong on one side of the water as the other; and our opposers, by condemning us, virtually condemn you; and, indeed, some do not hesitate to censure your Anti-Slavery conduct in direct terms. When we reflect that your Meeting has contributed largely to the funds of an Anti-Slavery Society, composed of Friends and others, thus giving such associations the most unequivocal evidence of its approbation; and that in this country the Yearly Meeting has taken the most energetic measures to

put down all its members who unite in such associations, and even those who have not so united, but are not prepared to unite with those proscriptive measures; and to exclude the cause and its advocates from our meeting-houses, thus depriving them in many places of the opportunity of pleading the cause of the poor and needy, the conviction is forced upon us, that there is a radical error in the conduct of your Yearly Meeting, or of the old Yearly Meeting of Indiana.

“The contrast is exhibited in a glaring manner in the facts connected with the proposed World’s Convention, to be held in London in Sixth month next. The call for delegates was signed, as you know, by an esteemed member of your Meeting, as chairman of the Executive Committee of the British and Foreign A. S. Society; and for responding to that call, for taking part in appointing a delegate in compliance with that call, Friends here who thus acted, and the Friend who received the appointment, are obnoxious to severe censure. Now, can the Friends who were instrumental in making that call, when they meet in the capacity of the Yearly Meeting of London, take any steps which shall, even by implication, cast censure on that delegate, and when they meet in the World’s Convention receive him with cordiality, as they will be bound to do? We cannot, we will not believe that our dear friends will act thus inconsistently, and by discountenancing us, give the severest blow to the Anti-Slavery cause in this country which it has ever received.

“In the important measures which we have adopted, we put our confidence in the great Head of the Church, and in the principles of immutable Truth. We know the Lord can save by many or by few; and we believe in the truth of the promise of the Divine Master, ‘where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.’ Though we may, like our holy Redeemer, be ‘despised and rejected of men,’ yet ‘the Lord seeth not as man seeth; man judgeth by the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh at the heart.’

“For a more full statement of our case, we refer you to the Declaration issued by this meeting; a copy of which we herewith send you.

“With the salutation of our love, we remain your friends.”

The meeting *published* but one other document at this time, namely, an Address to the Anti-Slavery Friends within the limits of Indiana Yearly Meeting. I deem it worthy the attention of the reader. It is as follows:

“ADDRESS.

“*To the Anti-Slavery Friends within the limits of Indiana Yearly Meeting.*

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“In the love of the everlasting Gospel, that love which desires the present and eternal welfare of the whole human family, we salute you, and wish to encourage you to faithfulness in every good work.

“As many of you have not been with us at this time, to witness for yourselves the unanimity, the harmony, and brotherly condescension, by which our deliberations have been conducted, and, above all, the holy solemnity which has covered our assembly, we would say for your encouragement, that the overshadowing canopy of Divine regard has evidently been felt to cover us, and in reverent humility and self-abasedness we wish to ascribe all the praise to Him who has thus favored us with his holy presence, to the confirming of our souls in the belief that our thus assembling together has been owned by Him.

“It is only by a faithful discharge of known duty, that we can be entitled to hear the joyful language addressed to us, ‘well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.’

“Our separation from the Yearly Meeting, with which we have heretofore been connected (some of the reasons for which may be found in the ‘Declaration’ issued by

this meeting, and in various other documents which are before the public), has not been made without due reflection, and much anxious inquiry, with breathings of soul for proper direction in our tried situation, and strength to perform our duty, let our sufferings, in consequence thereof, be what they may. Our opposers who have been instrumental in promoting those measures by which we have been driven to the necessity of taking the important step, have urged upon us the doctrine of subordination to the Yearly Meeting as unlimited in its application, that we are bound by the decisions of that body in all cases whatsoever. This doctrine we hold to be an absurdity, very nearly bordering upon the papal heresy of infallibility.

“For it is clearly a Divine Truth that we are bound ‘to obey God rather than man.’ And to contend that we are absolutely bound to obey the decrees of any man or body of men, is to contend for the doctrine of infallibility. The true doctrine of subordination, we conceive to be this: the members of the Church are bound to be in subordination to its decisions while it acts under the influence of the Holy Spirit; because its acts, when so directed, are infallible, and consequently, in accordance with the Divine law. To assume that the Yearly Meeting acted under the Divine direction in requiring us to cease our labors in the Anti-Slavery cause, is but to beg the question. It is assuming, without proof, the very thing that we deny, and which we think is abundantly proved to be incorrect, by the contradictory and arbitrary measures that have been adopted in relation to this subject. If it be admitted that the Yearly Meeting may err, the whole doctrine of unqualified submission to its decisions falls to the ground. If the doctrine contended for by our opposing Friends be true, that it is the duty of members to submit, even to those decrees of their Church which require them to refrain from that which they firmly believe God requires at their hands, or to do that which they as firmly believe he forbids, then it is clear that all who have, at any time, testified against what they believe

to be the errors of their respective Churches, have been in error. We much desire that none of our Anti-Slavery Friends may be carried away by this specious but extremely dangerous doctrine, to the conclusion that it is their duty to submit to the requirements of the body, though they know them to be wrong. Though the unity of the brethren is invaluable, let us remember that that unity which is purchased by the sacrifice of Truth, or a dereliction of duty, is not 'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,' and can be productive of nothing but bitterness, in the end. Let all be subordinate to the Truth, and obey the dictates of the Spirit of Truth in their own souls, and this will lead them to the true doctrine of Church subordination, which, as we said before, is submission to the decisions of the Church, made under the influence of the Spirit of Christ, the great Head of the Church. This, dear friends, is the true doctrine of Friends, and any doctrine of subordination or submission beyond this, proceeds from the spirit of Anti-Christ.

"We wish, also, to warn our friends against the fallacious idea that they can refrain from their Anti-Slavery labors without sacrificing their principles. When our opposers tell you that they do not wish you to sacrifice your principles, believe them not. If you are actuated by true Anti-Slavery principles, they will lead you to Anti-Slavery action; and you cannot cease from the latter without sacrificing the former.

"Could the apostles have ceased from their labors—could they have used their influence to discourage those who were laboring in the cause, by shutting the temple and the synagogues against them, thus preventing them to the extent of their power from all opportunity of spreading the religion of Jesus—could they have declined to associate with their fellow-Christians, or attend Christian meetings, without sacrificing their principles? If they could, then can we comply with the requirements of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, without sacrificing our Anti-Slavery principles. We are frequently told

that we are not censured for being Abolitionists. The absurdity of this assertion, is as great as it would have been for the father of William Penn to have told him that he did not turn him out of doors for being a Quaker; or for the martyrs, when chained to the stake, surrounded with fire and fagot, to have been told, that they were not thus persecuted on account of their religion. Suppose, however, we could cease our active exertions in behalf of the Anti-Slavery cause, and retain our principles, what would they be worth? Like faith without works, they would be dead.

“If all the people in the United States were Abolitionists of this kind, of what advantage would their Abolition be to the suffering slave, writhing in agony and clanking his chains, or to our guilty country, reeling to and fro like a drunken man, under the judgments of an offended God?

“We have long believed that the time will come, when the system of American Slavery will be abolished, either in mercy or in judgment; and from the signs of the times, we are strongly inclined to the opinion, that the time draweth nigh. The ears of the Lord are open to the crying of the poor, and the sighing of the needy. He hath seen, He hath seen the affliction of his people, and hath heard their groaning; and we verily believe, He hath come down to deliver them. We are deeply impressed with the conviction, that the hand of the Lord is manifest in the present Anti-Slavery enterprise, that it is his offer of mercy to a guilty land, which, if it be rejected, may be the last. And how soon He may turn his hand in judgment upon us, none of us know. Under a view of these solemn considerations, we feel an awful responsibility resting on us, and are impressed with the necessity of a conscientious discharge of our duty in regard to this matter, being well assured, that a bare belief of the sinfulness of Slavery, without the necessary action, will not abolish the system—save our country from judgment, nor ourselves from blood guiltiness.

Let us then, dear Friends, be willing to do for the

advancement of this great cause, whatever our hand findeth to do, and to do it with our might; looking for success in our labors, to the blessing of Him who alone can prosper the work of our hands; for we well know that without such blessing, all our efforts will be unsuccessful. 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman watcheth but in vain.'

"And now, dear brethren and sisters, suffer, we beseech you, the word of exhortation. Be increasingly careful to maintain unsullied, all the doctrines and testimonies of the Gospel, as we have received them, to hold up to the world. Manifest by a holy life and conversation that you are truly devoted to the cause of your Holy Redeemer. Let not the world nor its allurements entice you from the true simplicity of the Gospel, that all around you may have the evidence, that while you are engaged in the lawful concerns of time, and in the promotion of the reformation of the world, your treasure is in Heaven. 'Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath.' 'As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men,' and earnestly seek after and cultivate that heavenly disposition which will enable you to pray for your enemies, and in truth and sincerity to say: 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.'"

CHAPTER XI.

The Policy of the Leaders in the Opposition to A. S. F., changed—
Address of their Meeting for Sufferings, touching the Separation.

As soon as the Separation was in *de facto* made, the leaders in the proscription all at once reversed their policy. Instead of carrying out the advices, and those too, which they had claimed to have come from Divine authority, they violated them as completely as the Aboli-

tionists had done. They immediately, at the very next meetings for business, or at least, at a number of them, rather went out of their way to appoint those on important business, who were known to be in open violation of the advices and travail of the body, which they had said a few months previous, in a Yearly Meeting capacity, rendered such manifestly unsuitable for services in it.

Their object, as every one knew, was to prevent such from joining the Separation. But this was not Yearly Meeting business, although, without doubt, it had the sanction of the leading influences in it. Had the privileges been granted by the Yearly Meeting only a few months sooner, which were granted after the Separation by some of the Subordinate meetings, that separation would never have taken place.

Shortly after the close of the Yearly Meeting at Newport, that is, on the 6th of Third month, the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting was convened by special call. It adopted the following Address, and circulated it amongst the Members :

“ ADDRESS

“ From the Meeting for Sufferings, of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, held at White Water, in Wayne County, Indiana, by adjournments, on the 6th and 7th of the Third month, 1843.

“ *To the Quarterly, Monthly, and Preparative Meetings of Friends, within the limits of Indiana Yearly Meeting, and to Friends individually.*

“ DEAR FRIENDS :—

“ Our Meeting has been called together at this time, on a painful occasion. In the progress of the workings of a spirit of activity, self-confidence, and insubordination, which has for some time past been apparent among a portion of the members of this Yearly Meeting, another Separation from our religious Society has been effected, and a new and independent Association has been organized, bearing the title of ‘Indiana Yearly Meet-

ing of Anti-Slavery Friends.' This new organization took place at Newport, within the limits of New Garden Quarter, on the 7th of last month; and those forming it, proceeded, as we understand, to adopt a Discipline, to appoint a Meeting for Sufferings, to address each of the Yearly Meetings of Friends, and to do other such business as is common in the Yearly Meetings of our religious society.

"We think it our duty, to give you early notice of this state of things, and to apprise you that the new Association is one with which, being set up out of the good order, and contrary to the discipline and usages of our society, we can have no correspondence or communication.

"In their Declaration of the causes of their Separation, which has recently appeared, many charges are put forth, affecting unfavorably, the religious character and standing of the Yearly Meeting of Friends in Indiana, and many of our well-concerned members. One of these, which stands conspicuous in many parts of the document, and also in other publications of theirs, and which has been largely circulated by them, is, that the Society composing our Yearly Meeting is opposing the abolition of Slavery; that it, by its measures, is countenancing and supporting Slave-holders, Slave-holding, and Slavery; and that our well known Christian testimony against Slavery is not maintained; in the place of which, apathy and the fear of popular sentiment, have been suffered to get possession; and that lukewarmness, and the want of a disposition to do anything for the slave has been the consequence. Another is, that the proceedings of our Yearly Meeting, in its own acts, and of the subordinate meetings, in carrying out its advices, have been arbitrary, proscriptive, irregular, and contrary to discipline. These, and various other charges, equally untrue and unfounded against the Yearly and other meetings and their committees, and individuals acceptably filling responsible stations in Society have been made and widely circulated. We have no expectation on the present occasion, of going

into an examination and refutation singly of the various charges that have come to our knowledge. But we think it right to take this opportunity to declare that our Society in this Yearly Meeting, has not relaxed in its testimony against Slavery; that on the contrary, it is the united belief of this meeting, that the testimony has been growing stronger among us for many years past, and that our Yearly Meeting earnestly desires to improve every right opening, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, to advocate the cause of universal and unconditional emancipation; and to manifest, on all proper occasions, our testimony against Slavery and oppression. Our members have also been desired, in the Advices issued by the Yearly Meeting, to do the same thing; notwithstanding it has been thought right to advise them not to mix, for that purpose, with the popular associations of the day. By reference to the Minutes of our Yearly Meeting for the last five years or more, copies of which have been furnished to the families, this will more fully appear.

“In 1836, an edition of two thousand copies of an Epistle on Slavery, was printed for circulation, besides three thousand copies more of the same, which was contained in the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting, and furnished to the families. In this Epistle, which was introductory to a valuable one received from the Yearly Meeting of Friends in London, Friends were advised to take no part in the unrighteous work of expatriation, it being the judgment of the meeting that the slaves are entitled to their freedom without condition; and that conditions cannot therefore be justly attached to the right to be free. It was also proposed, whether it might not then ‘be most safe for the members of our religious society to refrain from becoming members of other societies, having for their object, the extinction of Slavery.

“In 1837, an Address on Slavery to all in the United States who professed the Christian religion, and hope for salvation through the mercy and merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, was adopted, and 20,000 copies

printed and widely circulated. A Memorial was also sent to Congress, in the same year, protesting against the annexation of Texas to the United States, in which it was distinctly set out, as the main objection to the annexation, that Slavery and the Slave-trade might thereby be perpetuated 'to a fearful extent.'

"At the Yearly Meeting in 1838, Friends were invited by the African committee, standing appointed by the Yearly Meeting, to renewed exertions in behalf of suffering humanity, by endeavoring to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people, by giving circulation to such publications as are calculated to advance the cause of emancipation on Christian principles, while it was also 'deemed best,' for reasons then given, that our members should abstain from mixing with associations of those not of our Society, for the purpose. At the next Yearly Meeting, the committee having been engaged as usual, in active exertions for the good of the free people of color among us, expressed their belief that there was an increasing interest and concern felt in the minds of many Friends, to promote the entire abolition of Slavery.

"In 1840, an Epistle was issued by the Meeting for Sufferings, and approved by the Yearly Meeting, in which the meeting expressed its satisfaction in knowing that others were engaging in the work in which our Society has been so long engaged, and desiring Friends not to indulge in apathy or lukewarmness, nor relax their labors, in all suitable openings, for the benefit of the colored race; repeating, at the same time, the advice before given, not to join the Abolition and Colonization Societies. The Yearly Meeting also directed the reprinting of an Epistle from the Yearly Meeting of Friends in London, on the subject of Slavery, to the number of five thousand copies, to be annexed to our Minutes for distribution to the families, and the Meeting for Sufferings afterward directed three thousand more for general circulation. The attention of the Meeting for Sufferings was also drawn to the subject of petitioning the Legislatures

of Indiana and Ohio, and of the general Government in behalf of the African race; but no way opening, in the right authority, to petition Congress, special deputations of Friends were sent with petitions, this year and also in 1841 again, to both the State Legislatures, in behalf of the people of color, who caused the petitions to be presented, and remained some time at the seats of Government engaged in active labors among the members.

“In 1841, in an Epistle to the subordinate meetings, issued by the Yearly Meeting, it is said that it is far from the wish of this meeting to induce, on the part of our members, an apathy of feeling on the deeply affecting subject of Slavery. On the contrary, a desire was expressed ‘that all may faithfully maintain this Christian testimony, and cherish a lively interest both for the oppressed and oppressors;’ again repeating the advice not to join in association with those who do not profess to wait for Divine direction in such important concerns.

“In 1842, the Meeting for Sufferings directed the reprint, for circulation mostly in the slave States, of three thousand copies of an ‘Appeal to the professors of Christianity in the Southern States and elsewhere on the subject of Slavery, by the representatives of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England,’ in which the horrors of the Slave-trade are strongly set out, and in which it is shown that the trade must derive its support from the unrighteous system of Slavery, etc.

“In addition to the forenamed public acts of the meetings, it is well known that many concerned individuals were also engaged, as way opened, in labors in the same cause; some of whom extended their labors into the slave States.

“After all these public demonstrations of the Society by our Yearly Meeting, how can it be said with any degree of fairness and truth, that we have been doing nothing before the public on the subject of Slavery?

“In the exercise and travail of the Society for the last few years, since the spirit of over-active zeal and insubordination made its appearance, we have esteemed it a

special favor of our heavenly Father and merciful Preserver, that the Ministers and other concerned Friends from other Yearly Meetings, who have, in the prosecution of their religious services, visited our Yearly Meeting and participated with us in feeling, have mostly, and so far as we know without exception, approved and sanctioned the Advices issued by this meeting and the Yearly Meeting on the subjects relating to Slavery, and have given us united support and assistance in those measures of which the Separatists so loudly complain.

“In regard to the measures alluded to before as being arbitrary and proscriptive, and which are set out as being another cause of separation, it may be proper to remark, that the proceedings alluded to, are believed to be in accordance with the usages of our Society. We think that the Epistle of Advice, issued by our late Yearly Meeting, made out in accordance with the proceedings of the meeting, in which it is said that ‘those who have distinguished themselves by opposition or disregard to the advices and travail of the body, are manifestly unsuitable for important services in it while they remain in that situation,’ no new principle or practice is recommended. It has, we believe, been a common practice in our Society, to leave off from all important appointments and stations in the Church, such as are out of unity with the body for any cause; and all such as are standing against the Discipline or Advices. It has not been common to disown such speedily, without first extending brotherly counsel and labor for their reclamation; nor were any disowned or cut off by our last Yearly Meeting: measures were only adopted, in accordance with the usages of Society, to discontinue from service, while they remain in their present condition, persons who had given much practical evidence of alienation, opposition, and disunity with the proceedings and advices, and not for bearing a faithful testimony against Slavery, as has been erroneously stated. And we have felt ourselves religiously concerned to proceed to do such duties as were required at our hands, in mildness and tenderness, and

under the influence of heavenly love and forbearance; and while it is still our concern and prayer to perform faithfully, firmly, and promptly those duties required at our hands, in the proper support of our discipline, and the good order of the Church, it is our desire, for ourselves and our members generally, to proceed cautiously, mildly, and tenderly.

“Finally, dear Friends, we wish you, in your testimony against Slavery, which we desire you by no means to abate, to exercise the spirit and follow the practice of our dear departed friend, John Woolman, and other worthy predecessors of the same practices, whom we have been slanderously charged with discarding. We again renewedly state, that we still adhere to our ancient principles and testimony in regard to Slavery, and that we desire and advocate unconditional emancipation; believing that all men, without regard to color or nation, are equally objects of redeeming love through Christ Jesus our Lord, and equally entitled to freedom.

“Signed by direction and on behalf of the Meeting aforesaid.

“ELIJAH COFFIN,

“*Clerk for the present meeting.*”

CHAPTER XII.

Reply to the Address of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting.

UPON the publication of the above, the Meeting for Sufferings of the newly organized body convened and addressed those who issued it as follows:

“ADDRESS

“*To the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends.*

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“An Address to the Quarterly, Monthly, and Preparative meetings, constituting your Yearly Meeting, issued

by you at a called meeting on the 6th and 7th ult., has been read among us; and as we conceive there are several assertions and statements contained in it calculated to mislead the unsuspecting and unwary, we feel concerned to address you for the purpose of expostulation and explanation; and to defend ourselves and the cause we have espoused from what we consider to be some of the erroneous charges which we think you have (perhaps erroneously) made. And as you have declared in the commencement of your Address, that you can have no correspondence or communication with us, we proceed at once to address you through the medium of the press, hoping that you will read it individually, and that others who have seen your charges against us, may have an opportunity to see our defense.

“You say, ‘In the progress of the workings of a spirit of activity, self-confidence, and insubordination, which has for some time past been apparent among a portion of the members of this Yearly Meeting, another separation from our religious Society has been effected,’ etc.

“‘A spirit of activity!’ Then it seems that, in your opinion, a spirit of *inactivity* is the spirit that should govern Christians. ‘We have not so learned Christ.’ Neither by precept nor example did our holy Redeemer, when personally upon earth, encourage a spirit of inactivity. On the contrary, his life was a scene of activity; He almost constantly ‘went about doing good.’ And by his precepts he inculcated the same active philanthropy; urging his followers to good works, commending the good Samaritan for flying to the relief of a suffering fellow-being, and, by implication, at least, condemning the high-professing priest and Levite for their inactivity in neglecting to administer to the necessity of a suffering brother. We find no censures heaped upon the head of this Samaritan who was despised by the self-righteous Scribes and Pharisees; he was not charged with a spirit of activity, of acting in his ‘own will’ and in his ‘own strength.’ Neither do we find the priest and the Levite commended for waiting for a ‘right opening’ to adminis-

ter comfort to the afflicted and help to him who had fallen among thieves. We do not discover that either Christ or his Apostles ever censured activity in doing good to men. But he did on one occasion, at least, censure that exclusive spirit which, we fear, actuates many of his professed followers in our day. At a certain time John said to him, 'Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him because he followed not with us. And Jesus said, forbid him not, he that is not against us is for us.' And we firmly believe, if we are sincerely engaged to follow in his footsteps, and to imitate his example in acts of mercy and humanity and in pleading the cause of the poor and needy, we shall find room enough for *activity*, and the necessary aid of His Holy Spirit will be afforded to direct our efforts and to crown them with ultimate success. The truth is, we are taught by the highest authority to seek out occasions of activity in doing good by administering to the necessities, and promoting the welfare of our fellow-creatures, and not to excuse ourselves and discourage others therefrom under a pretense of waiting for the 'right openings.' In this particular, as in other matters, our duty is to 'seek,' and the promise is, 'we shall find.'

"The next charge you make against us is 'self-confidence.' Permit us to ask you by what authority you make this charge. Do you find evidence of it in our publications? Have we not—have not Abolitionists generally, manifested in their writings, their full conviction of the inefficiency of all their labors, unattended by the sustaining hand of the God of the oppressed? What evidence, we ask again, have you that we have confidence in our own unassisted exertions, to advance the great work in which we are engaged? You have given no proof of the truth of the charge in your Address, and you may rest assured that charges without proof are but weak arguments. If, upon reflection and examination, you find yourselves unable to sustain this or any other complaint you have made against us, will you not have the candor to take it back?

“With regard to the charge of insubordination, we have stated our views of true subordination, in the Address to Anti-Slavery Friends, published in the proceedings of our Yearly Meeting, which we suppose most of you have read. If these views are unsound, it would become you to point out that unsoundness, rather than make a sweeping charge and leave it unsupported by facts. While the action of the Yearly Meeting on the subject of Abolition amounted to nothing more than advice against active labors in the cause, we do not conceive that it was insubordination to act counter thereto in compliance with our individual convictions of duty; but when that advice began to be enforced as a positive rule, and members filling responsible stations in society were removed in consequence of their firmness in the cause, when measures were put in operation with a view to the laying down of meetings on this account, a proper regard to subordination rendered a submission or separation absolutely necessary, for we could no longer remain in the connection, and carry out our principles, without being justly obnoxious to the charge of insubordination. During the progress of the last Yearly Meeting at White Water, it became evident that Anti-Slavery Friends had no reason to expect any favor, but that they must give up their principles or carry them out in opposition to the authority of the meeting, until they should be disowned or separate. This was not done hastily. Toward the close of the Yearly Meeting, a proposition was publicly made for Anti-Slavery Friends to remain in the house at the rise of the meeting, for the purpose of conferring upon their peculiarly tried situation, being virtually cast out of the bosom of Society, and deprived of its benefits. With this proposition considerable unity was expressed, and no objection made to it. But at the rise of the meeting, what was our surprise when one of your members walked into the ministers’ gallery, and in the name of the Trustees of the house, addressed us, before our conference commenced, first calling us Friends, and then recalling it, saying he would call us people, peremptorily

ordered us to leave the house, declaring that the door-keeper would immediately proceed to close the doors and windows. We were thus apparently reduced to the necessity of leaving the house. We then concluded to meet the next day at Newport, when a conference was held for the purpose of considering our situation, with a view to ascertain our proper course. In this conference a unanimous desire was felt and expressed, that unity and harmony might be restored upon the right foundation. Many Friends hoped that there would be a mitigation, or relaxation of severity in the measures of opposing Friends. With these views it was unitedly concluded to wait the action of the Yearly Meeting's Committee and of the subordinate meetings. But as time rolled on, it became more and more evident that nothing short of absolute submission on our part would produce reconciliation; and we became satisfied that the time had come wherein we were under the necessity of organizing a religious society, in which we could enjoy those invaluable privileges of which we had been deprived. We make these statements, in order that all may know that these things were not hastily done, but that we moved cautiously and deliberately, and, as we believe, not in a spirit of self-confidence, but in the fear of the Lord, and under the influence of His good spirit. Our deliberations were characterized by the utmost harmony, our assemblies were crowned with the solemnizing influence of the Divine presence, and, by the favors bestowed upon us, both immediately and instrumentally, our hearts were confirmed in the belief that we were pursuing the path of duty.

“In speaking of the organization of our Yearly Meeting, you say, among other things, that those forming it, proceeded, as we understand, to adopt *a* Discipline. Permit us to ask you, what was your object in using this mode of expression? You speak of our Declaration as having recently appeared; in the second paragraph of that Declaration, it is declared, that ‘We wish it distinctly understood, that we have adopted no new doctrine,

nor any new system of church government.' And in the opening of the proceedings of the Convention, it is set forth as the object of that Convention, to deliberate more fully upon the propriety of reorganizing the Yearly Meeting of Indiana upon the true principles, and in accordance with the discipline and usages of the Society of Friends. If you had occasion to allude to the circumstance at all, why was it not done fairly? Why was a form of expression used, which must of necessity convey a false impression to the minds of all who are ignorant of the real state of the case? We appeal to your own understandings. Does not your language fairly imply that the discipline, which you say we have adopted, is something new, something different from the published Discipline of Indiana Yearly Meeting? We appeal to your sense of justice. Is it fair to use language in reference to the acts of others, that will convey an erroneous and an unfavorable impression to the public mind?

“Again, you say, ‘In their Declaration of the causes of their separation, which has recently appeared, many charges are put forth, affecting unfavorably the religious character and standing of the Yearly Meeting of Friends of Indiana, and many of our well concerned members. One of these which stands conspicuous in many parts of the document, and also in other publications of theirs, and which has been largely circulated by them, is, that the Society composing our Yearly Meeting is opposing the abolition of Slavery, etc.’ If you mean to convey the idea, that we have charged your Yearly Meeting with directly opposing the abolition of Slavery, by speaking in its defense, or against its abolition, we believe no such charge is to be found in our Declaration or any other publication of ours. But we admit that we have charged the Yearly Meeting and ‘many of its concerned members,’ as you call them, with ‘countenancing and supporting, by their measures, slaveholders, slaveholding and slavery,’ and we gave facts in support of those charges. And here let it be remarked, that generally, if not always, we have exhibited the facts upon which our

charges are founded. In your notice of these charges, it certainly became you to notice the facts given to substantiate them, and either to show that they were not facts, or that the charges were not fairly deducible from them. Instead of which you have enumerated various acts of the Yearly Meeting within the last seven years, as evidence of its real Anti-Slavery character. We wish you distinctly to notice that our charges against the Yearly Meeting are not that it advocates Slavery, or that it has not officially and repeatedly condemned it. But that by its anxiety to avoid the odium attached to the Abolitionists, and from other motives, it has exerted its influence in such a way as to increase the prejudice against, and opposition to, the present Anti-Slavery enterprise, and consequently to retard the progress of the work, and increase the popular excitement which seems so much to be dreaded.

“We would, however, remark, with respect to the Anti-Slavery publications to which you allude, as having been issued by the Meeting within the last few years, that it is well known that most, or all of them were brought forth by the influence of those who have since been proscribed, but who at that time possessed considerable influence in the Society. It is a notorious fact, that most of the Minutes, Epistles and Addresses held up by you, as an evidence of your soundness, were written by some of those against whom the most rigorous opposition has since been directed, and that those very measures were met at the time by the opposition of some who are now among the leading members of your Society. Those very acts, which you now boast of, have frequently been condemned by some of your most active members, upon the plea that they were not really the sentiments of the Yearly Meeting, but were the works of a few Abolitionists, and passed through the meeting without due consideration. Do you not know that the republication of the ‘valuable Epistle from the Yearly Meeting of London,’ in 1836, of which you speak, was strenuously opposed; and that the propriety of the

measure was advocated by those who are now the objects of your censure? Are you, or are you not, aware that the most important quotations you have made, and others still more strongly tinged with Abolition, which you have either designedly or inadvertently omitted, were written by some of us, and were opposed by some who are now in your foremost ranks? Do you not know that the condemnation of the Colonization scheme was most strenuously opposed by the same class? And that, finally, the opposition grew so strong, that an Epistle of Advice, prepared by a committee of the Meeting for Sufferings in Sixth month, 1839, was rejected, principally on account of its hostility to Colonization? What can be plainer than that there has been a settled design in the minds of some individuals strenuously devoted to Colonization, to prostrate the influence of those Friends who were truly attached to the Anti-Slavery cause. This they have succeeded in, by working upon the prejudices and sectarian feelings of those who do not so well understand the tendency of the measures in progress. Of what avail, we ask, will all your professions of hostility to Slavery be to the cause of suffering humanity, while it is known that you use all your influence to prevent the advocates of that cause from getting access to the people, by closing doors of meeting-houses against them, and so demeaning yourselves toward them as to convince all around you, that you consider them as unworthy of notice, except to speak evil of them; and adopt the most rigid measures to prevent your members from associating with them in their labors?

“Why do you represent us as saying that Indiana Yearly Meeting has ‘been doing nothing before the public on the subject of Slavery.’ If you will examine our Declaration, which you speak of, you will find that we have quoted more from the Anti-Slavery labors of the Yearly Meeting than you have; and beside, in our quotations from, and references to, those labors, we have shown the Anti-Slavery feeling which some years ago, influenced to a considerable extent, the deliberations of that body.

For instance, you say: 'Friends were advised to take no part in the unrighteous work of expatriation, it being the judgment of this meeting, that the slaves are entitled to their freedom without conditions.' Why did you neglect to say that the advice was equally pointed against rendering any aid to this work—'to any political association on the subject of African Slavery, which is or may be founded on principles, either directly or indirectly having a tendency to promote the unrighteous work of expatriation?' Why, but because it would have shown in a stronger light the glaring violation of this advice, by the Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, in contributing to the funds of the Colonization Society, which we all know was in a very particular manner aimed at in the expressions quoted?

"Again, why did you not tell the public that the Yearly Meeting had some years ago, 'affectionately advised Friends to be so alive to our testimony against Slavery, as, neither through prejudice or otherwise, to cast any discouragement in the way of those who are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation, whether such laborers be found within or without the pale of our Society?' Why, but because the advice is so diametrically opposed both to the principles and practice of those who now rule in your counsels?

"Would it not have been proper for you to have quoted from the Yearly Meeting's Minutes, where, in allusion to the present A. S. enterprise, it is called a most righteous work? This did not suit you, because of its contrast with the opinion professed by Henry Clay, and by many in the front ranks of your Yearly Meeting at the present time, that the Abolitionists have put back the cause of emancipation.

"Why did you not refer to the feeling of the Yearly Meeting, expressed in language like this? We rejoice that others are coming up to labor on the same ground which we, as a religious society, have for many years occupied.

"Was it because it would have shown in too glaring

colors the inconsistency of your present policy, in closing the doors of meeting-houses against the cause and its advocates, who are laboring on the same ground that we, as a religious society, have for many years occupied, and casting every discouragement you can in their way, and proscribing your members who persevere in co-working with them?

“Should you not also have mentioned, that some years ago, Friends were individually encouraged ‘to a close examination as to what is required at their hands, and how they may employ the talents committed to them for noble purposes, in the advancement of the blessed work of universal emancipation, by meekly yet boldly either publicly or privately, pleading the cause of the oppressed?’ But perhaps you were aware that if you had quoted this advice, it would have shown too clearly the palpable inconsistency of your present course in persecuting those who are conscientiously endeavoring to act in accordance with its requirements.

“It is also worthy of observation, that in your Declaration of your Anti-Slavery principles, you have entirely omitted to make it known, whether you are in favor of immediate emancipation or not. And what renders the omission still more remarkable, is the fact, that quoting from the Minutes of 1838, where the circulation of such publications as are calculated to advance the cause of immediate emancipation is encouraged, you have (shall we say carefully?) omitted the word ‘immediate.’ What renders this omission still more suspicious, is the declared opinion of one of your number, who was appointed a member of your body in the place of one of those who were said to be disqualified, that he did not believe the slaves were prepared for freedom—that he believed Slavery should be abolished, but that it ought to be done gradually. This opinion was expressed since his appointment. Still more. The prime mover of nearly, if not quite all the recent measures of the Yearly Meeting against A. S. Friends, one of the committee appointed to carry its proscriptive measures into opera-

tion, stated in a large Quarterly Meeting, that when he had taken the whole subject of Slavery into consideration, and the situation and circumstances with which we are surrounded, he had never been able to determine what would be the best plan for the emancipation of the slaves, the best both for whites and blacks; this was united with publicly, by nearly all the committee in attendance from the Yearly Meeting; clearly implying that they were not prepared to say that immediate emancipation is the best plan.

“ You say, ‘ At the next Yearly Meeting, the committee having been engaged as usual, in active exertions for the good of the Free people of Color among us, expressed their belief, that there was an increasing interest and concern felt in the minds of many Friends, to promote the entire Abolition of Slavery.’ This opinion was no doubt true; and as this feeling continued to increase, the opposition also increased, and a determination was more and more manifested, on the part of certain characters, to destroy the influence and the standing of those Friends who were zealously engaged in the A. S. enterprise. This ‘ increasing interest and concern, to promote the entire Abolition of Slavery, was not to be thus suppressed. It increased, and continued to increase, until the opposition could no longer restrain it by its proscription, and we humbly hope that it may continue to increase, until, by the blessing of Heaven, every yoke, civil, political, and ecclesiastical shall be broken, and every bondman shall be free.’

“ You mention the fact, that special deputations of Friends were sent to the Legislatures of Ohio and Indiana, with petitions on behalf of the People of Color in these States, and that they ‘ remained some time at the seats of Government, engaged in active labors among the members.’ But you do not tell the fact, that one part of those labors was to satisfy the members that the petitioners had no connection with the Abolitionists. They knew that Abolitionists were hated, and in order

to make themselves and the Society respected, they took the most effectual course to increase that hatred. For it was enough to confirm the strongest prejudices, not only of the members of the Legislatures, but of the community at large, to know that Friends denied any unity with the 'fanatics,' as they were commonly considered. Was this in accordance with the advice, 'to be very careful that we should not through prejudice or otherwise, cast any discouragement in the way of those who are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation?' You mention the reprint of 3,000 copies of an 'Appeal to the professors of Christianity in the Southern States and elsewhere, on the subject of Slavery.' In that appeal, it is stated, that the professional Churches are mainly chargeable with the continuance of Slavery. Now we would request you, candidly and honestly to ask yourselves, if it is not evident that you are exerting a greater influence against the progress of the present A. S. enterprise, than any other religious body in the United States? In the various localities throughout the country where Friends are numerous, as a general rule, a stranger might really obtain a very correct knowledge of the state of the Anti-Slavery cause in the community, by learning the course pursued with regard to it by Friends residing in the respective neighborhoods. Wherever Friends generally, especially the leading characters, have identified themselves with this cause, there the community is to a great extent leavened into the Anti-Slavery principles. But where the contrary course of conduct has been pursued by Friends, there the cause receives very little favor from the mass of the people. The strongest opposers, both in the Free and Slave States, exult in the action of the ruling part of the Society of Friends, and it is common with those opposers, to refer to the course Friends are pursuing, both collectively and individually, with regard to this subject, in confirmation of their opinions. In the numerous discussions public and private, which are going on throughout the country on this subject,

there is perhaps no argument on which the opposers of Abolition rely with more confidence, than that drawn from the conduct of Friends.

“With regard to the countenance given to the laborers in the A. S. cause, by those whom you call ‘well-concerned members,’ it was fully illustrated in the case of C. C. Burleigh, to which we referred in our Declaration. The contrast between this case, and the marked attention paid to a Colonization agent, since in Richmond, shows too clearly to be misunderstood, whether Abolition or Colonization is regarded with most favor, by such men as lead in your deliberations, notwithstanding the Yearly Meeting but a few years ago called the former a most righteous cause, and the latter ‘the unrighteous work of expatriation.’ The attention paid to Henry Clay, the great slave-holder and President of the Colonization Society also shows conclusively, that there is far more anxiety to conciliate the good opinion of slave-holders and Colonizationists, that you may ‘retain place and influence with the rulers of the land,’ than to identify yourselves in feeling and interest with the humble and devoted, yet despised advocates of the claims of down-trodden humanity.

“After enumerating several public acts in reference to Slavery, you say, ‘In addition to the forenamed public acts of the meetings, it is well known that many concerned individuals were also engaged, as way opened, in labors in the same cause, some of whom extended their labors into the slave States.’ Who were those concerned individuals? And what was the nature of their labors? We are perfectly aware that many individuals have manifested great concern, and have labored with zeal and assiduity to put down the Anti-Slavery enterprise, by going up and down the country preaching down all those who were influenced by ‘a spirit of activity in it.’ Indeed it has been the principal theme of a great portion of the preaching that we have had for some years. Instead of being urged to the necessity of seeking after ability to perform works of humanity and mercy, and

encouraged to faithfulness in their performance, we have seldom heard but little else than exhortations to 'be still,' to 'get into the quiet,' with long discourses upon the danger of 'acting in our own wills, and in our own strength.' As though it were far safer to imitate the example of the Priest and Levite in passing by a perishing brother, than with the good Samaritan to yield immediately to the generous impulses of the heart, and feelings of sympathy with the sufferings of a common humanity, which prompt us to endeavor to pour the oil and the wine of consolation into the bleeding wounds of the millions of our fellow-beings who have fallen among thieves. If the same zeal had been manifested, and the same labor bestowed to promote the Anti-Slavery cause, and to recommend it and its advocates to the favorable notice of the public, that have been used to banish it from the Society of Friends, and consequently to disgrace it before the public, we are perfectly satisfied that it would have been far in advance of what it is. We are also aware that one of the most noted ministers and indefatigable opposers among you, has been engaged, to some extent, within the last year or two, in circulating an 'Appeal to the citizens of the United States and Great Britain,' written by him some years ago, in favor of the Colonization Society. If these are not the labors to which you allude, in which you say 'many concerned individuals are engaged,' we are entirely at a loss to understand what you mean, as we suppose you cannot refer to the individual acts of those you have proscribed on account of their labors, to prove the Anti-Slavery character of that portion of the Society which now claims to be the 'body;' though you might do so with about as much propriety as to have quoted the Anti-Slavery proceedings of former years for the same purpose.

"With regard to the 'some' whom you say 'have extended their labors into the slave States,' we suppose you alluded to those ministers who have traveled there on religious visits. We have the best evidence that some of these labored, in part, while there, to convince the slave-

holders that they were not in unity with the Abolitionists, whom they (the slaveholders) hated, and whose influence they so much dreaded ; thus, so far as those Friends had any influence with the slaveholders, confirming their prejudices against the A. S. enterprise.

“ You say you think the proceedings of which we complain are in accordance with the usages of Society. We ask, when, until in the present case, has the Yearly Meeting issued advice to its members, and then taken measures to enforce that advice by inflicting Church censure, and removing from the stations they occupied in the Society, those who could not conscientiously comply with that advice? We are not aware of any such measures being adopted in all the proceedings of the Society, until this time. Mere advice cannot be recognized as law, and we cannot recognize the authority of any body, either civil or religious, to impose official censure, but for the violation of acknowledged law or discipline. We maintain that by the Discipline, members of the Meeting for Sufferings cannot be removed from their stations while they retain their right in Society, for any other cause than declining or greatly neglecting the attendance of the meeting. And we believe that no instance is on record in the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting, so far as we have examined them, (which is as far back as 1827,) of the removal of any member from the Meeting for Sufferings, (until disowned from the Society,) on any other account than request to be released, or delinquency. And if we are not mistaken, in all such cases the reason is given. We apprehend the only instance on record of a member being stated to be disqualified, and no cause of disqualification mentioned, is that of an individual who was disowned, and had appealed to the Yearly Meeting, and that meeting had confirmed the judgment of the Quarterly and Monthly meetings. The report of the committee on the appeal, together with the judgment of the Yearly Meeting confirming it, were published in the proceedings of the same meeting that appointed another Friend in his place, on account of his being ‘disquali-

fied.' So that there was no danger of misapprehension about it.

“‘How then can it be said, with any degree of fairness or truth,’ that the proceedings of the Meeting for Sufferings and the last Yearly Meeting at White Water, in removing members of the Meeting for Sufferings, upon the vague charge of disqualification, who were among the most diligent attenders of that meeting, were in accordance with the usages of the Society; when not a single instance of the kind can be found on record in fifteen years, if ever? And not only so but the act is contrary to the plain provision of the Discipline, relative to that subject.

“‘Is it in accordance with the usages of the Society to prefer complaints against its members of such a nature as to be worthy of public censure, and even to cause their names to go to the world as offenders, without even informing them of the charge against them, or giving them an opportunity to answer for themselves? Is it in accordance with the usages of Society to refuse to place upon record, the alleged cause or misconduct of its members; for which they are censured, and to publish that record to the world to the injury of their characters?

“‘So far from being in accordance with the former usage of the Society of Friends, it is slandering the former character of that Society to make the assertion.

“‘You express your belief that ‘it has been a common practice in our Society to leave off from all important appointments and stations in the Church, such as are out of unity with the body for any cause; and all such as are standing against the Discipline or advices.’

“‘Permit us to inquire if you have excluded from important appointments and stations, those who are out of unity with the body on the subject of the important doctrines of the resurrection and the general judgment? It is well known to many of us, and we think it must be known to you, that many who have stood, and for aught that appears, yet stand in direct opposition to the pro-

ceedings of the body in this matter, still occupy stations of the greatest importance, and are among the most forward to condemn us for being out of unity with the body.

“How is it with those who are out of unity with the body in regard to the boarding-school, and to the monthly meeting schools? ‘By their fruits ye shall know them.’ If there be any truth in this maxim, it is evident that in some of the Quarterly meetings, where there is the most ability to maintain monthly meeting schools, there is very little unity with the concern of the body in this particular, as they have no such schools among them. At the same time it is observable that the members of those meetings are among the most intolerant toward those who do not unite with the advice of the body on the Anti-Slavery question.

“It is a notorious fact that if every Friend who is out of unity with the proceedings of the body for some cause, were left off from appointments, there would be very few to appoint. And as for standing in opposition to the Discipline, you have yet to show us what clause of Discipline those had violated who were rejected by the Yearly Meeting.

“You undertake to give currency to the misrepresentation which has often been made, that we were not censured for our Abolition principles, but for insubordination. We are astonished that you should be guilty of such an absurdity. Let us illustrate. In the early settlement of New England rigorous laws were made against the Quakers, with a view to suppress their principles and practices. They were banished and forbidden to return upon pain of death. Their principles impelled them to return, and some of them were hanged. According to your version, these persons were not hanged for their Quaker principles, ‘as has been erroneously stated.’ Surely that cause must be weak which has to be supported by such arguments.

“There is one portion of your Address which we have passed over, that is calculated, whether so intended or

not, to convey the idea to those who are unacquainted with the circumstances, that our Society of Anti-Slavery Friends is confined to New Garden Quarterly meeting; whereas there were present at the Convention at which the organization took place, members from at least six Quarterly meetings, and we have already four organized Quarterly, and ten Monthly meetings.

“ You refer, in several places, to the advices given by the Yearly Meeting to Friends not to join in associations with others.

“ You particularly notice the language of the report of the African Committee in 1838. You say ‘it was deemed best, for reasons then given, that our members should abstain from mixing with associations of those not of our Society, for the purpose.’ And what were the reasons then given? By reference to the Report, we find them to be as follows:

“ ‘Something objectionable may have been adopted,—some peculiarity we deem it important to maintain, may have been abandoned. We deem it best, for these and other reasons, that our Friends abstain from mixing with these associations.’

“ What may have been done, seems to be a strange reason for abandoning a course of conduct, for the promotion of one of the greatest works for the melioration of the condition of suffering humanity, that ever engaged the hearts of philanthropists, which, it must be evident, has been the approved means, in the hands of an overruling Providence, of blotting out the odious stains of Slavery from a large portion of the earth, and preparing the way for the ushering in of a great and general Jubilee, when liberty shall be proclaimed throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof. It is one of the clearest propositions deducible from the history of the past, that the hand of Divine Providence, has been signally manifest in preparing the way for, and bringing about the institution of, A. S. Societies composed of Friends and others, and in crowning their labors with happy results. And the success which continues to attend the labors of these

mixed associations, in their endeavors to promote the diffusion of just and enlightened views on the subject of human rights, and the spread of Anti-Slavery principles throughout Christendom, and even in Mohamedan countries, is of the most encouraging character. These facts, clear and incontrovertible as the light of history and experience can render them, should outweigh all the arguments, and suspicions, and fears, of sectarian prejudice, and bigoted exclusiveness. But it is pretty evident that the objection to mixing with others is not the great dread of many of our opposers, for they manifest no repugnance to associating in secular matters for the promotion of their worldly interests with those of any, or of no religious denomination. And what puts the matter beyond doubt, is the fact that when an attempt was made to form associations of Friends, it was objected to with as much earnestness as joining in associations with others. This proves clearly that mixing with others was only the ostensible, and not the real objection with many of our opposers, and that there was really a feeling of hostility to our becoming in any manner identified with Abolitionism.

“ In your Address, you say to Friends, you do not want their testimony against Slavery to abate; but that you wish them to ‘exercise the spirit and follow the practice of John Woolman?’ etc. Permit us to query with you whether *you* exercise the spirit, and follow the practice of John Woolman? You know, he bore his testimony against Slavery so far as to cease to trade in, or to use those articles which were produced by slaves. Can you say this is your practice? Why is it, we ask, that you have refused your assent to the investigation of this subject, when it has been brought before the different departments of Society? Why have you refused the subject a place on the Yearly Meeting’s Minutes, when regularly brought up by an inferior meeting? Why did you cause the summary answers to the Queries to be altered from what the subordinate meetings prepared in relation to this subject? Why should you have used

your influence to prevent the circulation, among Friends, of the only work, that we know of, that is published in the world, on the subject of Free Labor? Are not all these things at variance with the practice of John Woolman? He read and informed himself on the subject of Slavery, and when properly informed, he acted according to his light. It appears that he was not sensible of his connection with Slavery until he read a work entitled, 'A Caution and Warning to Great Britain and her Colonies,' for, he says, he was then trading in rum, sugar, and molasses, the product of slave-labor, and had little concern about them. Yet when his eyes were opened to see his error, he abandoned this trade, and sought out occasions of benevolence on which to appropriate what he had made thereby; thus contributing to the support of the cause of righteousness in the earth; and, to use his own words, 'was the first motion toward a visit to Barbadoes.' He further said, 'the oppression of the slaves which I have seen in several journies southward, on the continent; and the report of their treatment in the West Indies, hath deeply affected me, and a care to live in the spirit of peace, and minister just cause of offense to none of my fellow creatures, hath, from time to time, livingly revived in my mind, and under this exercise, I have, for many years past, declined to gratify my palate with those sugars.' Now is it not the fact, that many of your tables are furnished with those sugars, and the course of those who abstain as he did, lightly esteemed? John Woolman traveled much, and labored continually through evil report and through good report, for the enlargement of his oppressed fellow creatures.

'Nor was he willing to have the work put off for a more convenient season; but warned the people that if they delayed, they might be visited with 'terrible things in righteousness,' for the omission of duty. And he further says, that his concern was that he 'might attend with singleness of heart to the voice of the true Shepherd of Israel, and be so supported as to remain unmoved at the faces of men,' etc. Nor was this concern of his a mo-

mentary zeal, or fire of his own kindling, but one that lasted through life; for he requested his attendants around his death bed, to not give him medicine which was the fruit of oppression, in case he should be deprived of his senses in his last moments.

“We now come to the conclusion of the whole matter. A portion of the people of these United States, becoming thoroughly convinced that, in order that Slavery may be abolished, and our country saved from impending ruin, some means must be used to regenerate public sentiment, and change it from a deep-rooted, unholy prejudice against that degraded class of human beings, who are now held in abject bondage by their brethren, to a spirit and practice of equal justice to all men, ‘in the progress of the light of truth,’ have organized A. S. Societies, and are actively and increasingly engaged in supporting them, as affording the only measures now being put in operation, having any direct tendency to bring about the desired change in the views and actions of the people on this subject. To the labors of the supporters of this enterprise many of your acts manifest an opposition. And here lies the whole difficulty, and here it must and will remain, all your pretensions to the contrary notwithstanding. Hence difficulties, inconsistencies, incongruities, and contradictions have marked the line of your whole proceedings on this subject, and ever must, until you either cease to call the A. S. enterprise ‘a most righteous cause,’ ‘got up in the progress of the light of truth,’ etc., or cease to oppose it by undervaluing the characters of its supporters, by unchristianizing them, by many, various, and unmeaning charges, such as the working of a ‘spirit of activity, self-confidence, and insubordination;’ ‘working in their own strength and in their own wills;’ ‘not waiting for a right opening;’ acting in an ‘overactive zeal,’ etc., etc.

“With desires that you may yet see your error and retrace your steps, we remain your friends.

“Signed on behalf and by direction of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery

Friends, held at Newport, by adjournment, on the 10th of Fourth month, 1843.

“BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.*”

CHAPTER XIII.

Some corroborative Remarks—Origin of the Use of the Term “Body”—Anonymous review of the Declaration of A. S. Friends.

THE Epistle of Advice, alluded to in the foregoing Address, which was rejected by the Meeting for Sufferings in Sixth month, 1839, “on account,” as the Address states, “of its hostility to Colonization,” it may be proper to remark, embraced the *same caution* which had previously been given by the Yearly Meeting, against Friends joining in associations with others for the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause or other benevolent objects, and, therefore, could not have been faulted for a lack on that head. Hence the evident correctness of the statement that it was rejected mainly on account of its hostility to Colonization, which was a prominent feature in it. But this is only corroborative; that statement was made from personal knowledge by eye and ear witnesses.

In consequence of the repeated and continued assertions made by many, that unconditional submission to the advice of the body was the duty of members, the term “Body,” which sometimes occurs, was used after the separation to refer to those who hold that doctrine, or to Indiana Yearly Meeting.

The Meeting for Sufferings of that body did not deign to make reply to the document addressed to it, which I have just quoted, nor did the Yearly Meeting itself ever attempt to answer the arguments adduced nor to disprove the positions taken in any of the various epistles, addresses, or other documents of those they called “Seceders” and “Separatists.” This feature in the

history of this lamentable schism cannot fail to strike the mind of the intelligent reader as a very significant circumstance. Some attempt, however, at this was made by individuals. A pamphlet was sent forth to the world entitled "A Review of the Declaration of a Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends," but the author, probably aware of its fallacy or lack of candor, and hence dreading a public castigation, prudently withheld his name. Here it is, without any date; probably it was written in Seventh month, 1843:

REVIEW

OF THE

DECLARATION

OF A

MEETING OF ANTI-SLAVERY FRIENDS.

Which assembled in the capacity of a Yearly Meeting, at Newport, Indiana, Second month 7th, 1843, addressed to a Friend in answer to several inquiries about the Separation in the Society of Friends in Indiana Yearly Meeting.

"After their introduction, on pages six and seven of their Minutes, in which they propose to organize themselves into a Society of Friends, in which they may enjoy those religious privileges and benefits which they tell us they so highly prize, and 'of which (they say) we have been arbitrarily and unhappily deprived by the proscriptive measures of the ruling part of the Yearly Meeting,' they proceed to declare, that they have not separated from the principles of the Society nor from its testimonies and discipline,' the difference in title which they have adopted, being merely for distinction and to express their adherence to the testimony of Friends against Slavery.

"*Remarks.*—From what privilege have they been deprived by the Yearly Meeting? We may suppose our

Epistle of Advice will explain. 'Friends are advised to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to any of the important stations or committees in Society, so that faithful and trusty Friends may be chosen; as we believe that those who have distinguished themselves by opposition or disregard to the advice and travail of the body, are manifestly unsuitable for important services in it, while they remain in that situation.' Some of the leaders in this schism had distinguished themselves by opposition and disregard to the advice; and under such circumstance, ought they still to be promoted in the services of the Society, and put forward as though nothing was the matter? Was such ever the course of the Society, in any case, since its foundation? This is an important point in this separation. The Separatists being confessedly against the Advice and out of unity with the proceedings of the great body of the Society, claim still to do important services in it; or as they might have said more distinctly and not less truly, to rule it. Their proportion in numbers, in the Yearly Meeting at large, is very small; not, it is probable, at a very liberal estimate, over one-tenth of the members; yet they wish to rule or must separate.

"And that, so far as they had the power, they selected their *own men*, to the exclusion of others, was a subject of notice and remark for a considerable time before their separation. They proceed, pages six and seven, to state the 'universal liability of all associations, both civil and religious, to deterioration;' the great precaution taken by early Friends to prevent it in our Society in this country, and that facts and circumstances connected with the Society in this country, at the present time, sorrowfully demonstrate the inefficiency of all this.

"*Remarks.*—The inference plainly is, that our Society has, in their opinion, deteriorated, that it has departed, little by little, from the Truth as it is in Jesus,' and that they, not having deteriorated, but being more holy than those they have left behind, make the corruption of the mother church one cause of their leaving it. Those in-

interested will not fail to take notice whether this is the state of facts.

“They say on page seven, that ‘through the unre-mitted labors of Woolman, Benzet, and kindred spirits, Friends of the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia cleared themselves from holding slaves,’ etc., and that ‘about this time James Pemberton, Warner Mifflin, and many other Friends, eminent for their piety and virtue, apprehending that much advantage to the cause of the oppressed Africans might be derived from duly enlisting all classes of the community in their behalf, engaged in the formation of associations for that purpose.’

“*Remarks.*—Not associations of their sort, however. The modern Abolition Societies took their rise as lately as 1832, and do not agree, in practice nor throughout in principle, with the worthy individuals whom they name. It is very apparent that the Seceders are anxious to identify themselves, if possible, with these worthy predecessors, by claiming them as fellow-operators in the Anti-Slavery cause; whereas the Society they have left hold and endeavor to put in practice the views of Woolman and others, in regard to Slavery, yet they so far differ, that they proceed to separate. Would it not be more honorable in them to take their own stand; to assert their origin in 1832, and not inconsistently claim *our folks* and reject us? Some extracts from Woolman will make plain to any who understands the views and is acquainted with the *acts* of the Seceders, whether they hold and act upon his principles. Hear him.

“ ‘In this (Philadelphia) Yearly Meeting several weighty matters were considered; and toward the last, that in relation to dealing with persons who purchase slaves.

“ ‘During the several sittings of the said meeting my mind was frequently covered with *inward prayer*; and I could say with David, that ‘tears were my meat day and night.’ The cause of slave-keeping lay heavy upon me; nor did I find any engagement to speak directly to any other matter before the meeting. When this case

was opened, several faithful Friends spoke weightily thereto, with which I was comforted, and feeling a concern to cast in my mite, I said, in substance, as follows: In the difficulties attending us in this life *nothing is more precious than the mind of Truth inwardly manifested*; and it is my earnest desire, *in this weighty matter, we may be so humbled as to be favored with a clear understanding of the mind of Truth* AND FOLLOW IT; this would be of more advantage to the Society than *any medium not in the clearness of Divine wisdom*. The case is difficult to some who have slaves, but if such set aside all self-interest, and come to be weaned from the desire of getting estates, or even from holding them together, when Truth requires the contrary, I believe the way will open that they will know how to steer through those difficulties. Many Friends appeared to be *deeply bowed under the weight of the work*, and manifested much firmness in their love to the cause of Truth and universal righteousness on the earth.'

“ ‘ After this ——— I joined with my Friends ——— *in visiting Friends who had slaves*, and at night we had a family meeting at William Trimble's, many young people being there, and it was a precious reviving opportunity.

“ ‘ Some whose hearts were rightly exercised about them, appeared to be glad of our visit, but in some places our way was more difficult; and I often saw the necessity of keeping down to that root, from whence our concern proceeded; and have cause, in reverend thankfulness, humbly to bow down before the Lord, who was near me, and preserved my mind in calmness under some sharp conflicts, and begat a spirit of sympathy and tenderness toward some who were grievously entangled by the spirit of this world.'

“ After this, he says: ‘ It was a time of deep exercise, looking often to the Lord for his assistance, who, in unspeakable kindness, favored us with the influence of that spirit, which crucifies to the greatness and splendor of this world.'

“Another time, having no company, he says: ‘I went alone to their houses, and in the fear of the Lord, acquainted them with the exercise I was under, and thus, sometimes by a few words, I found myself discharged from a heavy burden.’—*Friends’ Library*, vol. IV, pp. 354, 355, 356.

“How different was John Woolman’s spirit; how different his example of waiting and labor, from theirs!

“Page 8. ‘But after much good had been effected through the agency of these institutions’—(not modern Abolition institutions it should be remembered) ‘a combination of adverse circumstances conspired to change the current of feeling. The hand of cruel avarice became afresh nerved to its unholy grasp by the prospect of extensive gain, through the facilities offered by the invention of the cotton gin.’

“*Remarks.*—Is not the whole of this an assumption without proof? Does it not sound like matter proceeding from an excited lecturer, who is endeavoring to make *capital* whereon to base his discourse? The cotton gin is a *labor-saving machine*, not calculated, one would think, to increase, but to lessen the demand for human labor.

“They proceed—‘This prospect and desire of gain was not confined to those immediately engaged in holding slaves, but extended with lamentable effect to many of those in the Free States, inclined to enter into mercantile or manufacturing operations. This class included a number of the most wealthy and influential in the Society of Friends in the Middle and Eastern States; and the consequent intercourse between them and the slaveholders of the South, had a direct tendency to leaven them into the same lordly, pompous, and intolerant feeling.’

“*Remarks.*—Shocking picture indeed, if true. Who will vouch for its truth? Let us ‘beware lest any man spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit.’

“‘This circumstance,’ they say, ‘taken in connection with that of the formation and active operation of the Colonization Society, instituted mainly by slaveholders,

and purposely for the removal of the free people of color from the country, and IN ORDER THAT NONE OF THE DESPISED CLASS MIGHT ENJOY LIBERTY AMONG US, almost sealed the fate of genuine Anti-Slavery feeling in the Society!"

"*Remarks.*—How melancholy the reflection that men professing to be guided under the influence of the religion of Christ, should be so far deluded as to hazard such expressions! What a shame to our religion! What a handle for infidels!

"The Colonization Society originated with Robert Finley, of New Jersey; and has always, it is said, received more patronage at the North than at the South. From the rise, many men of the best talents, of the highest order of practical benevolence, and of undoubted piety, have taken an active interest in its success. What a departure from charity, what a slander upon all these (and such as these have always been among the leaders), to say that their object was the removal of the free people of color, *in order that none of them might enjoy liberty among us.* The Colonization Society had no power, if they had desired to do so, to compel free people to go to Africa. They go only by their 'own consent'—this is one of the first articles. None go that do not think best to go. And what harm to assist any such! The free people of color are in many cases surrounded by circumstances (the existence of which we may deplore, but can not prevent) which may induce them to think best to remove. Most persons in the West have removed under the influence of circumstances. Our forefathers came from England under circumstances. Africans go to Canada because they think best to do so; and the Separatists have, many of them, at different times, assisted such, even those not legally entitled to their freedom; and yet to assist them in finding a refuge from their troubles, in Africa, in a way less objectionable, is declared in their publications, and intimated in this Declaration, to be a design to perpetuate Slavery.

"Many benevolent men, with claims as justly founded as these seceders, to the credit of the most honest and

devoted laborers for the good of the African race, have desired to see colonies settled along the western coast of Africa; Thomas Fowell Buxton, and many other English philanthropists, who are in favor of universal emancipation, may be named as examples. Such colonies form an asylum to which persons can go, who cannot be freed under the laws where they are; for there are many owners of slaves who are convinced of the evil, and desire to rid their hands of it, who cannot do it where they are, on account of the laws. The way might also be opened through such colonies, for the introduction under Divine Providence, of civilization, commerce, the arts, and Christianity, among the barbarous tribes of Africa, by their brethren, originally of the same stock, and with constitutions adapted to the climate. But the Society of Friends, as such, has done but little for the Colonization Society, if we except that Friends in the Southern States have made use of the facilities offered by that Society, to set on the shores of Africa, as entirely free persons, a great many who could not remain in the South without being in slavery; and it is presumed that all the Yearly Meetings have assisted them in the benevolent work. Some members have also occasionally contributed small sums, to assist such in going as desired to go.

“2. Notwithstanding the Society of Friends has been active for the good of the free persons of color, the great leading concern has been for the extinction of Slavery. And their labors have been active and unremitting for fifty years past, or more, in the cause. What a great departure then, from all Truth, must it be to declare to the world, that Anti-Slavery feeling has at any time within the last half century been almost sealed in the Society! Pious, sound-hearted, cool-headed, active laborers in the cause, in our Society, will look upon such misrepresentation with pain and disgust.

“Page 9. ‘In 1832, a resuscitation of the Anti-Slavery cause commenced in one of the Eastern States.’

“*Remarks.*—Why not say, ‘In 1832, the modern Abolitionists, to the ranks of which we belong, in

distinction from those of Woolman, Pemberton, Ben-
ezet, Mifflin, Franklin, and other Abolitionists of pre-
ceding years, and of the Society of Friends at the
present time, took their rise, and we think proper to
shake off the yoke of church subordination, and join with
these?" The matter of fact would then have been fairly
and honestly stated. For while some might doubt the
propriety, none could properly deny their right to do so.

"We pass over their other remarks on page 9, and
those on pages 10, 11, 12, and part of 13, as containing
nothing worthy of refutation. Suffice it to say, that the
statements are not acknowledged, in the manner they
make them;—their spirit and bearing being particularly
objectionable, and most of the facts brought to view be-
ing unfairly represented.

"On page 13, they say: 'One branch of the' (Afri-
can) 'Committee forwarded a report to its general meet-
ing,' in 1841, 'treating the subject (of the consumption
of the proceeds of Slavery) at some length, showing the
impropriety and inconsistency of Friends sustaining a
market for such productions. But when it was read in
that body, it was spurned, it was rejected, with manifest
bitterness and contempt,' etc.

"*Remarks.*—That is one version of the story, showing
an example of the manner in which they relate a history
of the past. The following is the true one. The New
Garden branch of the African Committee was at that
time under the influence and control of persons who have
since seceded. They prepared and sent up to the Gen-
eral Committee, a long essay on the subject of Free and
Slave labor produce. When this was brought before the
committee, they had strong doubts of the propriety of
having it read, or descending into the consideration of
the subject, in that capacity; inasmuch as it was alto-
gether foreign to the business of their appointment; and
as the subject was one with which Friends were already
acquainted. The duties of this committee are thus set
out in the Minute of their appointment: 'They are
charged with attending to the assistance and protection

of the people of color, and desired to endeavor to promote their education, and moral and religious improvement of those within our limits, with a view to their elevation to the rank and rights of freemen.'

"But the disaffected members of the committee showing so strong a desire to have the document read, the committee at length yielded, in condescension; entirely to satisfy and gratify them, to take the time to hear it. It was then read, and turned out to be an essay of like character with others of their productions, containing some things true, and some mixed, or at least liable to objections. After the reading, it was remarked in substance about as follows: 'That this was a subject foreign to the business of this committee, and therefore not proper to be presented, or discussed by it; that Friends now all had the right, and entire undoubted privilege to exercise, freely, their own conscience in abstaining from anything they saw fit on conscientious ground; a right and privilege which we would be far from abridging; but that we objected to the consideration of the subject in this committee until it should be laid upon us as a part of our business; or to its being made a matter of discipline;—it being entirely a matter of conscience.' To these views the main part of the committee responded, and were ready to respond, but the self-active spirits of some of the disaffected members were so uneasy at the expression of these remarks and under this way of leaving the subject, that, although Friends had in condescension suffered their document to be read, they could scarcely be restrained to let the committee rise in good order; as some of our Friends from a distance will bear us witness.

"It should be observed that in some few meetings, where the influence of the disaffected members prevailed, they had been introducing into the Answers to the Queries, complaints that Friends did not bear a testimony against Slavery, predicated upon the use of articles supposed to have been produced in slave countries.

"On page 14, they come again upon the American Colonization Society, as if the members of Indiana Yearly

Meeting were largely engaged in Colonization, or as members and contributors to that society; neither of which is the fact. There are very few Friends, if any, belonging to the Yearly Meeting, who are members of that society, and the contributions to its funds from Friends here must have been very small. A small sum, from one to three dollars, handed by a single individual, and that to assist some colored persons in Tennessee, is all that the seceders have been able to discover in the way of recent contributions, and they have trumpeted that from one part of the land to the other as a mighty transgression. *That* contribution was not made, however, contrary to any Advice of the Yearly Meeting, either in spirit or letter; for our Meeting for Sufferings itself, once caused near \$1,000 to be contributed for precisely the same object, viz: to assist friends in North Carolina, in helping persons of color to remove to Africa and elsewhere. The Advice of the Yearly Meeting was against participating in the work of 'expatriation,' by which it was undoubtedly meant, *forcible removal*, without consent; for this Advice was given very soon after Friends of Indiana had assisted Friends of North Carolina, as before mentioned, which is sufficient evidence that *voluntary* removal was not opposed in the Advice. If voluntary removal is what was intended by 'expatriation,' every active member may probably be guilty of transgression in some way or other; and if such an interpretation be admitted, Friends could be prevented from assisting people of color at all, in their removals, and which none are more guilty in than many of the leading seceders, who are almost continually, if not systematically, engaged in aiding them to escape to Canada. The fact is, Friends in Indiana have taken very little part in any way, in Colonization; their feelings have been mainly enlisted and directed toward amelioration and general emancipation.

"The meeting therefore acted very consistently and properly in passing over the remarks made by one of the leading seceders, about rescinding the 'Colonization

scheme,' and by immediately progressing on with its business.

“Page 14. ‘Henry Clay, the great champion of the Pro-Slavery, Whig party, and intended candidate for the ensuing Presidency of the United States—the President of the American Colonization Society, the slaveholder and duelist, while on an electioneering tour to the State of Indiana, attended a political meeting at Richmond, at the time of Yearly Meeting (1842); word being given out that it was his intention to attend the public Meeting of Friends on First-day.

“*Remarks.*—Who gave out such word, and where was it given out?

“Page 15. ‘His meeting was held on the day immediately preceding this, at which time a petition was presented to him, with near two thousand signatures appended, requesting him to give liberty to those of his fellow-beings whom he had long deprived of their just rights.’

“*Remarks.*—It is well known that this petition was got up merely for effect. It is said that it was signed by men, women, children, and persons of color; and that many of Henry Clay’s political enemies signed it, who probably cared nothing about Abolitionism, but liked well enough to do something that would gall him. The manner of its presentation was very reprehensible. He was *attacked* with it, in the midst of a vast concourse of many thousands of his political friends, while on a visit to them, at their special invitation—and upon the public stand whither he had gone to address them. The petition was presented by a person appearing to be a member of our religious Society. Does any one think that if the signers of this petition had been actuated by the sincere love of the Gospel of Christ in the measure, and under a sense of duty, and with any hope of making a favorable impression on the mind of Henry Clay, they would have taken this course for it? Would they not have been more likely to send the petition to him at his home at Ashland, where he could have received and considered it coolly and

calmly, aside from political bustles and political enemies? or to have presented it, by a respectful delegation, in his private room at Richmond? Such a course might have been well approved. Such a one might have had a good effect upon his mind. How much is it to be regretted that these people, in a good cause, should act with such misguided zeal.

“Page 15. ‘After this, a few Friends, in behalf of those who desired to ‘retain their place and influence,’ took an opportunity to inform him that the Society (of Friends) had no hand in getting up this petition,’ etc.

“*Remarks.*—Very proper information; and such as was due to Henry Clay, and the Society of Friends, more particularly as the petition had been presented by a person who had been taken for a Friend. But the Friends who gave Henry Clay this correct information, did it on behalf of *themselves*, and are personally responsible for all they said; they were not delegated.

“Page 15. ‘The Clerk of the meeting, on First-day morning, took him in his carriage to meeting; Friends took care to seat him in one of the most conspicuous places in the house.’

“*Remarks.*—What was there wrong in this? A distinguished stranger visits our neighborhood on meeting day; he tells a member whom he meets, that he is inclined to go to our meeting. Shall we do less than show him the way? and to find him a seat when he gets there? Would it not be a great and reprehensible violation of all good manners, courtesy, good breeding, and duty to disrespect such an intimation? Henry Clay is distinguished as an eminent politician and statesman, as a man of superior talents, and he has long filled one of the highest offices in the government. And what was done for him, was done in accordance with well-defined duties in religious and civil society, and done in as simple a manner, and with great caution to make as little parade and as little disturbance as possible, and we are glad to learn that Friends were generally well satisfied with what took place.

“We are not without feelings of gratitude to our heavenly Father, that He favored us to get along with so much quietness on the occasion of such a visit at so large a meeting. But the Clerk of the meeting, as such, did not conduct Henry Clay. The meeting had no Clerk on that day, it being a public general meeting, for worship. The individual who conducted him to meeting, did it upon his own personal responsibility, and not as the Clerk, and he must bear that responsibility. It need not, then, have been any cause for separation from the Society, as neither the Society nor the meeting was at all responsible for Henry Clay’s presence, or the manner of his traveling to meeting.

“Page 15. ‘After the close of the meeting, men and women, Ministers and Elders, gathered around him in the ministers’ gallery, giving the strongest evidence by their introductions and salutations, of the high estimation in which they held him; he in turn taking care to return the compliment with all the etiquette for which he is famed.’

“*Remarks.*—This is overstrained. No such remarkable demonstrations were made, as would appear from their representation. The person who writes this was on the spot, an eye-witness; the writer of the Declaration, as is supposed, and a great part of his leading friends, as is known, were not at meeting—being at Newport on that day. An aged, infirm Friend, and worthy minister, who had received kindness from Henry Clay when in severe bodily affliction, among strangers, at Lexington, Ky., introduced him in a becoming manner to his wife, and to a few other Friends near, but nothing worthy of any particular remark occurred, and some who were among the disaffected seemed as anxious to see Henry Clay as any others were.*

* It may be proper here to remark, that a contemptible tale has been widely circulated, that sundry women Friends kissed Henry Clay at the meeting; and it is believed that origin and currency to this tale has been given mainly by the seceders, as other persons would not be likely to trouble themselves about it. Such a tale would indeed be unworthy of notice and contradiction if it had not been considered of sufficient im-

“They proceed on the same page to say: ‘At the time of Yearly Meeting, in 1841, Charles C. Burleigh, an *eminent* philanthropist, came to Richmond, on a mission to plead the cause of equal and impartial justice—to plead the cause of millions of our *innocent* suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, who are not permitted to plead for themselves.’

“*Remark.*—A great flourish this, when the words ‘an Abolition lecturer,’ would have expressed the whole affair.

“Page 16. ‘But this man was treated with indignity—with utter contempt.’

“*Remarks.*—Not by Friends, however, as is insinuated. If they do not mean to say that Friends treated him contemptibly, why do they state it as a cause of separation? But hear them further.

“‘Friends closed their meeting-house doors against him, the doors of the public houses in the town were closed also, and he was mobbed in the open street while addressing the people.’

“*Remarks.*—This is also overstrained, false in insinuation, and unsound in facts. What business would C. C. Burleigh have had in our meeting-house in Yearly Meeting time, not being a member, except to attend a meeting for worship? This he had the most unqualified liberty to do. There were few Friends in attendance, who would not have offered him their own seat, if they had known him, and if it had been necessary to do so in order for him to be seated. I presume very few persons, except those who have since seceded, were aware of his presence at meeting. No application was made to the Trustees, in his behalf, for the use of the house, to appoint a meeting; hence it must be incorrect to say that the doors were closed against him, even though they know that Friends

portance for them to talk over, for the ridicule of our Society. Sufficient be it to say, that no such thing occurred.

Several slanderous articles have appeared in their publications, insinuating that extraordinary attention was paid to Henry Clay, *because* he is a slaveholder, etc., etc., an insinuation no less disgusting than corrupt and unfounded.

are not in the practice of opening their meeting-houses for the lectures of strangers. If the doors of the public houses in town were not open to him, it was because the houses had been previously filled, as is frequently the case in time of Yearly Meeting. If they have reference to the meeting-houses of any other religious professors, it is not necessary that we should answer for them—we know nothing about it—they can answer for themselves. The insinuation that Friends mobbed him in the street, is detestable. It may be safely asserted, that very few, if any persons of character can be found in Richmond, leaving Friends out of the question, who would not most decidedly disapprove of all mobbing. Not one could have been concerned in the reported mob, except bad boys and persons of low character, and probably very few of either.

“Page 16. ‘Thus it is evident, so far as an extensive tissue of facts and circumstances can establish, and so far as the fruit of a tree can manifest its character, that the influence by which the Yearly Meeting is now governed is PRO-SLAVERY, and that unsoundness lies at the bottom of the opposition with which we have been assailed.’

“*Remarks.*—It is only by a strong exercise of charitable feeling that we can be brought to think that the sentiment, expressed in this paragraph, is not willfully erroneous. Examples have, however, before occurred, in which, under the gloom of a thick cloud of delusion, men have taken darkness for light and light for darkness, and persuaded themselves to believe, through excitements and reasonings of their own getting up, that to be true which was altogether untrue. If delusion has so unhappily clouded the minds of *these* people as to cause them to imagine that the Society of Friends is in favor of Slavery, it is pretty certain that it does not extend itself beyond their influence; as the public, and particularly the slaveholders in the slave States, are well aware that Friends have long since cleared their hands of this evil on conscientious ground, and that they are

decidedly and firmly against slavery, in every country where they are found.

“If some of the leading seceders should turn their attention to themselves and seek a qualification to see, in the light of Truth, whether a disposition has not been growing upon them, for years, to govern our Yearly Meeting in their own way, and whether, when this disposition was fairly discovered and checked, they possessed the meekness and humility to submit to their brethren, or whether they took offense and flew off, they might probably be favored to discover a reason, better justified by truth than the foregoing, why they met with opposition in their course.

“But hear them through the paragraph: ‘Various, however, are the grounds of this opposition with different individuals, and much too complicated to be fully described in our limits.

“‘But that which we doubt not is occupied by the greater number is plainly alluded to in the following extract from the Epistle of Advice of 1841; ‘Thus maintaining our peaceable and Christian principles in unbroken harmony, we shall, we believe, be enabled, as way may open, more availingly to plead the cause of this much injured race of our fellow-men, and retain the place and influence which, as a Society, we have heretofore had with the rulers of the land.’

“*Remarks.*—And why should we not wish to retain a place in the hearts of those we desire to influence for good? If the truth is to be declared to one that has departed from the right way, will it not be most effectually done in the spirit of kindness, in accordance with ‘our peaceable and Christian principles? or shall we, if we wish to convince and gain one to whom we speak, approach him by calling him a thief, a liar, or a murderer, as the case may be?

“The insinuation, on page 17, that by being thus mild, and acting up to the advice they quote, Friends are ‘yielding to the prejudices, or accommodating ourselves to the corrupt views and sentiments of those

around us,' in regard to Slavery, comes without any substantial proof, and is believed to be groundless.

“They proceed, on the same page, to notice the case of the eight members of the Meeting for Sufferings, who were reported by that meeting to the Yearly Meeting as having lost their usefulness in the first-named body. As those eight members are among the principal leaders in the schism, and the declaration was probably drawn up by them, a sense of modesty, one would have thought, ought to have prevented their making this circumstance public. We should also think that any person of calm mind, who knows what their proceedings have been since that report, could not for a moment doubt the justice of the measure. The Meeting for Sufferings is a delegated body, acting under appointment, like a committee, to do important business, in behalf of the Society, in the interim of the regular sessions of the Yearly Meeting. It would indeed be strange doctrine to presume that the Yearly Meeting has not power to see that it is fairly represented by this body, which is appointed by itself for the special purpose of representing it; and that the Yearly Meeting has not power to examine, dismiss, and appoint others, until it shall be fairly represented. And it has been a general rule in our Meeting for Sufferings, which the Yearly Meeting has always recognized, that the former, standing, as it does, to watch the interests of the Society, has the liberty to make any suggestion or proposition to the latter which the state of society may require or which may be thought proper. Now here are certain members of the Meeting for Sufferings who do not represent the Yearly Meeting; who are counteracting and opposing its Advices; who are so alienated in their feelings that they are taking open and active measures directly at variance with the wishes of the meeting they represent. It would be great anarchy if they must be allowed to pursue their career interminably. They are talked to kindly, again and again; they are persuaded; they are admonished by their own personal and intimate friends, and by divers valuable Friends, eminent

for their piety, traveling from other States and countries for the spread of the Gospel through our land, but all to no effect. They know too much. They refuse to be persuaded. They refuse to change. And what could the Meeting for Sufferings do less, with the knowledge of these facts before it, than to make the suggestion to the Yearly Meeting that they had lost their usefulness. The Yearly Meeting would then be at liberty to act in the case as it might see proper. It was nothing like disownment, nor did it contain or contemplate any preparatory steps for it. But previously to making this suggestion, a large committee was appointed in the Meeting for Sufferings, who considered the matter weightily; and when they exposed the names of the eight members alluded to, a deep feeling pervaded the meeting, and almost every person in the meeting, excepting the ones named, wept freely—while the conviction of the propriety and necessity of the course was so strong that a very general expression of unity with the proceedings was made, under feelings of deep solemnity and sorrow.

“We are informed that the seceders were consulting, between this time and the time when the suggestion should reach the Yearly Meeting, concerning measures for defense and for the defeat of any proposition which might be made in reference to their leaders. So it is easy to see why the proposition was made in the Yearly Meeting by one of them, that the Minutes should state the cause of their disqualification. The object of that proposition was well understood by the greater part of the meeting, as soon as made. It is believed that there are very few members of the Yearly Meeting who are in the practice of taking an active part in its business, who did not readily see that the proposition was of a political nature, designed entirely to create difficulty by throwing out this plausible defense, which should be at once seconded by their own party. Hence the reason is plain why the meeting passed on without granting a request so unprecedented.

There are yet two or three pages of the Declaration

which contain no matter which will claim attention at this time, further than a few general remarks. We cannot now call up in review every objectionable sentence and expression. The whole document is written in a spirit so evidently bad toward our religious society, that most impartial readers will readily see and feel it. And it might be added, that the whole is written under such perversions of thought, that most of the matters brought to view are unfairly or incorrectly represented, or shown out under false colors. It, therefore, would require more time to descend into minute explanations, refutations, and defense, and extend this review to a greater length than can be profitably appropriated to it, without being wearisome, or than was contemplated when the pen was taken up.

“In reading this declaration and other publications of the seceders, we seem to arrive at the following conclusions, which may be thus stated:

“1. That a spirit of self-confidence and independence is entertained by the seceders, and a determination, on their part, not to submit to the church government and discipline.

“2. They make a general and, in many cases, unexplained charge of Colonization against the Society, not only in the West, but elsewhere throughout America. This charge contains a slander, because when explained out in words, they interpret it to be a disposition to drive from the country, without their consent, the people of color generally, on account of an unjust estimation or disregard of their rights, on account of unmerited prejudices against them, and for the purpose of perpetuating Slavery, etc. Such a charge against our Society is believed to be insupportable, and the causes of it to exist merely in the imagination, without reality. An extensive knowledge of the state of feeling in our Yearly Meeting convinces us that the great body of active members in Society hold no views of Colonization except such as are just, humane, and philanthropic, and in accord-

ance with unconditional emancipation. Colonization is not relied upon to extinguish Slavery.

“3. They charge that a widely extended prejudice is entertained against the African race on account of their color, degradation, etc., which they say, operates against their enlargement, and extends itself through the Society of Friends. It will be time enough to defend ourselves against this charge when proof of guilt is made. There may be too much prejudice among us; if there is, we have reason to hope and believe that there is a disposition to be corrected, when convinced, and to endeavor to come to the right standard.

“4. They place the existence of a predominant Pro-Slavery feeling in the Society, which, they say, shows itself in a desire to be popular with the slaveholder, etc.; a charge which may safely be considered slanderous, and rejected as unworthy of refutation.

“It should be remarked, in the close, that the religious Society of Friends, in this country, has nothing to do with the modern Anti-Slavery societies, or with the Colonization, for good or for evil. We have once said, in an Epistle, that we ‘wish to say nothing to discourage any *Christian* effort in the cause of freedom, by the first of these, nor to call in question the benevolent motives which influence many who are engaged in the last. Our desires and prayers are, that the Lord, in his mercy, may overrule the whole for good.’ The same views and feelings are still entertained.

“And for the seceders themselves, we earnestly desire forgiveness for all their errors, mistakes, and irregularities: and that through Divine favor, they may be enabled to return into a state of calmness, repentance, and fellowship with their brethren; which, we think, would greatly contribute to their own happiness and be calculated to give furtherance, more effectually, to the good cause in which they profess to be engaged.”

As this anonymous author endeavors to make the impression, that a certain “report,” alluded to in the

Declaration as coming from a branch of the committee on the concerns of the People of Color, contained objectionable matter, and that which was not strictly true, the reader may find it by turning to page 54, and by a re-examination (if he has already read it) be the better prepared to judge of the propriety of the statement.

CHAPTER XIV.

Defense against the Attacks of an anonymous Reviewer.

THE charges and misrepresentations of this nameless author were met by the Meeting for Sufferings of the newly-organized body, in the following manner:

D E F E N S E

O F

A N T I - S L A V E R Y F R I E N D S ,

AGAINST THE SLANDEROUS ATTACKS OF AN ANONYMOUS REVIEWER.

Issued by a Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, held at Newport, in Wayne Co., Indiana, on the 25th of Eleventh month, 1843.

“ A document, purporting to be a Review of the Declaration issued by our Yearly Meeting, in the Second month last, having been published and widely circulated, containing much that is erroneous, and intended to make an unfavorable impression on the public mind, and particularly on the minds of distant Friends, respecting the character and proceedings of A. S. Friends, we believe it to be our duty to say something in our own defense, and in defense of the cause of Truth, against the false

charges and dark insinuations, as well as to expose some of the erroneous principles contained in the Review.'

“If the Review had been written by an obscure individual, and had not received the sanction of the most active and prominent members of the Yearly Meeting, by giving it a general circulation as an approved work, we should not have felt ourselves under the same obligation to notice it. But as it is, being written (as is generally believed, and we have never heard of its being denied) by the individual who has long filled the most important station in the Yearly Meeting, and who has been re-appointed to that station since its publication; and being approved by the leading influences, both in the Yearly Meeting and Meeting for Sufferings, we have to regard it as entitled to the same respect or censure, as if it had been issued by the Meeting for Sufferings. All it lacks is the mere formality of reading in that meeting, and the signature of its Clerk, and this was most probably omitted, in order to avoid the responsibility, in case its errors should be exposed. And as the Yearly Meeting in 1841, censured members of Society for publishing an address to Friends, written by Joseph Sturge, because it was not approved by a Meeting for Sufferings; so, in the case before us, the writer of the review is a violator of discipline, according to their own doctrine. And if it is wrong to publish such a document over the author's name, is it less wrong to publish it without a name! If the author of the Review had affixed his name to his production, he would have been liable to the public censure of the Yearly Meeting. But as he has withheld it from the public, although he is known by the leading members to have committed the censurable act, he is still promoted to the highest place in the Society. But whether the author was known or not, if it be contrary to discipline (as our opposers say it is) to publish anything of the kind without the approbation of the Meeting for Sufferings, it is very inconsistent for leading characters in Society to give it their sanction by circulating it.

“The author of the work and all who aid in its publication and circulation are equally guilty. Take an illustration. Theft is a crime punishable by the civil law. If, however, a thief is crafty enough to escape detection, he escapes the penalty, but is he less guilty? And if the administrators of the law know who the thief is, share in the plunder, and promote the thief to places of trust, are they not all alike guilty? We have not, and do not now, condemn individuals for publishing their views (under certain circumstances) on any moral or religious question, but our opposers have brought themselves into the present dilemma, by maintaining this doctrine when it seems to suit their purpose, and violating it when circumstances appeared to render it expedient; and they have attempted to evade the penalty of the law (according to their own construction) by concealment.

“The Query, ‘From what privileges have they been deprived by the Yearly Meeting?’ needs no other reply than a reference to documents already before the public, and we have no doubt but all unprejudiced persons who are acquainted with the history of the past, in reference to this subject, will consider this question in no other light than as an insult to us, and to the good sense of the community. We were deprived of every privilege of Society except bare membership, and we know, whatever may now be said to the contrary, that measures were in train calculated to deprive us of that. Perhaps we ought to have made one other exception. While we were deprived of the privilege of exerting any influence in the disposition of the affairs of the Society, while we were denied the privilege of discharging those duties which we believed to be required of us, and our liberty of conscience denied us, we were still allowed the privilege of paying as much as we pleased, toward defraying the expenses of Society.

“The assertion, more than once made, that we wished to rule the Yearly Meeting, is without foundation in truth, and must proceed from a mind grossly perverted by prejudice, or influenced by a malicious design to de-

stroy our character, by misrepresentation and falsehood. So far were we from wishing to rule the Yearly Meeting, we stood entirely on the defensive. So far were we from attempting to drive other Friends into our measures and practices, we only asked for liberty to discharge our duty to the slave, according to the dictates of our consciences. We did not wish to compel or require others to join A. S. Societies, to attend A. S. Meetings, to deliver A. S. Lectures, or to read A. S. papers and publications; but we plead for liberty to do any or all of those things ourselves, as we believed them to be our duty, and this liberty was denied us. And for the exercise of these duties which we conscientiously believed to be required of us, we have been persecuted and proscribed, and driven to the necessity of seceding from the 'body,' in order to enjoy our rights in peace.

"The assertion, that, so far as we had power, we selected our own men *to the exclusion of others*, is equally untrue and unfounded. On the contrary, we *know* that Anti-Slavery Friends, when they took the liberty to name Friends on committees, very frequently named those who were opposed to our Anti-Slavery labors, or as they are commonly called 'body members.' But if the charge were true, we know it was the course pursued by our opposers, and directed by the Yearly Meeting to be practiced. Why should they condemn us for that which they were guilty of themselves.

"The remarks about the deterioration of the Society of Friends are remarkable. Will the writer say that it has not deteriorated? And did we say, that we had not deteriorated from the ancient purity of the Society, or that we were more holy than those we have left behind? Then why the self-important conclusion, that 'those interested will not fail to take notice whether this is the state of facts?'

"We wish to be a little particular with regard to the remarks of the reviewer, on the A. S. and Colonization societies, as here is an important point in the controversy. It has frequently been asserted by A. S. Friends, that

our opposers were not so much influenced by opposition to uniting with other people in benevolent enterprises, as by hostility to the present Anti-Slavery societies, or to what is termed modern Abolition; and that they, or at least, many of the leaders, were favorable to the American Colonization Society. These charges have been denied by many individuals, and represented as unfounded and slanderous. But surely they cannot be disputed any longer. After such sentiments as are contained in the Review have been put forth by such an individual, and received the sanction of the leading members—of those whose influence pervades and regulates all the transactions of the Society, it cannot be denied that they are the sentiments of the ruling part of the Yearly Meeting. To prove their opposition to the present A. S. societies it is only necessary to quote a sentence or two from the Review. After quoting from our Declaration an expression made use of by us to show that Friends were formerly in favor of mixed associations to promote the abolition of Slavery, stating that ‘James Pemberton, Warner Mifflin, and many other Friends, eminent for their piety and virtue, apprehending that much advantage to the cause of the oppressed Africans might be derived from duly enlisting all classes of the community in their behalf, engaged in the formation of associations for that purpose,’ the writer of the Review says: ‘Not associations of their sort however. The modern Abolition societies took their rise as lately as 1832, and do not agree in practice, nor throughout in principle, with the worthy individuals whom they name.’ Now, is it not plain that the objection really is to the modern A. S. societies, and not to uniting with other people? The argument is plainly this: ‘Those worthy individuals’ did right in uniting with others, because the principles of the societies *they* formed were sound, and their practices correct. But it is not right for Friends to join *modern* A. S. societies, because their practice is erroneous and their principles unsound. If this is not the import of the expression, it means nothing. For surely

it does not touch the question, of the propriety or impropriety of uniting with others for the promotion of a good work, except to sanction it by claiming those who are known to have practiced it, as their people.

“As an additional evidence of hostility to the present Anti-Slavery associations, hear him again. Quoting from the Declaration, where we were speaking of the good that had been effected by the A. S. institutions which Pemberton and other Friends were instrumental in establishing, the writer of the Review throws in a parenthetic sentence, thus: (‘not modern Abolition institutions it should be remembered’). Seeing then, that according to their own showing, they have no objection to joining A. S. societies, if they be of the right kind, why have they not shown wherein the modern differ from the ancient, so as to render them objectionable? If, instead of condemning the practice of joining benevolent associations altogether, the objection had only been made to joining those that were established upon wrong principles, and that pursued wrong practices, and had those erroneous principles and practices been pointed out, we might have been led to establish others that would be free from these objections.

“We think we have now shown conclusively that the writer of the Review, and all who have given it their sanction, are not opposed to joining in mixed associations, the objects and principles of which they approve, but that they are opposed to the modern A. S. enterprise. We are ready to admit and believe that this opposition is occasioned more by the unpopularity of the cause, than by any settled hostility to its principles; yet as they make an objection to its principles and practices, let us inquire wherein the modern Anti-Slavery societies differ from those in the days of Mifflin, Pemberton, etc., in order that we may discover the objectionable feature in the modern, as the reviewer has not pointed it out to us.

“As regards practice, we are not able to point out any material difference, and as the reviewer has not shown

any, we shall take it for granted that there is none, and inquire what is the difference in principle? And here we know of no difference except in one point. The old societies advocated *gradual* emancipation—the new, advocate *immediatism*. The old said, cease sinning by degrees—the new says, leave it off immediately. It is then the doctrine of *immediate*, as distinguished from *gradual* emancipation that renders the modern A. S. societies obnoxious to the displeasure of our reviewer and his adherents.

“It seems scarcely necessary to say anything to prove their attachment to the Colonization scheme, after the labored defense thereof by the reviewer. The most incredulous must be convinced that they hold the Colonization Society in much more favor than the A. S. Society. The former is praised and defended, while the latter is treated with contempt, and represented as unworthy of the patronage of such men as Mifflin, Pemberton, etc. The defense of the Colonization Society seems to have been the most prominent object in the reviewer’s mind, as we believe he has devoted a greater space to it than to any other topic embraced in the Review.

“It will be proper, we apprehend, to notice some of his assertions on this head, and to see how they will compare with facts. He quotes from our Declaration as follows:

“‘This circumstance, taken in connection with that of the formation and active operation of the Colonization Society, instituted mainly by slaveholders and purposely for the removal of the ‘free people of color’ from the country, and in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us, almost sealed the fate of genuine Anti-Slavery feeling in the Society.’ And then says:

“‘How melancholy the reflection that men professing to be guided under the influence of the religion of Christ, should be so far deluded as to hazard such expressions! what a shame to our religion! what a handle for infidels!’

“What are the expressions so notoriously bad, the bare utterance of which is cause of such melancholy reflections? We are assured by what follows that the expression respecting the institution of the Colonization Society is particularly obnoxious to his indignation; for he immediately enters into a defense of that institution, commencing thus: ‘The Colonization Society originated with Robert Finley, of New Jersey, and has always, it is said, received more patronage at the North than at the South. From the rise, many men of the best talents, of the highest order of practical benevolence, and of undoubted piety, have always taken an active interest in its success.’ What a departure from charity, what a slander upon all these (and such as these have always been among the leaders), to say that their object was the removal of the free people of color *in order that none of them might enjoy liberty among us.*’ If it be slander to tell the truth, then the language of our Declaration is slanderous. We asserted that the Colonization Society was instituted mainly by slaveholders, and purposely for the removal of the free people of color from the country, in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us. That this statement is true, is susceptible of the strongest evidence from the documents furnished by Colonizationists themselves. That the Colonization Society was instituted mainly by slaveholders, is a fact too notorious to need confirmation, is evident to all who are acquainted with its origin, and it is difficult for us to believe that the writer of the Review did not know it. But for the sake of those who may not be acquainted with its history, we will state some of the particulars. With whom the idea of colonizing the free people of color on the coast of Africa originated, is nothing to the purpose, if it could be ascertained, and we presume it is unknown to any person living. The institution of the society is the matter under consideration.”

“On the 23d of Twelfth month, 1816, the Legislature of Virginia, passed a resolution, requesting the governor to correspond with the President of the United States, for

the purpose of obtaining a territory on the coast of Africa, or at some other place not within the limits of any of the States, or Territorial Governments of the United States, to serve as an asylum for such persons of color as are now free, and may desire the same, and for those who may hereafter be emancipated within this Commonwealth.

“Near the same time a meeting was held at Washington, to consider this same subject. William Jay, in his ‘Inquiry,’ says: ‘It was composed almost entirely of Southern gentlemen; Judge Washington presided, Mr. Clay, Mr. Randolph, and others, took part in the discussions which ensued, and which resulted in the organization of the American Colonization Society. Judge Washington was chosen President, and of the seventeen Vice-Presidents, only five were selected from the free States, while the twelve managers were, it is believed, without one exception, slaveholders.’

“In the Appendix to the fourteenth annual Report, in an attempt to prove to the slaveholders, that the Colonization scheme is well adapted to promote their interests, this language is used: ‘nor should it be forgotten, that most of those who met to organize the Society, and ALL who expressed their sentiments on that occasion, were slaveholders.’ Will any one now question this part of our statement, ‘that the Colonization Society was instituted mainly by slaveholders?’

“Next, it devolves upon us to show that it was ‘purposely for the removal of the free people of color from this country.’

“This is evident from the first article in their Constitution. Here it is:

“‘Art. 1. This Society shall be called the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Color in the United States.’

“The second article is equally, or even more explicit on this point. It reads thus:

“‘Art. 2d. The object to which its attention is to be *exclusively* directed, is to promote and execute a plan for

colonizing (with their own consent) the free people of color residing in our country, in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient,' etc.

"Thus far then we have substantiated our statement. It remains now to prove that it was 'in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us.'

"The Constitution of the society leaves us altogether in the dark as to its *motives*, further than they can be ascertained by the expression of its object. They do not tell us why they wished to colonize the free people of color, but it is evident that it could not have been for their own benefit nor for the benefit of Africa; for it is expressly set forth, that they are to be colonized 'in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem best.' Any place out of the United States. Does not this look like a design to prevent them from enjoying liberty among us? But we have stronger testimony than this. It is true, in one sense, as the writer of the Review says, that 'the Colonization Society had no power, if they had desired to do so, to compel free people to go to Africa,' but they had the power, and have used it extensively, to exert such an influence as to cause the situation of free colored people to be extremely unpleasant here, and thus to induce them to go to Africa. Recollect, the object was to *promote and execute a plan* for colonizing (with their own consent). This plan could not be executed unless their consent could be obtained. To obtain their consent then, was a part of their object, as much as to colonize them. They do not say their object is to colonize them if they consent to go, but to colonize them with their consent. Those who are acquainted with the history of this affair know something, and those who will take the trouble to examine it *may* know something of the diabolical means resorted to, to obtain that consent, both in the slave and free States. In order to show more conclusively that the design was to prevent free colored people from enjoying liberty among us, we will make a few quotations.

“‘Free blacks are a greater nuisance than even slaves themselves.’ *Address of C. C. Harper, African Repository, vol. XI, page 189.*

“‘A horde of miserable people—the objects of universal suspicion—subsisting by plunder.’ *Speech of Mercer, Vice-President.*

“‘Of all classes of our population, the *most vicious* is that of the free colored—contaminated themselves, they extend their vices to all around them.’ *Speech of Henry Clay, Vice-President. 12th Report, p. 21.*

“‘Averse to labor, with no incentives to industry or motives to respect, they maintain a precarious existence by petty thefts and plunder.’ *Af. Rep. VI. 135.*

“‘An anomalous race of beings, the most depraved upon earth.’ *Af. Rep. VII. 135.*

“We could give much more of the same character if our limits would allow, and it were necessary, showing the means used for carrying out the plan of the society. Is it not plain that the object of these speakers and writers was to excite a strong prejudice against the free colored population—to induce such measures toward them as would extort their consent to removal? Is this the language of kindness and benevolence? And are the authors of these sentiments, the men spoken of by our reviewer, as ‘men of the best talents, of the highest order of practical benevolence and undoubted piety?’ They are certainly among the leaders, and he says, ‘such as these have always been among the leaders.’

“As a further evidence of the tendency of the scheme to promote the oppression of the free colored people in this country, to obtain their consent to be expatriated, we will make a few more quotations.

“‘This law (a law by which a manumitted negro becomes again a slave if he remains twelve months in the State), odious and unjust as it may at first view appear, and hard as it may seem to bear upon the liberated negro, was, doubtless, dictated by *sound policy*, and its repeal would be regarded by none with more unfeigned regret than by the *friends of African Colonization.* It has

restrained many masters from giving freedom to their slaves and has thereby contributed to check the growth of an evil already too great and formidable. *Memorial of Powhattan Col. Soc. to Virginia Legislature.*

“ ‘I am clear that whether we consider it with reference to the welfare of the State, or the happiness of the blacks, it were better to have left them in CHAINS, than to have liberated them to receive such freedom as they enjoy, and greater freedom we cannot, must not allow them.’ *Af. Rep.* III. 197.

“ ‘We do not ask that the provisions of our Constitution and statute book should be so modified as to relieve and exalt the condition of the colored people *while they remain with us*. Let these provisions stand in *all their rigor*, to work out the ultimate and unbounded good of these people.’ The obvious meaning of this is, to compel them to go to Africa. *Memorial of the N. Y. State Col. Soc. to the Legislature.*

“ Brodnax, a strong advocate of Colonization, said, in the Virginia Legislature :

“ ‘*It is idle to talk about not resorting to force. Every body must look to the introduction of force of some kind or other.* If the free negroes are willing to go, they will go ; if not, *they must be compelled to go.*’ And again, ‘all of us look to force of some kind or other, direct or indirect, moral or physical, legal or illegal.’

“ The free people of color early discovered the evil tendencies and prejudicial effects of this scheme and generally opposed to it. At a meeting of them held in New Bedford, in 1832, the following resolutions were passed.

“ ‘*Resolved*, That in whatever light we view the Colonization Society, we discover nothing in it but terror, prejudice, and oppression. The warm and beneficent hand of philanthropy is not apparent in the system, but the influence of the society on public opinion is more prejudicial to the interests and welfare of the people of color in the United States than Slavery itself.’

“ ‘*Resolved*, That the society, to effect its purpose, the

removal of the free people of color (not the slaves) through its agents, teaches the public to believe that it is patriotic and *benevolent* to withhold from us knowledge, and means of acquiring subsistence; and to look upon us as unnatural and illegal residents in this country, and thus by the force of prejudice, if not by law, endeavor to compel us to embark for Africa, and that, too, apparently by our own free-will and consent.'

“Let the impartial reader now judge whether we have not fully substantiated the charge that the ‘Colonization Society was instituted mainly by slaveholders, and purposely for the removal of the free people of color from this country, in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us. Where then is the ‘shame to our religion?’ the ‘handle for infidels?’ They consist in the facts that the charge is true, and that professing Christians, well acquainted with the circumstances, should attempt to mislead the uninformed by denying it. That the Colonization scheme has had the effect to strengthen the chains of the slave, and that it was so intended, is attested by the memorial of the Powhattan Colonization Society to the Virginia Legislature, in the following language: *‘It has restrained many masters from giving liberty to their slaves, and has thereby contributed to check the growth of an evil already too great and formidable.’* This is the society which we have charged the leading characters in the old Yearly Meeting with favoring, and of this charge they stand convicted before the public. Whether they support it for the purpose of producing these results or not, is not the question at issue. It is enough that they advocate a scheme having such tendencies and instituted for such purposes.

“We have not charged them, as the writer intimates, with relying upon Colonization, to extinguish Slavery. This was no part of the object in the formation of the society, but directly the reverse. If we could believe them ignorant enough to advocate the Colonization Society as a means of abolishing Slavery, we could look

upon their conduct with more charity; and notwithstanding the denial of such motives by the reviewer, we do hope that *some* of those who favor the scheme, do it in ignorance, not knowing its design and tendencies, but looking upon it as a means of exterminating Slavery.

“This is the institution our author attempts to justify, a hundredth part of the obliquity and moral turpitude of the actions and principles of which cannot be disclosed in our limits. He even declares in effect, that it is more objectionable to assist a brother, who, having fallen among thieves and been stripped, wounded, and robbed of everything, has escaped them and come to our houses, although naked and hungry, than to support that association.

“A society, too, the funds of which go directly to pay for instruments of death, and for obtaining implements to defend their colony with devastation and slaughter. He even dared to assert that to contribute to those funds is not contrary to any Advice of the Yearly Meeting of Indiana heretofore issued. In 1836, that Yearly Meeting cautioned its members to take no part in, nor render any aid to, any political association on the subject of African Slavery, which is, or may be founded on principles either directly or indirectly, having a *tendency* to promote the unrighteous work of expatriation; it being our settled conviction that this work, as a condition to the slaves being set at liberty, is unjust and oppressive. In 1838, it says: ‘fearing that there are of our members occupying and contending for grounds that are not in full accordance with our well known testimonies on this important subject, by too much countenancing the policy of the day, which denies to that class of our fellow-beings the capacity of enjoying the natural rights of man, only on the terms of expatriation, we earnestly invite Friends to renewed exertions on behalf of suffering humanity, etc.’

“Now it is well known that it is the policy of the American Colonization Society and its prominent advocates, to oppose any scheme of emancipation without Colonization, and the author of the Review must know (it

cannot be otherwise) that it was this association that was alluded to in the Advices above quoted, and yet he says, virtually, it is not contrary to them, to aid, support, and countenance this scheme! although it is evident that he endeavors to mislead his readers by representing it as merely aiding in voluntary removals; but we have seen what kind of voluntary removals this society and its advocates endeavor to promote.

“He says, page 6, ‘the Advice of the Yearly Meeting was against participating in the work of expatriation; by which it was undoubtedly meant, forcible removal.’ Here he, in effect, says that the Advice was against directly aiding in this work. Not so; it was against *aiding an association* founded on principles having a *tendency*, either directly or indirectly, to promote this unrighteous work, and we have shown that such was the tendency of the Colonization Society!

“Again, he endeavors to confound the principles of Buxton and many other English philanthropists in regard to forming colonies on the western coast of Africa, with this nefarious scheme of slaveholders; while, at the same time, he must be aware that Buxton has condemned and repudiated it in the most unqualified terms.

“There is one very strange feature about this little anonymous document. The author, after endeavoring to advocate and defend the Colonization Society as a good institution, and never once uttering a syllable against any of its principles or measures, says, that ‘Friends of Indiana have taken very little part, in any way, in Colonization.’ Now, if he really thinks it is such an institution as he would have us believe, why should he, in endeavoring to defend the Society of Friends, declare that it has taken very little part in supporting it. To us it is clear that he does not believe his own representations of its character, or else that he has charged those whom he professes to defend, with criminal apathy, in neglecting to support a work, so good as he represents it to be.

“But here it should be remembered, that it was not

on account of the members of Indiana Yearly Meeting being so largely engaged in actual colonization, or of their rendering any great pecuniary support to that society, that the subject was spoken of in the Declaration, in either place, but to show the sentiment and feeling of the leaders in the ruling party, in favor thereof, to show the existence of those feelings among them which present one of the most powerful barriers to the progress of the cause of immediate emancipation in our country, feelings which almost everywhere around us are expressed in language like this: 'I am as much opposed to Slavery as anybody, but I don't want the niggers set free here among us.' 'If they could have a country to themselves, I should be glad they were free, but I don't want them turned loose unless they are colonized.' When the same sentiments are expressed by those Friends in unity with the ruling party of that Yearly Meeting, they generally assume a somewhat milder form, such as, 'I would rather they were somewhere to themselves.' 'Would it not be better for both classes (whites and blacks), for the colored people to be in a country of their own?' etc. On page 4 of the Review, the author asserts that the labors of Friends, in promoting the extinction of Slavery, have been active and *unremitted* for fifty years or more.

"It is difficult to conceive of a greater departure from all truth, than there is in this Declaration. It is well known that fifty or sixty years ago, and some time after, many of the most prominent members of the society were actively engaged in associations, organized expressly for the purpose of promoting the abolition of Slavery, in addition to what was being done among Friends as a religious society; which all who are apprised of the zeal and energy of the influential part, must know, was far more than what it has accomplished in that capacity at any recent date. And it is equally well known, that all those societies have been suffered to expire for want of this energy and zeal, with but one solitary exception, and so completely have they remitted all their efforts that a member of Society would now be con-

sidered as a violator of the Advice of Society even for holding membership in that very organization which Friends more than fifty years ago were instrumental in establishing.

“The author proceeds, page 2, to make some extracts from Woolman, which, he says, will make plain to any one who understands the views and is acquainted with the acts of the seceders, whether they hold and act upon his principles. Various quotations are then made, carefully italicizing such passages as this: ‘*nothing is more precious than the mind of truth inwardly manifested;*’ ‘*inward prayer;*’ ‘*deeply bowed under the weight of the work;*’ ‘*looking often to the Lord for assistance;*’ ‘*in the fear of the Lord,*’ etc., and then winds up by saying, ‘how different was John Woolman’s spirit, how different his example of waiting and labor from theirs.’ All this is mere assertion, and all the italicizing, together with his remarks, show that he, claiming to be with Woolman, claims also to occupy a position entirely the reverse of that held by Anti-Slavery Friends in regard to ‘inward prayer,’ ‘the fear of the Lord,’ etc., and discovers to us much of the spirit of the Pharisee, alluded to by our Lord in the parable concerning one who, with a publican, went up into the temple to pray. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself: ‘God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican (Abolitionist), *I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all I possess,*’ ‘*I pray, I fear the Lord, not like these deluded, self-active spirits.*’ But how is John Woolman’s example different from the practice of Anti-Slavery Friends? ‘in waiting and labor.’ When we have become convinced of what was required of us, we have endeavored to perform it without further waiting, and not till then. Was this his doctrine and practice? ‘Hear him! Should we now be sensible of what He (the Lord) requires of us, and through a respect to some friendships which do not stand on an immutable foundation, neglect to do our duty in firmness and constancy, *still waiting* for some extraordinary means to bring about

their (the slaves) deliverance, it may be that God may answer us in this matter by terrible things in righteousness.' Here then is no waiting after we have ascertained our duty, or if so, it will be at our peril. And what is the difference between his and our labors? The words in the following sentence, quoted from Woolman, placed in italics, will show, at least, part of what he thinks is different. 'I joined with my friend *in visiting Friends who had slaves.*' The inference is plain. Abolitionists generally do not go to those who have slaves, as he did. The same old Pro-Slavery excuse, 'why don't you go to the slaveholders, we have nothing to do with Slavery here, is evidently in his mind; and he would doubtless insinuate that Woolman had nothing to do with talking and discussing this subject among those who did not hold slaves. Now every one might and should know that this was not the fact. To be sure, he was not a member of an Anti-Slavery society, and for the very good reason, that he died about two years before the first one in America was organized, and very probably before such an institution was ever thought of. No doubt, if an association of this kind had existed anywhere near him in his lifetime, he would have been a member of it. But it should be recollected, that the author of the document pretends to claim and unite with the old Anti-Slavery organization. Will he say, that that institution had nothing to do with agitating the question among its members and others who were not slaveholders? He cannot do it. And yet he unites with *it*, and condemns *us* for carrying out *its* practice.

"On page 5th, our author quotes the following from the Declaration: 'One branch of the (African) committee forwarded a report to its general meeting (in 1841), treating the subject of the consumption of the proceeds of Slavery at some length, showing the impropriety and inconsistency of Friends sustaining a market for such productions. But when it was read in that body, it was spurned, it was rejected with manifest bitterness and contempt.

“ ‘That,’ says he, ‘is one version of the story, showing an example of the manner in which they relate a history of the past. The following is the true one,’ and of course, he pronounces the other false. He then proceeds to state, that the committee had strong doubts of the propriety of having it read, or descending into the consideration of the subject in that capacity, inasmuch as it was altogether foreign to the business of their appointment, etc., without once noticing the argument, which all must know is founded in truth, that the consumption of the proceeds of Slavery was the very thing which had reduced this people to a situation which demanded the appointment of the committee to have the care of their concerns, and that therefore it was not ‘foreign to the business of their’ appointment, to take the subject into consideration, in order to act consistently, and not pretend to be alleviating their distress with one hand and strengthening its groundwork with the other. But to proceed with what he says, is a true story, he remarks, ‘the disaffected members of the committee showed so strong a desire to have the document read, the committee at length yielded in condescension, entirely to satisfy and gratify them, to take the time to hear it. After the reading, it was remarked in substance about as follows: That this was a subject foreign to the business of this convention, and therefore not proper to be presented or discussed by it; that Friends now had all the right, and entire undoubted privilege to exercise freely their own conscience, in abstaining from anything they saw fit on conscientious ground; a right and privilege which we would be far from abridging, but that we objected to the consideration of the subject in this committee, until it should be laid upon us as a part of our business, or to its being made a matter of discipline; it being entirely a matter of conscience. To these views, the main part of the committee responded and were ready to respond, but the self-active spirits of some of the disaffected members were so uneasy at the expression of these remarks, and under this way of leaving the subject, that although Friends had,

in condescension, suffered their document to be read, they could scarcely be restrained to let the committee rise in good order, as some of our Friends from a distance will bear us witness.'

" We know not to what these Friends from a distance will bear witness; but one thing we do know, and that is, if they will bear testimony to the truth, they will not contradict the statement made in the Declaration; for many of us were present in the committee, and know it to be true. But this gives an opportunity to explain the whole matter in regard to this subject being before that committee from the commencement, which as yet has not been done publicly. Before proceeding to this however, we would observe, that we do not recollect that there was any objection made to the subject of abstinence from slave-labor produce being made a matter of discipline, *because* it was entirely *a matter of conscience*; but if it was so, it only discloses another of the profound absurdities of that party. A matter of conscience should not be made a matter of discipline! Astonishing! Friends profess to be conscientiously opposed to war and fighting. We should then have no discipline on that subject. Conscientiously opposed to the use of oaths, therefore our Discipline should be silent on this point also; and so of all the rest of our testimonies which we propose to bear to the world.

" In 1839, the General Committee on the concerns of the People of Color, had the subject of abstinence from slave-labor produce before it, and the different branches thereof in the Quarterly meetings were encouraged to endeavor to ascertain what facilities existed for the procuring of free-labor goods, and directed to make report thereof to the committee the next year. In 1840, after the 'alarm' had been taken, alluded to in our Declaration, when this committee met, one of the branches produced a letter from a Friend in the east, relative to the subject and to that only, which the Clerk read in the regular order as the business of the meeting. But as soon as he was through with the reading, the committee

presented indeed a most astonishing picture. That branch which forwarded it, was censured for presenting such a document, notwithstanding what they had done was in strict accordance with the requisition of the committee the preceding year, and the Clerk was censured also, although he had performed that only which devolved upon him as a duty, by virtue of his appointment. And the committee finding itself in a condition, as was said, not suitable for the transaction of business, turned its attention, or at least, some of the prominent members of the opposing party, to seek for some place whereon to cast the blame of their then present situation, which they endeavored to fasten on the spectators, a number of whom were present, in consequence of the fact, that invitation had previously been given out, even in the Yearly Meeting, by members of the committee, for all to attend who felt interested in the concern; and were quietly, without saying a word, listening to the proceedings of the committee. 'We can see now,' said some of them, 'what we have come to, by throwing the doors open in this way,' or words to this import.

"Thus finding so much unsoundness in Society in regard to the subject, Anti-Slavery Friends found it their duty to endeavor to turn the minds of Friends more particularly thereto, and hence the report alluded to from one branch of the committee originated. When it was presented to the General Committee in 1841, at its first sitting, probably by the Clerk, who perhaps, announced its character, it was treated with such manifest contempt, that one of those who spoke in favor of its being read, was interrupted while endeavoring to give his views, and considerable effort was used to stop him from proceeding further. Again, when another of the same class arose deliberately to deliver his sentiments, and one of the opposite side had put in before him, was quietly standing and waiting for him to get through, one among the leaders of the opposition rose, manifestly under the influence of great excitement, and addressing himself to the individual, accosted him with, 'it is very dis-

orderly for a Friend to get up and stand on his feet that way.'

“Although the committee did not suffer it to be read at this sitting, yet it did not decide positively against it, and of course, it again came before them at the next, when, in the language of our reviewer, they *condescended* to *suffer* it to be read. After this was done, as all other business was gone through, an Anti-Slavery Friend rose and proposed that the meeting should then close. As soon as he took his seat one of the principal leaders of the opposition, and we have no doubt, the very person who has had at least a large share in preparing the Review under consideration, rose, and with much warmth, said the committee was not ready to adjourn—he was not going to sit under the reading of such a document, without expressing his decided disapprobation of it; with considerable more, which is not now recollected. Various others of the same class then spoke in favor of rejecting everything of the kind, and the conduct of Anti-Slavery Friends was severely censured, and they charged with making disturbance and disorder, which necessarily drew out some expression and defense. Now, we did not ask them to discuss the subject. We had no idea that any good would result from such discussion under the circumstances in which we were placed, but that it would only lead to disorder and confusion. Our object was to get the subject fairly before Friends, with the hope, that the truth would silently produce its proper effect upon their minds; all we asked, was, that they should ‘condescend to suffer’ us to tell them what we conscientiously believed was a right and consistent course for Friends to pursue, and there we were willing to leave it. And it was purposely to prevent *disorder* that the Friend made the proposition above mentioned, that the meeting should close as soon as the document was read. But they would not permit it to be so, and the disorder and confusion, which was great, was all among themselves. And yet our author says, ‘they could scarcely be restrained to let the committee rise in good order.’

As said an Anti-Slavery Friend at the time when we were charged with creating disorder, so say we now: 'There is one who knows who are the authors of *this disorder and disturbance*;' and in addition, who they were that not only 'could scarcely be restrained,' but who would not suffer that 'committee to rise in good order.'

"In regard to the petition alluded to in the Declaration, which was presented to H. Clay, he observes, that 'it is well known, that this petition was got up merely for effect.' Now this is an assertion without the shadow of evidence of its truth, so far as we are able to ascertain, except the effect alluded to, was to the liberation of the slave. And we should suppose those who got it up would certainly know their motives as well as any others.

"Again, 'it is said, that it was signed by men, *women, children, and people of color*;' from which we infer that he considers it very objectionable for people of color, at least, to sign such a petition. These, in his opinion, should not presume to ask relief for their suffering brethren and sisters. *Is this the sentiment of the leading members of the body?* And is there no evidence of prejudice against colored people in this? But let us proceed with his remarks. 'The manner of its presentation was very reprehensible. He was *attacked* with it, in the midst of a vast concourse of many thousands of his political friends, while on a visit to them, at their special invitation—and upon the public stand, whither he had gone to address them.' Here, again, we must pause in astonishment. He speaks as if he was personally acquainted with the whole transaction, and we have no doubt he is a resident of the city where it occurred, and yet the assertion that he was attacked with it in public, which, he says, is so reprehensible, is also utterly false; the very reverse of what was the fact. The committee to present the petition, opened a correspondence with the particular attendants of Henry Clay, styled the Committee of Reception, it being understood that this was the

only means of access they could have to him, in order to ascertain when and where it would suit him to have an interview. It was agreed by this body, on the part of H. Clay, that they should present him with their papers on the next morning at his lodgings, it being alleged that he could not possibly receive them sooner. A short time after, when the committee had separated, J. Rariden announced to the multitude, that if the Abolitionists had any request to make of Clay, or papers to present to him, it was his (Clay's) wish, that it should be done publicly, and on that occasion.

“So that the committee to present the petition, were prevented from doing it as they intended, in his private room at Richmond, which the reviewer says ‘might have had a good effect upon his mind.’

“One thing we learn in pages 7 and 8, which we had hardly expected was the case, viz: that those who adhere to the old organization ‘were generally well satisfied with what took place’ on First-day, in regard to the treatment of Henry Clay, by the Clerk and other leading Friends. The only effect it can possibly have, will be to convince all who are not willfully blind, that their faithful testimony against Slavery, consists in *profession only*. If a man, a distinguished stranger of equal talents with Henry Clay, who had robbed his white neighbor by violence of half his property, or had stolen a horse from him, should have visited Richmond at the same time, and had told the Clerk he was inclined to go to his meeting, would he have taken him there in his carriage and led him about by the arm as a brother beloved, and would Friends have conducted him into one of the most conspicuous seats in the meeting-house, etc. ? And yet he says in effect, it would have been a great and reprehensible violation of all good manners, courtesy, good breeding, and duty not to show this respect to Henry Clay, a man who is continually robbing fifty colored persons not merely of a part, but of everything they should rightfully possess. Can any person define, consistently with a faithful testimony against Slavery, why such a

character should command more respect than the petty robber?

“Page 8. ‘But the Clerk of the meeting, as such, did not conduct Henry Clay.’

“It seems to us he need not to have taken the pains to deny that which no one supposed. We had no idea that he conducted him *as* Clerk. The object was, to show that he who had the confidence and support of the ruling party thus acted, and of course that it was a pretty good index to their character, unless they had shown their disapprobation of the conduct, which they did not.

“‘The meeting had no Clerk on that day, it being a public general meeting for worship.’

“This is a mere quibble. He need not to have told that a meeting for worship has no Clerk. And he well knew that it was the Clerk of the *Yearly Meeting* that was spoken of in this quotation. And does he mean to say that the Yearly Meeting had no Clerk on that day? If so, then after a sitting of the Meeting has adjourned, it has none to open it the next day!

“He declares, that the description of the treatment of Henry Clay in and about the meeting-house, is overstrained, etc., alleging that he was on the spot, an eye-witness, and *supposing* that the writer of the Declaration was not, seems to think he has the best right to know. Alas! how liable people are to be mistaken when they move in ‘their own will and strength!’ The principal writer of the Declaration was on the spot also, and no doubt knew that the truth would have warranted a much stronger delineation of remarkable manifestations than he gave, at least some of us know it.

“Under a pretense of correcting a report that had been circulated, ‘that sundry women Friends had kissed Henry Clay at the meeting,’ he appends a note. But it is evident that it was for the mere purpose of charging us with originating the report and giving it currency; for the editor of the *Free Labor Advocate* long since corrected it before the public. He asserts that we ‘consider it of sufficient importance to talk over to the ridicule of their

Society.' Now, we do not believe there is a particle of truth in this, for we never heard it done, of its being done, or of any one among us that believed the report.

"But why did he decline noticing the report as it stood corrected in the Advocate, where it was distinctly stated that the kissing took place at a boarding-house in Richmond? Simply, because he could not deny this report, and thought by denying the other, the impression would be made on the public mind, that there was no such occurrence anywhere.

"The whole of this, together with such expressions as the following: 'a great flourish this, when the words, 'Abolition lecturer,' would have expressed the whole affair,' shows conclusively, that he is strongly under the influence of prejudice, and that he associates in his mind, the Abolitionists, whom the Yearly Meeting, he pretends to defend, once called 'Christian philanthropists,' with everything mean and contemptible.

"It will be observed that he denies that Charles C. Burleigh was treated with indignity and contempt by Friends.

"Now, it seems to us to be impossible, for any person who was present, and not willfully blind or hardened, and witnessed their carriage toward him, to make such a denial. When a Friend spoke to several members of the Meeting for Sufferings about the use of the house for Burleigh to hold a meeting in, he received the reply, 'let him go to the South with his abolition, we don't want any of it here.'

"After quoting the remarks that Friends closed their meeting-house doors against him, etc., and stamping them as false, he affects to understand them as charging Friends with shutting him out of the Yearly Meeting or meeting for worship, and then again, in regard to the public houses in town being closed against him, he pretends to suppose that taverns and boarding-houses were alluded to. Now, this is indeed a pitiful quibble. Every one who will take the pains to read the Declaration, will understand perfectly well, that Friends are represented a

refusing to allow him to hold a meeting in their meeting-house, and that it was those public houses in which *meetings* are held in town, that were spoken of. And indeed what he says, shows that he so understood the matter himself, notwithstanding his pretensions to the contrary; for he says, application was not made to the trustees in his behalf for the use of the house, *to hold a meeting in*; and that 'if they have reference to the *meeting-houses* of any other religious professors, it is not necessary that we should answer for them.'

"He says, 'the insinuation that Friends mobbed Burleigh in the street, is detestable.'

"Truly there is no such insinuation, and no candid person will assert it. The most that can be made of it is, that the conduct of those who treated him thus, was supposed to have had a tendency to stimulate the mob; which we really believe was the fact. And the writer himself can not believe, that if Burleigh had been treated with half that respect, that was shown to Henry Clay, by Friends and others, occupying responsible stations in the community, he would have been mobbed by a set of bad boys.

"Page 9th he makes the following quotation: 'Thus it is evident, so far as an extensive tissue of facts and circumstances can establish, and so far as the fruit of a tree can manifest its character, that the influence by which the Yearly Meeting is now governed, is Pro-Slavery, and that unsoundness lies at the bottom of the opposition with which we have been assailed.'

"'It is only (says he) by a strong exercise of charitable feeling, that we can be brought to think that the sentiment expressed in this paragraph is not willfully erroneous.'

"He might with equal propriety have asserted that it was with difficulty that he could be brought to think the declaration of our Divine Master, 'by their fruits ye shall know them,' is not erroneous, for neither he nor any others have ever shown that those matters spoken of were not facts. They can not show that the fruits are not as rep-

resented, which are most certainly Pro-Slavery; but yet they deny that the tree is such. We have never said they have not professed to be 'decidedly and firmly against Slavery; but we do say that that does not make them so; and that men do not 'gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles.' And it seems to us, from the position recently taken, and especially in the document under consideration, that their Anti-Slavery profession will shortly have to associate with as strong a Pro-Slavery one; for if they are opposed to immediate emancipation, of which we have no doubt some of the leaders are, then they are in favor of Slavery for a time, and therefore must be Pro-Slavery. Hence, those who profess opposition to *immediate* emancipation, must make a Pro-Slavery *profession*. This is clear.

"In regard to what is spoken of in the Declaration, as the most common ground of opposition, namely, 'a desire to retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land,' which was shown to be equivalent to a desire to retain a place and influence with the very essence of a corrupt popular sentiment, and which induced them to close their meeting-houses against those whom they had formerly declared were laboring on the same ground they themselves had for many years occupied, and forbid their members associating with them, in order to accomplish that object; he in effect queries, 'and why not do so?' He knew very well that Anti-Slavery Friends were not opposed to retaining a place and influence with any person, which had been acquired by a firm, uncompromising adherence to sound principle and duty. He knew very well that it was that policy in the Yearly Meeting that trampled under foot, those whom it before denominated Christian philanthropists, rather than lose their good name in the world, by being identified with them, seeing they had become the targets of popular fury, that was spoken of in the Declaration. Why then did he not meet the subject on fair ground, and if such was not the fact, make it appear? Again he says, 'if the truth is to be declared to one that has departed from the right way, will it not be most effectually done in the spirit of kind-

ness?' We answer, most certainly. But should we be declaring the truth to one we might wish to gain, who *was* a thief, a liar, or murderer, should we mince the matter, and fail to tell him his real condition? Does declaring the truth, in terms that cannot be misunderstood, manifest a spirit of unkindness? Did our Saviour evince a want of kindness, when he said to the Jews, 'O generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?' 'Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!' 'Ye fools and blind!' etc. Did the apostle Paul lack the spirit of kindness, when he said to the sorcerer, 'O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?'

"Page 10, he says, the insinuation on page 17, that by being thus mild, and acting up to the Advice they quote, 'Friends are yielding to the prejudices; or accommodating ourselves to the corrupt views and sentiments of those around us, in regard to Slavery, comes without any substantial proof, and is believed to be groundless.'

"Every one who will take the trouble to read the Declaration, will see that it is there shown, that the place and influence with the rulers of the land, alluded to in the Advice he speaks of, was to be retained by not associating with the Abolitionists and by not giving Anti-Slavery societies any countenance whatever; and that individuals of the highest standing among them did not hesitate to avow in direct terms, that Friends should have no connection with the Abolitionists *because* they were hated, alleging that if Friends should join their societies they would lose their influence with the slaveholders, etc., without saying a word against their principles. It is there also shown that even the committee from the Yearly Meeting took the ground that the wealthy and influential part of the community not being engaged in Anti-Slavery societies, made it wrong for Friends to be. And yet he has the temerity to state, that the Declaration, that they have yielded to the prejudices and accom-

modated themselves to the corrupt views and sentiments of others, 'comes without any substantial proof, and is believed to be groundless.'

"In regard to noticing the case of those who were reported to the Yearly Meeting as disqualified members of the Meeting for Sufferings, he observes, 'as those eight members are among the principal leaders in the schism, and this declaration was probably drawn up by them, a sense of *modesty*, one would have thought, ought to have prevented their making this circumstance public.'

This is indeed adding insult to injury. After publishing the names of four of those individuals in five thousand copies of the printed Minutes of the Yearly Meeting as offenders, it is truly astonishing that they should be accused of a want of modesty in making it public, for the purpose of defending their characters against the public aspersions of their accusers.

"Again, he says, 'we should also think that any person of calm mind, who knows what their proceedings have been since that report, could not for a moment doubt the propriety and justice of the measure.'

"This, we suppose, is a fair exhibition of the justice of the party he advocates. He here, no doubt, alludes to their Separation from Indiana Yearly Meeting. Now let us, for the sake of argument, admit they did wrong in that act.

"Then let us suppose that the writer of the Review becomes exasperated at a brother, and commences a tirade of abuse upon his person, and finally the sufferer's patience becomes exhausted and he begins to retaliate, which is certainly wrong. Now would we think that any person of calm mind, who knows that he did retaliate, could for a moment doubt the propriety and justice of thus abusing him, or would this retaliation prove that he deserved the abuse?

"But not so in regard to the Separation. It was made under an imperious sense of duty, and not to retaliate or for self-gratification. We come now to his defense of the

course pursued by the Meeting for Sufferings toward these individuals. But he appears careful not to rehearse the statements in the Declaration, showing conclusively that it was contrary to the plain letter of Discipline. If such was not the case, if it was not contrary to Discipline, why did he not cite us to the passage which justifies it? 'It would (says he) indeed be very strange doctrine to presume that the Yearly Meeting has not power to see that it is fairly represented by this body, *which is appointed by itself.*' Here is another specimen of what an 'over-active zeal' will induce a man to utter. He asserts that the Meeting for Sufferings is appointed by the Yearly Meeting itself, and, therefore, should dismiss and appoint until it is fairly represented. Now the fact is, according to Discipline, the Yearly Meeting has no power to appoint more than twenty-six members to represent it, and each Quarter has the power to appoint four to represent it. But we suppose he cares not for the Discipline, for by the course he and his copartners take, they completely deprive the Quarters of this privilege.

"It would, indeed, be very strange doctrine, to presume the Yearly Meeting has power to reserve privileges, and none to grant them; and the Discipline shows what it has reserved and granted; and that all it reserved, in this matter, was to appoint twenty-six members itself, and that that granted to the Meeting for Sufferings, is to notify the Yearly and Quarterly meetings if any of the members appointed in either, have deceased or greatly neglected the attendance of its meetings, in order that their places may be filled; and that granted to each Quarterly meeting, is to appoint four to represent it; and that to individuals appointed as members, that they should remain such while members of Society, unless they should request to be released or should neglect to attend the meetings. This is the exact regulation of Discipline, according to plain and undoubted inference; there being no provision in Discipline for a change in any other way; and if the Yearly Meeting will not comply with its own regulations, on its own part, how can it

expect its subordinate branches and individual members to do it? If it wishes to reserve more power in its hands, let it take up the Discipline and alter it to that effect.

“He says, ‘it has been a general rule in our Meeting for Sufferings, which the Yearly Meeting has always recognized, that the former, standing, as it does, to watch the interests of Society, has the liberty to make any suggestion or proposition to the latter, which the state of society may require, or which may be thought proper.’

“There is a great deal more cunning in this than candor. Was it a *mere proposition* of the Meeting for Sufferings to the Yearly Meeting, for it to report a number of its members to the Quarters, as well as Yearly Meeting, as disqualified, in order for their place to be filled with others? If this is not acting as with authority we know not what is. And will he say that the Yearly Meeting has always granted the Meeting for Sufferings the liberty to *act in any way* it may think proper? If it has, it has granted that which the Discipline expressly forbids.

“Again, he proceeds to observe, ‘now here are certain members of the Meeting for Sufferings, who do not represent the Yearly Meeting,’ etc. We would like to know what he styles the Yearly Meeting. Is it that portion which holds a certain set of sentiments and opinions, or is it the whole body of members? If the latter, we should suppose these members to which he alludes, constituted as proper a representation as those who had different sentiments. True, we know when they come together to transact business they must settle upon some course to be pursued, and perhaps that course (especially if it be adopted through the power of ‘wealth and influence,’ or by the preponderance of numbers, independent of, and in opposition to, the evidence of Truth, as has been the case in regard to the present controversy) is wounding to the feelings of many of its members, and requires a violation of their conscientious principles. Must these,

therefore, for opposing this wrong, and thus endeavoring to produce righteous action in that body and throughout Society, be deprived of representing themselves and their conscientious suffering brethren then, merely for making this exertion! Must those who feel it their bounden duty, in accordance with the advice of the Discipline, to be accessory to *no step* whereby the bondage of the slaves may be prolonged, be compelled to approve or connive at those proceedings which cast odium and obloquy upon the advocates of their immediate and unconditional freedom, and thus be accessory to that which, if it should continue, would prolong the bondage of the slave interminably?

“These individuals, he says, have ‘been talked to kindly again and again, they have been persuaded and admonished, but they refuse to be persuaded. They refuse to change.’ Here he would make his readers believe that abundance of care was exercised toward them in the overflowings of kindness and brotherly love. But the fact is, but one of the eight was ever spoken to privately to persuade him to change, and when he was ‘approached, in order to gain him,’ by one of those ‘Friends eminent for his piety,’ it was done by declaring to him, ‘thou art gone, fallen, and out of the life, and if thou removes to Michigan thou wilt be lost forever!’ etc. This is the character of their persuasive language. And scarcely ever did they condescend to enter into a free conversation, showing that they felt willing to inquire whether he or they were right. The leading feature of all their interviews was, thou must submit.

“He says, ‘it is easy to see why the proposition was made in the Yearly Meeting that the Minutes should state the cause of their disqualification, and that the object of that proposition was of a political nature, designed entirely to create difficulty by throwing out this plausible defense.’ Now it is well known that Charles Osborne was the man who made the proposition to the Yearly Meeting. Hence, no wonder the writer withholds his name from such a libel on his character. For we

trust, none who are not blind with malice, will believe that Charles Osborne did it merely to create a difficulty. He stated publicly why the cause should be placed on Minute, namely: that it was their due—justice demanded it, the cause of Truth and righteousness demanded it, and the cause of suffering, bleeding humanity demanded it. His object was, if we may believe his own testimony, that justice, truth, and righteousness might not be so completely prostrated in the dust. But why should it create a difficulty, or why should they suppose that any would think it would, to state the truth, to state the alleged cause of disqualification, if it was something they had done which would justify their opposers according to Discipline and usages of Society in making such an allegation? Why should it create a difficulty to place these individuals in the exact position, before the public, which they really occupied, and not leave the matter in such a condition as for it to be supposed they had been guilty of gross immorality, and were disowned? For nowhere can it be found in the proceedings of the Yearly Meeting that a member of the Meeting for Sufferings has been reported as disqualified, except he has been disowned, and that, perhaps, for immoral conduct. But again after stating that it was their design merely to create a difficulty, he says, 'hence the reason is plain why the meeting passed on without granting a request so unprecedented.' This is indeed strange reasoning. A person asks that which is just and reasonable (for he does not pretend to show to the contrary, nor even to contradict its being so) with a design to create difficulty, hence the reason is plain, is it, why a body of people professing to do justice should refuse to grant that which is just and reasonable? The request which, he says, was so unprecedented, cannot possibly, we think, be more so than the treatment toward them which made it necessary to make it, as it has been clearly shown to the public, that none such has been made use of, so far as the records have been examined, which has been for fifteen years back.

“After this, he proceeds to state, ‘we cannot now call up in review every objectionable sentence and expression. The whole document is written in a spirit so evidently bad, toward our religious society, that most impartial readers will readily see and feel it.’ With equal propriety might the Scribes and Pharisees have declared to our Saviour, thy conversation to us manifests a spirit so evidently bad toward us, that most impartial hearers will readily see and feel it. He exposed and rebuked their corrupt principles and practices, and Anti-Slavery Friends have done no more in regard to that party who have assumed the control of Indiana Yearly Meeting.

“But to proceed, our author says, ‘it may be added that the whole is written under such perversions of thought, that most of the matters brought to view are unfairly or incorrectly represented, or shown out under false colors.’ We trust that every impartial reader, by this time, will see where the perversion of thought and misrepresentation lies, for he cannot fail to discover the fact that in every attempt to show the falsity of the statements or representations contained in the Declaration, he has utterly failed. True, he has denied that which it would be impossible to prove either one way or the other, viz.: that there were no such remarkable demonstrations made, as would appear from the Declaration, in regard to the treatment of Henry Clay at the meeting-house. For really, they were remarkable to those who felt it their duty to render honor to whom honor is due, which they knew could not be to this man. While on the other hand, the writer and those who are with him, ‘were well satisfied with the whole transaction,’ and, therefore, to these it was nothing remarkable.

“Let us now examine some of the articles of his conclusion. ‘They make a general, and, in many cases, *unexplained* charge of Colonization against the Society, etc. This charge contains a slander, because when explained out in words they interpret it to be a disposition to drive from the country, without their consent, the

people of color generally, on account of an unjust estimation, or disregard of their rights, on account of unmerited prejudices against them, and for the purpose of perpetuating Slavery.' This is another misrepresentation. That which they are charged with is, in the Declaration, clearly explained to be a disposition to aid and countenance the American Colonization Society. And if it has been 'explained out in words to mean a disposition to drive from the country without their consent,' the writer and his copartners have done it themselves. The Declaration nowhere intimates that Friends engaged in the Colonization scheme, for the *purpose* of compelling the colored people to go to Liberia, or for the purpose of perpetuating Slavery. But it does, in effect, say that Friends, being under the influence of prejudice against the colored people, had those prejudices increased, or their efforts, in behalf of immediate emancipation diminished, by the formation of the Colonization Society, which proposed to take those people out of the country who they had rather were to themselves, in their own country where they belong, etc. It is useless, however, to endeavor to substantiate a charge of the existence of this prejudice among them, when the sentiment is openly avowed almost everywhere around us.

"It will be seen, from what has been said, and from a careful examination of both documents, that all the principal grounds taken, or assertions made, by the Declaration are, by the Review under consideration, proved to be true, which we will sum up in the following order:

"1st. That a Pro-Slavery spirit exists in the Society."

"This he shows by evidently opposing immediate emancipation, and by declaring, in effect, that the slaveholders, laying claim to a person, makes it more objectionable to assist such person than to assist a free one; thus, to a certain extent at least, recognizing the slaveholder's right to his brother, which all who are not willfully blind must know at once is a Pro-Slavery position.

“‘2d. That they have a warm feeling in favor of the American Colonization Society.’

“This is shown to be correct by his defense of that institution, and by at least tacitly owning and approving all its principles, measures, and tendencies.

“‘3d. That ever since the issuing of the Advices repudiating the Colonization scheme, there were some of our prominent members, open advocates of that institution, who appeared to have been fired with indignation at the expression of such sentiments, evidently entertaining a settled purpose to prostrate the Anti-Slavery cause and its advocates in the Society, if ever a favorable opportunity should present.’

“This he verifies by his allusion to a disposition in some to govern the Yearly Meeting in their own way. It was this disposition to promote an Anti-Slavery feeling and action in the Society, and to oppose Colonization, that was discovered and checked by those who entertained a settled purpose to prostrate the Anti-Slavery cause and its advocates.

“‘4th. That the ruling party in the Yearly Meeting, are really opposed to the present Anti-Slavery movement and not merely as they professed, opposed to mixing with others.’

“In regard to this, there is such an open avowal of opposition to the cause in such terms as manifests the most decided malignity of feeling toward it, toward ‘modern Abolition societies,’ as he terms them in contempt, as to require only a reference thereto.

“Many of the charges, misrepresentations, insinuations, and falsehoods contained in the Review, seem, indeed, too insignificant to notice, and had it not been for the source from which they emanated, and the weight of influence they may wield against the cause of Truth, if suffered to go unanswered, being widely indorsed by the leading characters of Indiana Yearly Meeting, we should have passed over them as unworthy of attention.

“Signed on behalf of the meeting aforesaid.

“BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.*”

CHAPTER XV.

Declaration of Sentiment of A. S. Friends.

It was thought necessary at the Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, in Ninth month, of this year, 1843, in order to clear the Society of certain charges, and to vindicate the truth, to issue the following Declaration of Sentiment:

“ A DECLARATION OF SENTIMENT.

“ It is a subject worthy of particular attention, that in every age of the world, those who have attempted to stem the torrent of public error, or to withstand the corruptions of the times, either in principle or practice, have been subjected to the invectives of malice, or the slanderous imputations of those who have endeavored to uphold and sustain those corruptions. Our blessed Lord and the apostles themselves, had many grievous and false charges laid against them, nor were our primitive Friends at all exempted from the persecutions of this wicked spirit; and they very frequently found it necessary and incumbent upon them to come boldly forth in the public declaration of their principles, and in the defense of their doctrines and practices, in order for the clearing of the blessed truth which they professed, and thus to expose and refute the slanderous imputations preferred against them. And as we believe a proper regard for the promotion of the cause of our blessed Redeemer at the present day, will unquestionably lead to this course of conduct, we can but esteem it our indispensable duty, whenever circumstances of a similar character occur, to follow their example in all meekness and Christian boldness.

“ It is indeed to us a sorrowful circumstance, that we have been driven to the necessity of separating ourselves from the original organization of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting, as the only alternative left us by that body, whereby we could enjoy the privileges

and benefits of religious society, and at the same time act in obedience to the dictates of a tender conscience.

“In the course of the insidious workings of the spirit of opposition to the present Anti-Slavery cause (for laboring to promote which, we have been driven to our present position), to impress and bias the minds of the people against it and its advocates, great pains have been taken to represent us as holding false and erroneous doctrines.

“We have been charged, at least indirectly, with denying the immediate and special influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart; or in other words, the immediate revelation of the Divine will to man; and directly, with working in our own will and strength, without waiting for or receiving Divine ability, to enable us to perform those works in which we were engaged.

“These charges appear to be the false deductions of a censorious spirit, which have been wrested from the professions we have made of the true and genuine doctrine, and which we now publicly repeat in the language of Scripture: ‘He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.’

“From this, and other Scripture testimony, as well as the very laws of our being, we are convinced that it is at all times required of us to do justly, love mercy, etc., as well as to fulfill all the moral precepts of the Gospel; and hence we hold that it is nothing short of presumption, to suppose a revelation upon these revelations is necessary before we should engage in works of benevolence and charity, or any of the common or general duties of life. To ask for a manifestation of the Divine will, or seek to witness a display of Divine power, when that will is already known, or the object to be effected by that power, can be effected by the means already afforded, is evidently regarded in *this* point of view by our Saviour himself, as we learn from his reply to the suggestions of the grand deceiver: ‘If thou be the Son of God,’ said he, ‘cast thyself down (from the pinnacle

of the temple), for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' But the reply was, 'It is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' And why would it be to tempt God to cast himself down with an expectation of being preserved from injury? Undoubtedly, because there was no necessity for it. Just so, in regard to waiting for a special inward revelation to manifest what is required of us, when we already know it. Some of our accusers, in endeavoring to make it appear that we are unsound in principle, have taken the extraordinary position, that we should not undertake to do any good work, without waiting for the immediate and special impulse of the Holy Spirit. Now, as principles must unavoidably have a powerful effect upon the conduct of those who possess them, can we at all wonder that those who hold such sentiments as these, should be found in such a state of inactivity as those are of whom we speak, especially in regard to objects requiring pecuniary or worldly sacrifices? We have ever held, and believed in the doctrine of immediate revelation, or the communication of the will of God to man; but there is evidently a distinction to be made between such extraordinary and supernatural illuminations as must alone qualify for the public acts of preaching the gospel, prayer, etc., and that influence of the Holy Spirit, which is with all and in all (except they be reprobates,) to incline them to every good word and work, and to qualify for all the common general duties of life; and hence, when we speak of no necessity of waiting for the special impulse of the Holy Spirit in regard to performing those duties, we by no means discard the teachings of the good Spirit, which is placed in the hearts of men universally, inclining them to live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present world; for whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we should do all to the glory of God. Every gift of God is good, and should be received with thanksgiving, and applied to the purposes for which he designed it. And hence the Holy

Scriptures, containing a revelation of the will of God to man, in regard to all general duties, both toward God and his fellow-man, as well as the light of reason and reflection, by which we may ascertain the consistency of a given course of conduct with this manifestation of the Divine will, are gifts which cannot be discarded without rejecting the means which a gracious Providence has ordained for the guidance of man in regard to these duties. All these gifts, when applied according to His will, must and will completely harmonize in their legitimate effects. And although it is through the influence of the Holy Spirit immediately operating upon the heart, that we are inclined to anything that is good—that a devout thought is engendered in the heart, or that a saving knowledge of God is communicated to us, yet, through the proper use of the gifts above referred to, without any special or extraordinary revelation, we may ascertain what is right in regard to social and benevolent duties of general obligation, and which are required of us in common with others; and it would be a manifest dereliction of duty, to refuse to perform such acts, under a pretense of waiting for a sufficient call thereto.

“Through the prejudice of a corrupt education, and the influence of a traditional religion, many have adopted the sentiment, that, let Scripture, reason, and common sense say what they will, in regard to what constitutes those duties, it is wrong to undertake to perform anything of the kind, without first waiting for and receiving a special Divine impulse. Such sentiments being publicly advocated by Ministers of the Society of Friends, has for a considerable time past stood as a reproach against it. And having taken a position in which we can now testify against them, we wish to make this testimony known to the world, being assured that they have emanated from the grand adversary of man’s happiness, and are calculated only to hinder the progress of the cause of truth and righteousness in the earth. The especial, supernatural and direct communication of the Divine will to man, is necessarily made, only when the

existing means whereby this knowledge in some respects may be attained, are not adequate for the purpose. To take any other view of the subject, would be virtually to impeach the Almighty's attributes of boundless wisdom and perfection. And we apprehend that every honest, intelligent and reflecting mind must admit that it would be criminal in the highest degree, in many instances which might and do frequently occur, to wait or hesitate a moment to act; for instance, to rescue a brother or sister from certain death or imminent danger. And why would it be criminal? Without question, because his sense of what is right, would assure him of his duty to act instantaneously for his brother's preservation. If, therefore, this knowledge is adequate to the purpose, would it not be derogatory to the character of the All-wise Creator of the universe, to suppose he has required us to wait for some more extraordinary manifestation in regard to his will in all similar circumstances? It is therefore when duties are of such a character as are not, and cannot be ascertained through those means, to be such, that they are manifested so to be by the special revelation of the Spirit of God. This doctrine is fully confirmed, not only by the sentiments of our forefathers in the Church, but by that which is better authority, the sacred volume of inspiration. It is a declaration of an eminent apostle, that 'he that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.' Now, as it is incontrovertible that, in regard to all the social and general duties of life, we may know what is good and what is required of us, without this special communication of the will of God; it is therefore evident from this scripture authority, that he who neglects to do that which he thus knows to be his duty, without this extraordinary manifestation, under a pretense of waiting for an immediate call, is in the commission of sin.

"In regard to this subject, William Penn observes, 'we have a call to do good as often as we have the power and occasion.' Hence, it is evident, in the opinion of this great man, whenever we have the ability, an

occasion constitutes the only necessary call to perform every moral and social duty.

“Another charge which is constantly being preferred against us is, that we are opposed to the Church government and discipline of the Society of Friends.

“In treating upon this subject, it will be necessary to inquire into the character of this government as originally instituted. Barclay, in his *Anarchy of the Ranters*, declares that no decision or decree of the church is available, without the aid of the power and Spirit of God leading thereto.

“Hence, it is obvious that true subordination to the Church, according to original principle, consists in submission to those decrees only, which are made under the influence of the Holy Spirit. But some of our accusers, when endeavoring to fasten the charge of insubordination upon us, have taken the ground that no decision or decree of the Church can be made but what should be available; that it is the duty of its members to submit thereto, if they know it to be wrong. Who cannot see that this doctrine is calculated to uphold the greatest abominations in the Church, and to prevent it, when the rulers may have become corrupt, from ever being reformed without some miraculous interposition, by which they should all become renovated at once!

“It is the judgment of Truth alone, to which, by the church government of the Society (which has always been acknowledged,) its members are bound to be in subordination; and hence, a majority being in favor of a particular measure, is no certain evidence that that measure is right. Now, as this judgment is to be arrived at through the application of the means, and by attending to the gifts which the great Head of the Church has conferred upon it, in order for the attainment of the object, whether they be the Scriptures, reason and reflection, or the special revelation of the Holy Spirit, according as the nature of the case may demand one or the other of these, or the whole of them, it follows as a matter of course, that even if the majority should neglect or reject

the appropriate means by which this true judgment is to be arrived at, that this majority is, in the true and legitimate sense of the term, the insubordinate part of society.

“In conclusion, we would make use of this opportunity to declare, that we firmly believe in the doctrine of immediate revelation, as held by the Society in its pristine purity, and that we have never held any other view whatever in regard to the matter.

“And, in regard to the ministry of the Gospel, we believe that the same call and qualification for the work, which was formerly requisite, is now as necessary as in any age of the world, that the Gospel which the true minister of Christ communicates to the people, is not received of man, neither is he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

“Signed on behalf of the Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, held at Newport, Ind., by adjournments from the 4th to the 9th of the Ninth month, 1843.

“WALTER EDGERTON, *Clerk.*”

CHAPTER XVI.

Address of the Indiana Yearly Meeting to the Christian Professors, etc.

THE Yearly Meeting, held at White Water, also issued a document this year, on the subject of Slavery; but a portion of it having allusion to the matter of difficulty, was of such a character, that the Meeting for Sufferings of Anti-Slavery Friends, in the Eleventh month following, thought proper to review it. I will present the reader with both documents.

“ ADDRESS

“*Of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting, to the Christian Professors in the United States, and to the Citizens generally.*

“It is with feelings of religious concern for the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus

Christ, and for the welfare of our beloved country, that we believe ourselves called to address you on the subject of Slavery; a subject which essentially involves the peace and happiness of the citizens of these United States, and which claims their most serious consideration, and their prompt and persevering exertions for its termination.

“We believe there are many in all the Christian denominations, who, with ourselves, deplore the existence of this system of iniquity and oppression, and who long for its extinction. For the encouragement and strength of such, we would state, that about eighty years ago, a weighty concern came upon the Society of Friends, respecting the Slave trade, and the participation of their members in the practice of holding in bondage their fellow-men of the African race. Under the conviction that our Almighty Creator made of one blood, all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and that the enjoyment of life, liberty and happiness, is the natural inherent right of all, they became convinced, through the influence of the Holy Spirit on their hearts, that, consistent with the spirit and precepts of our holy Redeemer, which teaches us to do to others all things whatsoever we would they should do to us, no man possesses the right to hold his fellow-man in unconditional bondage.

“When this righteous concern to abolish slave-holding amongst themselves first arose, many obstacles to its prosecution presented, and continued for several years to impede its progress; but keeping to the ground of religious duty, and submitting the cause to their Lord and Master, to whom they looked for wisdom and direction, and who alone could soften the hearts of those who persisted in asserting the right to retain their slaves, a number of enlightened and devoted men labored faithfully with these, to convince them of the injustice of the practice. Notwithstanding the various discouragements with which they had to contend, the way was finally opened through His blessing, who laid this duty upon them, for the entire extinction of Slavery within the limits of our religious society, and having cleared itself of Slavery, it

was prepared to raise an availing testimony against slaveholding among others.

“After liberating their slaves, Friends proceeded to remunerate those who had served their masters at an age entitling them to the proceeds of their services, making such compensation in very many instances, for their labor, as justice dictated. They also extended a parental care over them, providing schools for their literary instruction, frequently holding religious meetings with them, and ministering to the wants of the aged and indigent. When the work of emancipation was thus generally effected, they adopted rules in their Discipline against buying, selling, holding and hiring slaves; and the few members who stood out in opposition to the decisions of the body were, after being labored with to recover them from their error, disowned, and the Society has ever since continued to deny, church membership to those who violate the Discipline in these respects.

“Having liberated their slaves, Friends then felt religiously engaged from time to time, under the constraining power of Divine love, to urge upon their fellow-citizens, both privately and publicly, the obligation which they were under to accord to the enslaved African and his descendants, the inalienable right to freedom. Memorials, petitions and addresses were frequently presented to Congress, to various Legislative bodies in the slave States, and to the public, for the purpose of promoting this desirable object. While their language was plain and unequivocal, these documents were always respectful and pacific in their character. Expressions calculated to exasperate the slaveholder, or to excite to violence and insurrection on the part of the slave—as they would be repugnant to the benign spirit of the Gospel, and militate against the object in view, were carefully avoided. To convince the master of the injustice of the system, and the degradation and suffering which it inflicted on the slave, and thus induce him voluntarily to break the yoke and let the oppressed go free, was the design, and in many cases the effect of their labors. By their judicious

proceedings, the way was opened in the minds of slaveholders to hear the pleadings of Friends on behalf of the poor negro; and had this temperate and Christian spirit been kept too by all those who have stepped forth professedly to advocate his rights, we apprehend, the cause of freedom would have made far greater progress than it has—there would be less sensitiveness on this subject in the mind of the master than now exists, and consequently a fairer prospect that this opprobrium of the Christian name, would soon be banished from our favored land.

“While we have been endeavoring to advance our testimony against Slavery, in our own peaceable way, and as we were favored with the leadings of the Spirit of Truth; we have been accused of apathy, and negligence, and even of giving countenance to the system itself, because we could not consistently with our own convictions of duty, unite with some measures which others thought proper to adopt. But how much better would it be, if those who profess to be opposed to Slavery were to bring their testimony to bear upon the system itself, rather than waste their strength and influence by publishing criminations against others! And though some who have seceded from this Yearly Meeting, and assumed the designation of Anti-Slavery Friends, as if they were the chief defenders of the rights of the colored man, have joined in with those unfounded accusations, for whose proceedings and publications we are no longer responsible, yet our abhorrence of the system of Slavery, with all its dreadful consequences, remains undiminished, and we not only continue as the way opens, to lift up our voice for the dumb, but rejoice in the efforts which our brethren of other religious persuasions are making in the same cause, under the influence of the same Christian spirit.

“It is this spirit that can soften the hard heart, break every yoke, and proclaim liberty to the captive, and set the oppressed free; and we would invite the members of the different religious societies to endeavor, under its blessed influence, to eradicate Slavery from their respective churches. Let those who see the magnitude of the

evil, and whose hands are clear of it, labor steadfastly and faithfully with their members who have slaves, to dissuade them from the practice. And may we not hope that their patient labors in gospel love, would be greatly instrumental, if not completely successful, in bringing about the peaceful termination of this enormous evil in our favored country! Were all the professors of the Christian religion, in these United States, clear of holding their fellow-men in bondage, the system, being practically condemned by the religious part of the community, we apprehend would soon fall to the ground. That it is the will of the Great Head of the Church, that all those who name the name of Christ should depart from iniquity, and wash their hands in innocency respecting this evil, we can have no doubt. Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. Is not Slavery, at this day of light and knowledge, a dark spot and blemish in the visible Church, which must contribute to lay waste its character as the Church of Christ, and to retard the spreading of His kingdom in the earth?

“Have we not reason to believe that this system of iniquity, upheld by many who call themselves Christians, and some of them standing in the character of ministers of the gospel of peace and salvation, is hanging over us as a dark cloud, and is one of the great causes of the difficulties to which the country is subjected? Can we expect the smiles of Divine Providence to be continued upon us and upon our country unless we break off our sins by righteousness, and our iniquities by showing mercy to the poor despised slave? It appears to us, that under the blessings of our heavenly Father, the peaceful abolition of Slavery by the slave States, very much depends upon the exertions and influence of those who act on Christian principle, with steady and unyielding firmness for its removal. There is, therefore, we believe, great responsibility resting upon professing Christians in

relation to this deeply affecting subject, and we desire that our brethren may not slumber at their posts while the enemy is within their borders, but, relying for wisdom and strength upon the Head of the Church, labor in the ability which He would grant to put away this sin from among them. Thus they would not only receive the reward of peace in their own bosoms, but be the happy instruments of releasing their brethren from the crime and the curse of Slavery, purifying the Church from this defilement, and exalting the standard of universal righteousness in the earth.

“In that love which breathes glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good-will to men, we would also commend to the serious reflection of the slaveholders the accumulated guilt of oppression, and their fearful responsibility in subjecting to the debasing consequences of this system, human beings possessing, as themselves, immortal souls to be saved or lost, for whom Christ died, not that they should be plunged in pollution, but that they should be redeemed from all iniquity and serve him in newness of life. Deeply impressed with the inestimable value of human souls, our accountability to our Creator for the deeds done in the body, the shortness of time, and the awfulness of eternity—that all earthly things pass away as the morning cloud, or the early dew, and that all the wealth and honors of the world are only as vanity and vexation of spirit, we look with feelings of deep concern and interest, on that portion of our fellow-men, who still adhere to the system and practice of Slavery, with earnest desires that they may take the subject more closely into consideration; and may the Lord grant to them the light of his Holy Spirit, to see the fearfulness of their standing, and strength to perform his whole will concerning them.

“In thus addressing our fellow-citizens on this momentous subject, we trust we shall not be suspected of party or political motives, for although our religious Society, in its official capacity, takes no part in the political operations going on in the country, we feel a deep and

lively interest in the welfare of the nation. It is only as the people comply with the Divine requisition to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God, that we can reasonably hope for the Divine blessing in preserving us in harmony, peace and prosperity. Our religious society cannot give countenance to measures of confusion and violence to attain any object whatever, for our testimony against war is equally decisive as that against Slavery; and as we cannot resort to force or resistance to the law of the land to obtain or defend our own most valued rights, so neither can we do it for those of others; we believe it is our religious duty to live in active or passive subordination to the government placed over us.

“In conclusion, we fervently desire that all those who are implicated in the system of slave-holding, may stand open to the convictions of the Spirit of Truth in their own hearts, which, during the day of mercy, pleads with all, to save them from their sins; that by obeying its dictates they may faithfully do their duty in setting their slaves free from bondage. Were this mass of corruption and iniquity removed from our beloved country, it would be the opening of a new and joyful day, in which the ancient prediction would be in measure realized: ‘Then shall thy righteousness go forth with brightness, and thy salvation as a lamp that burneth.’ May all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire the exaltation of his name and dominion over all, be united in the spirit of prayer to the God and Father of our sure mercies, that He will continue his forbearance and long-suffering toward our guilty land, and through the workings of his mighty power, change the heart of the slaveholder, and give deliverance to his oppressed and trodden-down children, who are groaning under bondage.

“Signed by direction and on behalf of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, held at White Water, in Wayne County, Indiana, by adjournments from the 28th day of Ninth month to the 3d day of Tenth month, inclusive, 1843.

“ELIJAH COFFIN, *Clerk.*”

CHAPTER XVII.

“Review of an ‘Address of the Society of Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting to the Christian Professors in the United States, and to the Citizens generally, on the subject of Slavery.’”

“It is not for the sake of controversy, nor for the purpose of injuring the character or destroying the influence of the above-named Address, so far as it may have any influence to promote any Anti-Slavery feeling in the community, but believing as we do, that it is well calculated to mislead the unwary and to militate against the progress of the present Anti-Slavery enterprise by insinuations against the measures of its advocates; and believing also that on the success of this enterprise, as the means in the hands of Divine Providence, hang the hopes of the advocates of human rights for the peaceful termination of Slavery and the preservation of our country from the judgments of offended Heaven, we feel concerned to notice a few expressions contained in the Address in connection with the attending circumstances.

“We would by no means undervalue the Anti-Slavery labors of our ancestors. We believe they performed a great and a glorious work in clearing the Society of Slavery. They also did much to turn the attention of others to the subject; and it is, probably, to the influence of their labors, more than to any other means, that the present Anti-Slavery organizations owe their origin; and it grieves us to the heart to think that, after the example and precepts of our fathers in the Church have induced many philanthropists of all denominations to engage in the work, their successors should pursue such a course and assume such a bearing toward those laborers as in a great measure to destroy their influence. The authors of the Address tell us of the labors of the Society in this cause from the commencement of the concern, eighty years ago (we think they might have dated it some further back), down to the present time. Now, much as we value the faithful labors of Friends formerly, and honor

them for their good works, we do not wish to overrate them. We do not claim for them infallibility, or that they did, in all things, the very best that might have been done. Neither do we believe that the Society, of late years, has acted faithfully in the cause according to the example of their ancestors.

“Speaking of the past labors of Friends on this subject, they say, ‘Notwithstanding the various discouragements with which they had to contend, the way was finally opened through His blessing who laid this duty upon them, for the entire extinction of Slavery within the limits of our religious society; and having cleared itself of Slavery, it was prepared to raise an availing testimony against slave-holding among others.’ Are we here to infer that they mean to say the continuation of Slavery in the Society of Friends for one hundred years before the ‘weighty concern,’ they speak of, ‘came upon the Society,’ and for many years afterward, was in consequence of the withholding of the Divine blessing in opening the way? If this is their meaning—if this is what they mean by saying, ‘The way was finally opened,’ we would say, in reply, we do not believe it was ever shut. We do not believe there was ever a time when Friends might not have abandoned this sin, if they would; neither can we allow that, if they had faithfully and in all things, followed the teachings of that Holy Spirit they make so much profession of being guided by, Slavery would ever have gained a foothold in the Society; much less have remained in it more than a century,

“We do not believe in the truth of the doctrine, that way does not open at all times for the leaving off of sinful practices, if we are disposed to do so. And none will be held innocent in the continuation of, or connivance at, known sins, under the plea that ‘the Lord’s time is the right time,’ and ‘the Lord will abolish it in his own time and way.’ We believe the Lord’s time for wickedness to be abandoned is immediately; it is not his will that individuals, or societies, or nations should continue in sin, day after day and year after year, waiting for the Lord’s time to

come—for Him to ‘open the way’—to ‘abolish the evil in his own time and in his own way.’ If they do—if they resist the Lord’s long-continued mercy under such a fallacious pretense, ‘His time *will come* in which He will accomplish the work,’ and it may be, in the language of John Woolman, ‘by visiting them with terrible things in righteousness. We do not mean to be understood as saying that the above doctrine of waiting for the Lord to do the work in his own time and way, is literally advocated in the Address, or that the words of that import, used above as quotations, are found there, but we do say, that this sentiment and these expressions are in common use among all classes of the body that issued the Address, and that they are almost constantly used to discourage the active labors of the Abolitionists, and they are introduced here for the purpose of arriving at a better understanding of what they mean by saying that ‘the way was *finally* opened through his blessing, who laid the duty upon them, for the entire extinction of Slavery within the limits of our religious society.’ This expression, especially when viewed in connection with a knowledge of the use of the argument above referred to, seems to us to imply that the Lord’s time had not previously come—that the way had been closed, and that Friends could not, until the time spoken of, abandon the practice of slave-holding, and that consequently, prior to that time, slave-holding in the Society was not sin. If any should charge us with doing them injustice in this matter, let them show that this is not the unavoidable result—the sum and substance of their own arguments.

“We regard this as a most dangerous doctrine, in the application which many of them make of it, to this question. Look at its consequences. Slavery cannot be abolished till the way opens—the way cannot open till the Lord’s time come—when the Lord’s time shall come Slavery will be abolished. Then as Slavery is not abolished, the way is not open, the Lord’s time is not yet come. Consequently its existence, at the present time, is not contrary to his will, and cannot be sin, for what-

ever is not contrary to his will cannot be sin. And as it cannot be sinful till the way opens for its abolition, which will be in the Lord's time, and as he will then abolish it in his own way, it follows that Slavery never has been and never can be a sin. If this is true of Slavery, it is true of every other practice, and it follows again, that there can be no such thing as sin in the world, and all the labor of Friends to show the moral turpitude of Slavery, is vain. We know they will recoil at these conclusions, but they are the legitimate conclusions drawn from their own premises. We have no wish to expose our friends, for the sake of the exposure or for the purpose of injuring them; but we wish to defend the Truth, and in so doing, it becomes necessary for us to expose the fearful errors into which they have been betrayed in their anxiety to oppose the labors of the Abolitionists, and particularly of A. S. Friends, both before and since their separation. Let it be understood that we do not charge them with wishing to perpetuate Slavery; on the contrary, we doubt not that most of them desire its termination, notwithstanding their present anomalous position, wherein they exert a powerful Pro-Slavery influence, by throwing themselves in the way and obstructing the progress of the labors of the great host of philanthropists who have been raised up and are now pleading the cause of immediate and unconditional emancipation.

“If it be asked, if we do not believe the Anti-Slavery sentiments contained in the Address are the sentiments of the meeting? We have no doubt but they are, of the members generally, and were it not for the influence of a few leading characters, the great majority might have been in the Anti-Slavery ranks—in full unity with modern Abolitionism.

“That they (that is, the ruling influences) stand opposed to the present Anti-Slavery organizations, is evident from all their proceedings on this subject, ample proof of which has been given in documents heretofore issued from the Anti-Slavery press; it is shown pretty clearly in the document before us, in the various allu-

sions to their own excellent method of doing the business, indirectly charging the contrary upon others. They speak of their own 'peaceable way,' 'keeping to the ground of *religious duty*,' '*Friends then religiously engaged*,' 'these documents were always *respectful and pacific* in their character.' 'Expressions calculated to *exasperate* the slaveholders, or to *excite to violence and insurrection* were carefully avoided.' 'By their *judicious proceedings* the way was opened,' 'as we were favored with the leadings of the Spirit of Truth.' 'Our religious society cannot give countenance to measures of confusion and *violence* to obtain any object whatever, for our testimony against *war* is equally decisive as that against Slavery, and as *we* cannot resort to *force or resistance* to the laws of the land to obtain our own most valued rights, so neither can we do it for those of others.' That all these are so many indirect charges against the Abolitionists of contrary principles and conduct, is so manifest that it seems to need no proof; but if any be required, it may be found in the same document in these words: 'Had this temperate and Christian spirit been kept to by all those who have stepped forth *professedly* to vindicate his (the slave's) rights, we apprehend that the cause of freedom would have made far greater progress than it has.' The persons here alluded to must include at least a very large portion of the Abolitionists, as a small number could not be supposed to have so greatly retarded the progress of freedom. In short, this is but another edition of the old story that Abolitionists have put back emancipation fifty years.

"We fully believe that, as they say, Friends, after 'having liberated their slaves, felt religiously engaged, from time to time, under the constraining power of Divine love, to urge upon their fellow-citizens, both privately and publicly, the obligations which they were under to accord to the enslaved African and his descendants, the inalienable right to freedom.' And we know that when any of their fellow-citizens became prepared to labor in the same cause, Friends did not turn from

them and affect so much superiority and self-sufficiency as to refuse them as co-workers. They freely and cordially united with them in the promotion of the work, not only to convince the slaveholders of their error, but to promote political action, in order that the iniquitous system might be abolished by law. No, they did not think it necessary to clear themselves of 'political motives,' like our modern Friends, for in those days of plain common sense, it seems to have been the opinion of all the friends of the slave, that political action was the necessary and legitimate result of a correct public sentiment induced by moral suasion, and the proper means of ridding the country of Slavery. And the idea, that political action for its removal was inconsistent with a *religious* testimony against it, does not seem to have entered their minds; and none but those who adopt the doctrine of the inconsistency of political action for the removal of any evil, can with any consistency entertain the idea for one moment. They would not be 'suspected of party or political motives,' in addressing the community on the subject of Slavery. No, indeed! for 'they feel a deep and lively interest in the welfare of the nation.' Plainly insinuating that the welfare of the nation would be injured by political action in favor of liberty. Is this like the conduct of our early laborers in the cause? most certainly not. And why should it be thought that 'political motives,' with a view to the removal of the great evil of Slavery, is more inconsistent or improper than for the removal of any other moral and physical evil? Will it be said that a concern to suppress or prevent crime is not a religious concern? Or that it is not the legitimate object of political action to protect the rights of the people against the encroachments of oppression, and to promote their welfare both morally and physically? If we dare not entertain political motives, and resort to political action for the removal of this greatest of all the moral and political evils that afflict our country, then we dare not for the removal of any other evil, then it is no wonder that politics are corrupt: and

we have no doubt but this view of the subject, that the removal of moral evils and the promotion of virtue are *religious* concerns, and would be ruined by being brought into politics, has done much to render the policies of the nation corrupt and wicked.

“The authors of the Address say: ‘Our religious society in its official capacity, takes no part in the political operations going on in the country.’ Although this may be true, yet it is too well known to need proof, that the members generally do. They are not so fearful of ‘political motives,’ as some may think. And their devotion to the Whig party, and sympathy with it, is so apparent, that it is difficult to believe they were not mistaken, when they supposed they were not influenced by ‘political or party motives,’ in issuing at least, this part of their Address. They were not influenced by motives of political abolition; but was there not a political motive in making this declaration? Was it not made chiefly for the purpose of satisfying a certain class of politicians, whose feelings seem to be so nearly parallel with theirs, as exhibited by public demonstrations on both sides? For it is well known, that Friends generally support the Whig party, and that the most popular Whig presses, in return, defend and eulogize them. That Friends are not afraid of political action when it suits them, and as an evidence of their devotion to the Whig party, it may be stated, that many of their active members attend and take an active part in Whig Conventions, held to promote the election of a slaveholder to the Presidency of the United States; and some years ago, previous to a Presidential election, the subject was introduced into the Meeting for Sufferings, and the conclusion come to, that Friends should be advised to vote the Whig ticket. This was certainly very nearly ‘in its official capacity, though the subject was not minuted.’

“From all these circumstances, taken in connection with the language of the Address, we are bound to believe, that so far from not being influenced by political motives, they were among the leading objects in view, in

issuing the Address, and in a particular manner that part of it disclaiming political motives.

“The sentiment expressed by them, that it would be much better, ‘if those who profess to be opposed to Slavery, were to bring their testimony to bear upon the system itself, rather than waste their strength and influence by publishing criminations against others,’ is certainly deserving their own serious attention. They first endeavored to criminate the Abolitionists, and opposed them in various ways, and then, in their own defense, and for the clearing the cause from reproach, the Abolitionists were under the necessity of meeting those criminations and that opposition, in such a way as to correct the false impressions they might otherwise make upon the public mind; and we can see no inducement that Abolitionists could have to speak evil of Friends, if they had not acted toward them in a manner very different from the course pursued by Friends formerly toward the Abolitionists of their day. We know of no criminations against them but what are well founded. With respect to the insinuation, that Anti-Slavery Friends consider themselves the chief defenders of the rights of the colored man, it is perfectly unfounded, but at the same time perfectly natural, coming from a people so jealous as they have manifested themselves to be; for we have no doubt but that a desire to have the *honor* of being the chief means of abolishing Slavery, has been one great cause of their opposition to those, who, while they (that is Friends) were sleeping over the wrongs of the slave, had got far ahead of them. We claim no such honor; we do not wish to be considered ‘the chief defenders of the rights of the colored man.’ We wish to do our duty. We desire to see the slave liberated, and our country freed from the curse of Slavery, but as to the honor that may accrue in this world, our opposers may share it among themselves, if they can.

“What object they had in view, in disclaiming force and violence on their part, or in declaring that they could not resort to force or resistance to obtain or defend

their own rights, or those of others, we cannot conceive (as their principles are well known in these respects), unless it be an indirect charge upon the Abolitionists of practicing contrary thereto; and this, we doubt not, was the case. We regard this, together with all their other insinuations of the kind, as a poor and pitiful attempt to confirm the prejudices of the community against the Abolitionists, and as unworthy of any further notice, except merely to say, that the confusion and violence attendant upon the A. S. enterprise has been created by the opposition, and that the responsibility rests with ponderous weight upon themselves.

“They say, ‘We believe it is our religious duty to live in *active or passive* subordination to the government placed over us.’ If they mean by this, that it is wrong to do aught which the law of the land forbids, we protest against such doctrine as antichristian, and contrary to the conduct of the faithful in various ages.

“We would observe, that whatever other object the leaders had in view, in issuing the Address, these two appear to have been prominent. 1st. To satisfy distant Friends that they are bearing a testimony against Slavery, and thus secure their confidence and unity; and 2d, to ‘retain their place and influence with the rulers of the land,’ and particularly with the Whigs, by their insinuations against the Abolitionists, and disavowal of political motives. In short, they prove themselves to be just such Anti-Slavery men as the mass of the people; opposed to Slavery, and at the same time opposed to the Abolitionists. And as to the petitions and memorials they speak of, we think of latter days, they have been few and far between, and when they have been sent, pains have been taken to let it be known that the petitioners were not modern Abolitionists, and had nothing to do with them. And further, we believe it cannot be shown that Indiana Yearly Meeting has ever petitioned government for the abolition of Slavery anywhere, or at any time, immediately or prospective, or that the Society

anywhere in the United States has ever petitioned explicitly for its *immediate* abolition.

“In conclusion, we would say to our Friends of the Old Yearly Meeting, ‘Ye cannot serve two masters.’ Ye cannot serve the Anti-Slavery cause, and retain a popular standing with the slaveholders and a slaveholding community. Therefore choose ye whom ye will serve.

“Signed on behalf of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, Eleventh month 30th, 1843.

BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.*

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Epistles issued by the Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, unnoticed by other Yearly Meetings, except London—Letter to the Editors of the ‘British Friend,’ by Elijah Coffin and others of Richmond.

It appears that the Epistles addressed to the different Yearly Meetings, at the time of the re-organization, were not so much as read publicly; and no one of the Yearly Meetings designed to pay so much attention to the matter as to send any official account of having received anything of the kind, but that of London. The account from it, it seems, was forwarded to the Yearly Meeting in Ninth month, this year, but did not reach in time for the meeting.

It ought here to be observed, that notwithstanding London Yearly Meeting rejected the Address of the newly organized Yearly Meeting, and its overtures of paternal correspondence, there was a number of warm-hearted, consistent Anti-Slavery Friends in that body, who, it seems, could not be induced to justify the wrong for the sake of popular favor—who could not find it in

their hearts to censure the *few* for having labored in the Anti-Slavery cause, in the same manner the most eminent Friends in their own Yearly Meeting had done, because they had been condemned by the *many* in Indiana, who opposed such labor.

Among these, were Wm. and Robert Smeal, editors of the 'British Friend.' Those editors copied the Declaration and a part of the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends into their paper, and sent them forth to the world, without casting a censure upon their authors. This, it seems, was rather too keen a rebuke to be borne in silence by the opposing party.

Accordingly, five of their number, two of whom were known to be about at the head of that party, addressed the editors in the following manner and style:

"To the Editors of the 'British Friend.'

"RICHMOND, IND., *Eighth month 15th, 1843.*

"RESPECTED FRIENDS.—We have been favored by a friend, with the perusal of a number of your paper, issued under date of Fifth month 31st, 1843, the first number of the paper that we have seen, and the only one that we know of in this part of the country. We perceive that you copy a part of the Minutes, and the whole of the Declaration of the seceders from our society, within the limits of this Yearly Meeting, who style themselves 'Anti-Slavery Friends.' Also, a letter, addressed by Benjamin Stanton, H. H. Way, and Daniel Puckett, three of the principal seceders, to James Canning Fuller, dated Third month 31st, 1843. You moreover make some editorial remarks in relation to the 'Indiana Separation, and the Anti-Slavery cause,' to all of which, we have given attention with feelings of interest.

"These documents, together with your remarks, take up more than ten columns in your paper, without one single paragraph in all the paper to counteract the prejudicial and pernicious tendency of all this matter from

the seceders. In reflecting on the subject, feelings of sorrow have attended our minds, while anticipating the injury the circulation of such matter uncontradicted, may possibly have with English people, and English Friends, published as it is, with sympathy for the seceders against the solemn acts, the religious professions, and the religious character of one of the largest Yearly Meetings of Friends in the world. Hence, even at this late period, Eighth month 15th, two-and-a-half months after the publication of the paper referred to, and notwithstanding other later numbers may contain sufficient balancing matter, we think it a duty, though apparently out of season, to address you a few lines on the subject in general, more particularly, as your paper professes to be mainly devoted to the interests of our religious society.

“With their Minutes and Declaration we have very little to do; the last-named document contains so much error, misrepresentation, and false coloring, and has been written in feeling so evidently bad, toward our religious society, not only in this Yearly Meeting, but in America in general, that it would take much time and writing effectually to expose all; and a thick controversial pamphlet would be the result. We refer you to a Review of the Declaration, herewith sent you, written in a concise and mild manner, the accuracy of which is undoubted by us. The Declaration, and the paper called the ‘Free Labor Advocate,’ in which it was originally published, are considered by Friends here, decidedly *pernicious*, on account of their containing so much matter, not only erroneous in itself, but which, if read and believed, would have a tendency to alienate Friends one from another, and from the Church, and the Truth, contrary to the advice of our Yearly Meeting. Among the many mistakes contained in the Declaration, no one would seem wider of the mark, than the conclusion which is come to, after much laborious argument, that Friends in this country are favorable to Slavery (see *British Friend*, p. 70, third column).

“If this were true, we should not be surprised that

you on the other side of the water, should sympathize with them. But we are confident that it is *not true*: and we are happy to believe, that no system of false reasoning or foul report can make it so. Friends here, entertain a warm and decisive Anti-Slavery feeling; and they have shown it in various acts; they are continually exercising it; and as Truth may open the way, will we hope, be faithful still to continue to make it appear. And there is reason to believe, that their way will be much cleared, by the absence of those, who, departing from our well-known principles, are zealous to go to work, without waiting to know and feel the sanctifying power and authority of the Holy Spirit, without which, we must expect that all our society proceedings will be utterly fruitless of good.

“If you have seen the Epistle of our Meeting for Sufferings to our subordinate meetings and members (a copy of which we will send you herewith,) you know that various charges contained in the Declaration, and other publications of theirs, such as, that *our Yearly Meeting is opposing the Abolition of Slavery, countenancing and supporting Slaveholders, Slave-holding, and Slavery, etc., etc.*, are pronounced to be false and unfounded. If you have not published this document, it may be right to publish it, clear of any remarks, notes, or comments of the seceders—let your readers have it fairly as an official document of our society.

“The seceders have been very anxious, both before and since the Separation, to get themselves identified with Friends in England and Ireland. Hence, no efforts appear to have been spared, by writing letters, sending papers, documents, etc., to prejudice Friends abroad, and to enlist their sympathies in their favor. They warn you against being imposed upon by our representations, when we were making none (‘a guilty conscience is its own accuser’). (See beginning of letter to J. C. Fuller.) They arrogate to themselves and their associates, the credit of being the only ones in the country engaged in the Anti-Slavery cause. They puff small matters into

great consequence (such as Henry Clay's going to Friends' meeting one First-day, as he passed through this place), and endeavor to pervert them from any object meant or intended, or perhaps thought of, into a favoritism to Slavery, and desire of popularity with the world, etc., and claim entire fellowship and coincidence of action with Friends beyond the water. Even the sympathy expressed in the editorial of your paper, has been referred to, magnified and circulated with exultation—and pardon us, if we take this opportunity to say, in freedom, that circumstanced as you were, with none but their representations before you, we believe you went too far in your sympathy.

“ You seem to admit in your editorial, that the only cause of Separation was *Pro-Slavery* on one part, and *Anti-Slavery* on the other, ‘having respect,’ as you say, ‘solely to the abolition of Slavery,’ etc. Whereas, we can say emphatically, and we hope, sincerely with you, that this ‘cause has claimed the warmest sympathies of the Society since its origin,’ sympathies which we still profess to entertain in a lively manner. In a valuable document on Slavery, lately issued by Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, speaking of the time when the Society cleared itself of the Slave-trade, etc., they say, ‘from that period to the present time, the Society has continued to labor with diligence and perseverance in this righteous cause, endeavoring to enlighten the public mind, respecting the enormities of the Slave-trade and Slavery, to prepare the way for the extinction of these foul blots upon the Christian name, and to ameliorate the condition of the free people of color.’ To this statement we believe the proceedings of the several American Yearly Meetings, particularly including those in the Southern slave States, will bear ample witness, in opposition to the statements made in the Declaration, and from various other sources by the seceders.

“ In addition to the erroneous matter communicated in letters, such as that to J. C. Fuller, they have, where they have had the influence, made use of the Anti-

Slavery delegates who have gone to England, to propagate their errors. We have lately read in an American Anti-Slavery newspaper, a communication to your paper, by this same J. C. Fuller, in which our society in this land is shown out to great disadvantage. Such sentiments as the following, in the letter to J. C. Fuller, now before us in your paper, will be looked upon with abhorrence by Friends here: '*It is a well-known fact, that the influence of the Society of Friends in this country, is almost universally understood to be opposed to the Anti-Slavery enterprise.*' By whom, it might be asked, is it so universally understood? By none, we believe, except the seceders, and those in their favor and under their influence, and those who have borrowed their ideas from them in their papers. Apart from the influence of those who are now, or have once been members of our religious society, we believe that the American Anti-Slavery Society, would have acknowledged the Society of Friends to be their forerunner and coadjutor in the Anti-Slavery cause: for we would rejoice in the progress of Anti-Slavery principles inculcated in the gospel spirit, either through that Society, or any other that has been, or may be engaged in the cause.

"It may be asked, then, what have been the causes which have led to the Separation? This is a subject we would touch with delicacy. Various circumstances, of course, have led to it. If you were among us, and familiar with the state of society, you would understand it better than it can be explained to you. *They* have come out with a long declaration of causes on their part, some, as we think, misrepresented; some imaginary; some inapplicable; and all altogether insufficient to warrant such a procedure. The great weight, we think, lies at the door of a few of the leaders. A few of these once had considerable influence in our society. That influence, and the consequent authority connected with it, they seemed to wish to maintain; but when they had gone into extremes or errors, they were not willing to bend to good counsel. They had their adherents. And against

admonition and brotherly exhortation, on one hand, were opposed their obstinacy, and the support of their party, on the other. Many young persons were led off, in a zeal just awakened, and apparently unhallowed; but strongly inclined to burst forth in speech-making, etc., without the sanctifying power of godliness and experimental religion. Reverse the influence of one, two, or three persons, and there probably would have been very little trouble or contention, much less the setting up of a new altar within our limits.

“*‘The cause is good,’* was the continual argument. Many Friends were misled by this. The cause of Christianity is also good, but Friends would not, however, on that account, think it best to yield their support to a hireling ministry for its promotion, nor to justify every means which others might see cause to use for its extension. They prefer to act in their own way. So do Friends here in regard to Slavery. While we are, and have long been convinced of its iniquity, and wish not to cease to proclaim its inconsistency with the Gospel, we desire that, in opposing it, Christian zeal may be tempered with Christian prudence and forbearance. We ought to wish to conciliate, and convince those who are in error, as did our early Friends on this subject. We do not wish to be excited to harsh or intemperate expressions. Our course should be marked by discretion, no less than by perseverance. *They* seem to have different views and to be determined to carry them out, as reference to the *Advices* of our Yearly Meeting, and their opposition to them, and their after conduct, abundantly demonstrate.

“You cannot reasonably suppose that so large a body of Friends as remain loyal to our good order, and united in the bonds of fellowship against the scattering and dividing spirit, are acting on party grounds; especially when they are doing business, as in our religious meetings, under solemn responsibility to our heavenly Judge, and with desires to be rightly directed by Divine wisdom in the deep trials in which we are involed. Such a supposition would do them injustice. Beside, you may be

aware, that all the Yearly Meetings on this continent, entertain about the same views. (See their Epistles.) You say that 'most of the American Epistles advert to the state of Slavery in that country with feelings of abhorrence.' Of the sincerity of this we have no doubt, nor do we doubt that Indiana is properly included. You might also have said, that most, if not all, the Ministers and others, from other Yearly Meetings, including yours, who have been traveling in the service of Truth, and who have attended Indiana Yearly Meeting during the last three or four years, have united with Friends in the course taken, and given their support to the Advices so much spoken against by the seceders.

"But while you refer to parties in this country, and say that you do not wish to be identified with either, you must not expect the *old* Yearly Meeting, as you call it, will go into controversy about the matter. And we presume you will find yourselves under some necessity, if you devote your paper mainly to the interests of the Society of Friends, to make a plain and unequivocal distinction in your preferences. If you do not, the seceders will have accomplished, at least in part, what they have so ardently sought after—that is, to gain your approbation and support, and thus further to distract and divide society. Contention appears to be their element; disputation, discussion, and excitement, their great work. Hence, prudently desiring and preferring to cultivate the 'unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,' Friends will not incline to enter into controversy. The very *act* would gratify what we believe is wrong in them, and essentially weaken us, though we might apparently have all the victory of words on our side.

"We hope you will bear kindly with the brotherly freedom in which we write, and in which we seem to censure you. We have no doubt that 'Truth is mighty and will prevail,' and that time will make manifest, not only the weaknesses and errors of our seceding members, but ours also: and therefore we forbear to go into details, on many matters touching the Separation, that might, per-

haps, be explained to *present* advantage. Nor can we have any just reason to doubt, that as Friends, and as individuals loving the good order and the discipline of the Society, you will see the propriety of standing up promptly in defense of those who remain loyal to it, and we hope that you may feel yourselves, in a good degree, at least, relieved from your apprehension concerning our favoritism to Slavery, on account of the representations of those who oppose, and who have left us.

“We are grieved with the remark in the last paragraph of your editorial about the Separation, in which you say, you hope ‘that the Yearly Meeting (of London) will be induced to disclaim any sympathy with the temporizing spirit so lamentably prevalent among many of our society in America, whereby the reputation of the body is endangered, and the way of Truth likely to be evil spoken of.’ And further, that you ‘trust the *stain* which attaches to the character of the Society of Friends in America, the unchristian prejudice against our fellow-man, ‘guilty of a skin not colored like our own,’ will shortly be removed, and Friends on that continent be found in their more appropriate vocation of undoing the heavy burdens, and letting the oppressed go free.’

“By what authority can you say so? While we do not boast of our works, nor of our freedom from weaknesses and errors, and some defection in this as well as in other wrong things, we believe, with sorrow, that you have been misled by statements from prejudicial sources, derived, probably from our opposers, and not entitled to exactly that kind of confidence which you have placed in them. We think if you were among us your minds would be different. We beg you to remember, that in America, in the Society of Friends of all the Yearly Meetings, are to be found the long-tried friends of the slave, who have devoted themselves much during a large part of their lives, to the cause of humanity; who have had, and still have, the unity and support of our society; but who have not joined the Anti-Slavery societies, and who would be far from affording any strength to the

secession here ; and also, that the Society is engaged, we believe, in all the Yearly Meetings, by committees and otherwise, in doing good to this much injured class of our fellow-men ; and that applications are frequently made by the Society to legislative bodies, for the amelioration of their condition.

“ We are, respectfully, your friends,

“ ELIJAH COFFIN,

JOHN POOL,

BENJAMIN FULGHUM,

BARNABAS C. HOBBS,

WM. KENWORTHY.”

CHAPTER XIX.

Reply to Elijah Coffin and others by the Editors of the *British Friend*.

THE Editors of the *British Friend*, with manly independence and Christian boldness, after giving publicity to the above (though, probably, it was not intended for the press by its authors), inserted, in their Journal, an excellent reply, which, I think, will be interesting to the reader. Here it is :

“ INDIANA YEARLY MEETING — THE SECEDERS — AND THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE. — Our attention has again been called to this subject, by the receipt of a long letter, signed by five Friends belonging to Indiana Yearly Meeting, which will be found in preceding columns. Its object appears to be to disabuse the minds of Friends in this country, of the impressions they may have imbibed from perusing the statements of the seceders, which have appeared in our Journal, or by means of other publications. These individuals do not inform us, whether they write by authority of the body of which they are members, or on their own responsibility ; we incline, however, to the latter conclusion ; and shall now offer

some remarks on their production, and on the question which it involves—the Anti-Slavery cause.

“ We are pleased with the good feeling in which the letter is written, though we are far from admiring those portions of it, in which they ascribe, as appears to us, very unworthy motives to that portion of Friends who have felt it their duty, on Anti-Slavery principle, to separate from their brethren in religious profession. They express something like surprise, as well as sorrow, that so much matter has been published through our columns, regarding the secession; anticipate what they term the injury which the circulation of it would inflict on the Yearly Meeting of which they are members; and deem it their duty, though late, to endeavor to palliate such apprehended injury. We presume they have, ere now, seen from our subsequent numbers, that what we have published, has not been, as they suppose, altogether one-sided; seeing we gave, in the *British Friend* for Seventh month, the Epistle of Indiana Meeting for Sufferings; and that, as our correspondents suggest, without note or comment, either on our own part or that of the seceders; but ‘*fairly as an official document*’ of Friends of Indiana.

“ Our correspondents state, that they ‘have very little to do’ with the ‘Minutes’ and ‘Declaration’ of the seceders. Now, we entirely differ from them herein. If they intended their letter effectually to counteract the statements of the seceding Friends, they ought to have gone into an open, manly, and straightforward exhibition of their own view of the question at issue. It will not do for a party coming after his neighbor to search him, to tell us that the ‘Declaration’ contains ‘error, misrepresentation, and false coloring;’ something very different from this must be adduced before the statements of the seceders can be satisfactorily met or confuted. And as regards what our correspondents call the ‘evidently bad feeling’ evinced by the seceders toward our religious society, not only in Indiana but America in general; we are well satisfied that the Declaration of the seceders will

not suffer, in reference to the temper in which it is written, by comparison with the 'Review' of that document, noticed in our last, and to which they now refer us. Even the Epistle of the Meeting for Sufferings, already adverted to, does not, in our opinion, at all meet the case made out by the separatists, for the step they allege they were compelled to take. Indeed, the whole aim of the 'Review,' as well as the letter of our correspondents, is to throw blame upon those who have *separated* from the Indiana Yearly Meeting, on the ground not only of that meeting failing to evince, as they conceived, a sound and lively Anti-Slavery zeal, but because they were, as individuals, subjected to something like persecution on account of desiring to go beyond their brethren in this labor of love.

"We have already had occasion to remark, in reference to the seceders, that we cannot think them in error simply because of their separating from the body and establishing another Yearly Meeting. They aver that they had abundant cause for so doing. *It might have been* a wiser course could they have borne *longer* with those of different views, and even to have endured greater *suffering* and loss of Christian privileges *rather* than separate; yet, aware there are among them those who have long been known as honest, upright, and faithful Friends, we have been, and still are, disposed to give them credit for sincerity in the step they took; and we cannot but deprecate the assumption of our correspondents in arrogating to themselves and their party, that *they* exclusively 'wait to know and feel the sanctifying power and authority of the Holy Spirit,' in order to the right performance of their various duties as men and as Christians. So far as we have been able to observe, we feel bound to believe that the seceding Friends are equally sincere and upright, in intention, so long as they number among them such men as Charles Osborne, and others who might be named; men, who as assuredly believe as do our correspondents, that except as they act under the light and guidance of the Spirit of Truth, all their proceedings will be fruitless

of good. Their having been necessitated, as they believe, to separate from their brethren cannot, of itself, deprive them of the assistance and guidance of Him who is still 'nigh unto all them that call upon him; unto all that call upon him in truth.' The seceders profess that they 'have *not* separated from the *principles* of the Society, nor from its *testimonies* and *Discipline*, but from that body of members who have departed from our testimony against Slavery, and from a due respect to the Discipline.' They further declare, that they 'wish it *distinctly understood* that they have adopted *no new doctrine* nor *any new system of Church government*; that they claim to be, in the *strictest* sense of the word, a society of Friends, with no other nominal distinction in the title which they have adopted, than that which is necessary to distinguish them from those whom they have left, and to express their adherence to our well-known testimony against Slavery.' Now, the assertion of our correspondents, that the separatists *have* departed 'from our well-known principles,' without adducing any proof, must go for nothing; and until we obtain some evidence that the seceders are *not* what they profess to be—Friends—we must continue to esteem them as brethren in religious profession; the more so, because they apprehend themselves *sufferers* in the Anti-Slavery cause, yet desiring, in *consistency* and *faithfulness*, to support that humane and truly Christian object; and not only so, but we consider it to be the duty of the Meeting for Sufferings in London, the constituted representatives of the Society in this country, to enter into correspondence with the seceders, in accordance with the sympathy expressed at the Yearly Meeting, and in the hope that, through such intercourse, way may open for their being restored to unity with the Society. They appear to us to be even *more* entitled to the sympathy of Friends in this country than if they had never been connected with the body; and it would seem, from the opprobrium attempted to be cast upon them by those from whom they have esteemed it a duty to separate, that there is but little hope of *their*

being 'the repairers of the breach;' it is far more probable that parties may be reconciled and unity restored through the intervention of neutral persons.

"Our Indiana correspondents inform us, that the 'Declaration' of the seceders, and 'the paper called the *Free Labor Advocate*, in which it was originally published, are considered by themselves and their party decidedly 'pernicious,' on account of their containing so much matter not only erroneous in itself, but which, if read and believed, would have a tendency to alienate Friends from one another and from the Church and the Truth, contrary to the Advices of their Yearly Meeting.' The meaning here is not very apparent. We have seen but few numbers of the paper, but such as have come into our hands do not certainly, in our judgment, come up to the character here affixed to that Journal. We can conceive it possible that the *Advocate*, which appears to be conducted by *Friends*, in exposing what it has deemed the unsound sentiment and practice of the Society in relation to Slavery, may have entitled itself, in the estimation of our correspondents, as well as others, to the epithet 'pernicious;' especially if the generality of its Anti-Slavery articles happen to be of the same complexion as one we lately quoted, entitled 'A new Idea among Friends'—wherein a prominent member of one of the Preparative meetings belonging to the old Indiana Yearly Meeting, is represented to have 'commented at some length on the conduct of the *Abolitionists* (he, of course, not being one of *that* class), and among other things, said they were guilty of conveying away fugitive slaves to a land of freedom—which was, in fact, stealing and secreting other men's *property!*' A representation like this, if founded on *fact*, cannot fail to have a 'pernicious' effect on the Anti-Slavery character of one and all who hold or indorse such sentiments; and so long as these views are cherished and propagated by persons calling themselves Friends, it is utterly vain to expect anything like either zealous or enlightened effort among Friends in America, in behalf of Abolition.

“Our friends are very desirous to repudiate such representations of their Anti-Slavery feeling as the above, whether in the columns of newspapers, or in the ‘Declaration’ of the ‘Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends;’ and tell us, that Friends in Indiana ‘entertain a warm and decisive Anti-Slavery feeling’—that ‘they have shown it in various acts’—that ‘they are continually exercising it, and as Truth may open the way, will, they hope, be faithful still to continue to make it appear. And,’ they add, ‘there is reason to believe, that their way will be much cleared by the absence of’ the seceders. Referring to the Epistle of their Meeting for Sufferings, our correspondents inform us that ‘various charges, contained in the Declaration and other publications of the seceders, such as that *our* (the Indiana) *Yearly Meeting is opposing the abolition of Slavery; countenancing and supporting slave-holding and Slavery, etc.*, are pronounced to be false and unfounded.’ It is next stated, that ‘the seceders have been very anxious, both before and since the separation, to get themselves identified with Friends in England and Ireland!’ That they have spared no efforts ‘by writing letters, sending papers, documents, etc., to prejudice Friends abroad, and to enlist their sympathies in their favor. They warn you against being imposed upon by our representations, when we were making none (a guilty conscience is its own accuser’). Now really, we must remark, in this place, that the memories of our correspondents are here completely at fault. Had they forgotten the Epistle of their Meeting for Sufferings, dated the 6th and 7th of Third month, 1843? (See our 7th No., page 109, Vol. 1,) in which the seceding Friends are stated to have been actuated by ‘the workings of a spirit of activity, self-confidence, and insubordination?’ Was not such a statement as *this* a representation? not to mention other charges in the same Epistle; which, *we* believe, had arrived in this country *before a single line had reached us, regarding the secession, from any quarter.* Had not, therefore, a complete obliviousness on this matter come over our

friends, they never would have permitted such a quotation as that about '*a guilty conscience*' to have found a place in their letter.

"Our correspondents further inform us, that the 'seceding' Friends 'arrogate to themselves and their associates the credit of being the only ones in the country engaged in the Anti-Slavery cause.' This we regard as a decidedly *overcharged* picture of the seceders' sentiments; and we have never seen anything, that we remember, to *warrant* such a representation of the 'Yearly Meeting of *Anti-Slavery Friends*.' Again, it is said of the seceders, 'They puff small matters into great consequence (such as Henry Clay's going to Friends' meeting one First-day, as he passed through this place),' etc. And 'even the sympathy expressed in the editorial of the *British Friend* has,' it seems, 'been referred to, magnified, and circulated with exultation—and pardon us (our friends continue), if we take this opportunity to say in freedom, that circumstanced as you were, with none but their representations before you, we believe you went too far in your sympathy.' Again, it is said that in *our editorial* we 'seem to admit that the only cause of separation was *Pro-Slavery*, on one part, and *Anti-Slavery*, on the other.'

"In several of the foregoing quotations there is a wide scope for remark; but we must be brief. With regard to the justice of the statement made by the seceders, that the Indiana Yearly Meeting was 'opposing the abolition of Slavery and countenancing slaveholders,' etc.; it would have been well had our correspondents—instead of referring us to the Epistle of their Meeting for Sufferings, where the allegation is pronounced to be 'false and unfounded'—given us some more satisfactory evidence on the subject. They do not deny the fact, that Henry Clay *was countenanced* and that in the most marked manner. Like their friend, the writer of the 'Review' of the seceders' 'Declaration,' they do not say that was 'false;' they only join in the attempt to *palliate* the affair. Now, we do not hesitate to declare that such attention, paid to a

slaveholder, was but a very *questionable* proof, to say the least, of the *sound* Anti-Slavery feeling of Friends of Indiana. The seceders, we are told, '*puff* *small matters*.' What? call it a *small* matter thus to notice so notorious a dealer in the bones and blood, and sinews of his fellow-man—he who, but the day before, talked with such remarkable coolness (to some of these same Friends, it may be) of his owning about *fifty slaves*, and that 'he considered them his *property*!'

“Unchristian thought! on what pretense soe'er
 Of right, inherited, or else acquired;
 Of loss, of profit, or what plea you name!
 To buy and sell, to barter, whip, and hold
 In chains, a being of celestial make;
 Of kindred form, of kindred faculties;
 Of kindred feelings, passions, thoughts, desires;
 Born *free* and heir of an *immortal* hope!
 Thought * * * only overreached in wickedness
 By that, which aim'd to make a reasonable man
 By legislation *think*; and by the sword *believe*.”

“Instead of Henry Clay being taken to meeting by a *Friend* in his gig, and thus, in *his* person, *practically* countenancing slave-holding and Slavery, such a thing would have been spurned by a genuine Abolitionist; and the slaveholder, on the contrary, would have had the *kindness* done him of exhorting him to 'loose the bands of wickedness; to undo the heavy burdens; to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke.' Such faithfulness as this, it is true, would not be likely to '*retain*' for individuals or for Friends, in America generally—we quote their own words—the *place* and *influence* which, as a society, they have heretofore had with the *rulers of the land*!'—*Indiana Epistle of Advice*, 1841. *Away* with such place and influence, we say, if it is to be enjoyed on condition of openly countenancing slaveholders, instead of proclaiming, as upon 'the house-top,' that Slavery is a sin in the sight of the Almighty, and ought *immediately* to be abolished! Are we told that *our* circumstances in this country, as regards Slavery, were very different from those of our brethren in America? We

are aware of it. Is it urged that the General Government possesses no power to legislate for the different States in reference to Abolition? Of that, too, we are cognizant. It has, however, absolute power over the District of Columbia, to proclaim freedom as by the dash of a pen. To this point Friends, in conjunction with other Abolitionists, may *unceasingly* direct their pleadings till the desired objects are obtained. And however different the circumstances of the two countries, we can see nothing which obstructs the march of emancipation, which an honest zeal, on the part of Friends, guided by Christian principle, would not, under the Divine blessing, be able to overcome; and 'liberty be proclaimed throughout all the land unto *all* the inhabitants thereof.'

"Our correspondents evince some little adroitness, in making us use words *not to be found in our pages* on this subject. We allude to the expression said to have appeared in our 5th Number—'*Pro-Slavery* on one part, and *Anti-Slavery* on the other.' Now, we never used these expressions. What we stated was, 'That the Separation had respect solely to the abolition of Slavery.' And, in our *preceding* Number, we remarked: 'It is comforting to know, that the separation has not been occasioned by difference on points of doctrine; but simply with reference to the course of Christian duty, in regard to' Abolition. We meant our words to convey no injurious or offensive meaning; but that Friends of the *new* Yearly Meeting deemed it incumbent on them to take a more decided and active part in the Anti-Slavery enterprise in the United States; while those of the *original* Yearly Meeting seemed disposed to continue their course, of keeping aloof from that movement.

"The statement in the letter to J. C. Fuller, in reference to the 'well-known fact, that the influence of the Society of Friends in America, is almost universally understood to be hostile to the Anti-Slavery enterprise,' will, it is said, be looked upon by Friends there with abhorrence. For this we see no remedy, except by an altered course upon the part of Friends. Their opposi-

tion to the Anti-Slavery societies is no new thing to us ; we have seen it alluded to in American papers, several years ago, before there was anything like separation in Indiana contemplated ; and it is the firm belief of some of the most eminent Abolitionists in the two countries, both among the members of our society and others. It is an opposition greatly to be lamented ; but not to mention other matters, if Friends in America continue to vote for such men as JOHN TYLER, *the slaveholder*, to be President, and that almost in 'one unbroken phalanx'—they must be content with the character assigned them, however repugnant they may feel it—for surely their conduct in this instance harmonizes somewhat lamely with their saying, that 'they entertain a warm and decisive Anti-Slavery feeling,' which 'they are continually exercising,' and waiting for way to open that they 'may still continue to make it appear !'

“Our correspondents query, 'on what authority' we have spoken as we have done, in this controversy ? We may briefly reply, we have had no guide but the professions and actions of the respective parties, both of them being entire strangers to us, CHARLES OSBORNE excepted. We can have no *party* feeling, therefore, in the matter ; neither do we wish to be regarded as the *organ* of any party. A concern that our Society in that land should maintain a reputation consistent with its well-known professions, in regard to Slavery, alone dictated what we have written ; and we may confess, that we should have been most happy could we have formed, or had now ground for forming, a different conclusion.

“One remark more, and we conclude. As to the number in 'all the Yearly Meetings who are the long-tried friends of the Slave,' we can only wish it were much greater than it is—but the conduct of these or even of ministering Friends from this country, in this respect, or in not affording any strength to the secession, is nothing decisive to us of the question at issue ; so long as the statements of the seceders remain unrefuted.

“To evade controversy, lest we should gratify what is

wrong in others, as is pleaded by our correspondents, in excuse for their not proving themselves in the right, seems little to betoken confidence in their being so; and is a course neither respectful, nor commendable for its justice to themselves—to their opponents—nor to those whose favorable judgment is solicited in the dispute.

“We have been as desirous as our correspondents to write ‘in brotherly freedom,’ which we trust will not be worse received than theirs has been. ‘As Friends, and as individuals loving the good order of the Society,’ we would wish, according to our feeble measure, to stand up in defense of such as remain loyal to it, provided they are so in consistency with the spirit, and not the letter merely, of our profession. Our Discipline is good in itself, but it may be an instrument of *oppression* in improper hands. Trusting we have now defined, with sufficient explicitness, how far our sympathy is to be enlisted on *either* side, we must, for the present, leave the subject.”

CHAPTER XX.

Remarks by the Editor of the Free Labor Advocate on the Correspondence between E. Coffin and others and the Editors of the British Friend.—A Review by Daniel Puckett and others of certain Positions and Proceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, etc.

THE editor of the Free Labor Advocate, after copying the two foregoing documents into that paper, from the British Friend, published some very appropriate remarks relative to the correspondence, from which I take the following:

“IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

* * * * *

“Surely the writers of the letter can no longer attribute the views of the editors to a lack of information, after

the long and elaborate communication sent for the express purpose of giving them a correct view on the subject, written by those the most capable of doing it justice (or injustice), of any within the pale of their Yearly Meeting. It is to be hoped that the caustic and well-merited rebukes of our transatlantic Friends, will teach the letter-writers that wise, impartial men will discern the difference between reason and railing—between empty declamation and a plain and sober statement of facts, accompanied by documentary and other substantial evidence of their truth.

“The letter has been so thoroughly used up by our British Friends, that there is but little left, requiring any additional remarks. There are, however, a few passages which it may be well briefly to notice.

“The letter-writers say, ‘Among the many mistakes contained in the Declaration, no one would seem wider of the mark, than the conclusion which is come to after much laborious argument, that Friends in this country are favorable to Slavery.’ If they mean to say that our Declaration asserts that Friends in this country are sentimentally in favor of Slavery, as their language fairly implies, all the reply that seems necessary, is, that there is no such assertion in our Declaration, or any other document of ours. But if they mean, that the Declaration, conveys the idea that their *action* against A. S. Friends, and the Abolitionists in general, is favorable to the continuance of Slavery; then, if there is no greater mistake than this in the Declaration, it must be a very faultless document—without mistake from beginning to end. The public has already had too much evidence on this point to need more.

“Further on in their letter they use the following language: ‘Such sentiments as the following in the letter to J. C. Fuller, now before us in your paper, will be looked upon with abhorrence by Friends here. *It is a well-known fact, that the influence of the Society of Friends, in this country, is almost universally understood to be opposed to the Anti-Slavery enterprise.*’

They then query, 'By whom is it so universally understood?' and answer the question by saying, 'By none, we believe, except the seceders, and those in their favor and under their influence, and those who have borrowed their ideas from them in their papers.' Now this is all extraordinary, and it is difficult to believe that they would have hazarded such expressions, if they had supposed they would ever have been made public in this country, where the facts are well known. It is very clear, that in the use of the term 'Anti-Slavery enterprise,' in the letter to J. C. Fuller, we intended to designate the efforts now being made by those called 'modern Abolitionists,' or the doctrine of immediate and unconditional emancipation, as taught and advocated by the modern A. S. societies. Now, will our letter writers have the presumption to deny that the influence of the Society of Friends, in this country, is almost universally understood to be opposed to this enterprise? Dare they do it, in the face of all the evidence of its truth before the public? Dare they do it, when it is well known that Abolitionists so regard it?—that the most violent and determined opposers of the enterprise have again and again eulogized the Friends, as taking the right ground on this question?—when slaveholders themselves, with H. Clay at their head, known to be actuated by an implacable hatred to the enterprise, have frequently claimed the Society of Friends as being the right kind of Abolitionists?—when they themselves have given the most indisputable evidence of the truth of the assertion, by taking special pains to inform legislative bodies, slaveholders and the public generally, that they have no connection, in any way, with 'modern Abolitionists;' by proscribing their members for uniting with others, or for forming associations among themselves for the promotion of this enterprise; by shutting their meeting-houses against the advocates of the cause; by frequently reiterating the absurd charge made by H. Clay, that the Abolitionists had put back the cause of emancipation, and by the well-known partiality of many of them for the Colonization scheme? The

signers of the letter under consideration can not, without the most barefaced disregard to truth, deny that *their influence* is opposed to the A. Slavery enterprise, in the sense in which the term is used in the letter to J. C. Fuller.

“ I shall dismiss this subject, at this time, by stating that the letter, and the animadversions thereon, are given as they are found in the *British Friend*, italicizing and all. Let both the documents have an attentive perusal, and an impartial examination, by every one who would arrive at truth. I have no desire to restrict the reader to one side of the question, like the letter writers, in recommending to the editors of the *British Friend* to publish the statement of their Meeting for Sufferings, ‘ clear of any remarks, notes or comments of the seceders.’ Here is a remarkable evidence of a lack of confidence in the justice of their cause, as well as unfairness of intention. Truth shuns not investigation; but error, conscious of its deformity, dreads the scrutinizing torch of critical examination.”

“ The following document, published in the ‘ *Free Labor Advocate*,’ in Twelfth month, of this year, 1843; was written by an individual, as a review of certain positions and statements of Indiana Yearly Meeting and some of its active members, and as a further exhibition of facts, particularly relative to the treatment of Charles Osborne. But its publication was deferred until it was thoroughly examined in presence of Charles and a number of other Friends. The editor of that paper, in his introduction to the article, observes that ‘ the principal inducement to its publication, is to do an act of simple justice to that devoted servant of the Lord, Charles Osborne, who has been treated in a most cruel manner by those who should have been his most unflinching friends. I am fully prepared to say, that much of what is related, took place under my own observation, and the balance I have from such authority, that I fully believe the statements are substantially correct.

“DEAR FRIEND, B. STANTON:—

“Notwithstanding our Yearly Meeting and Meeting for Sufferings of Anti-Slavery Friends have shown to a considerable extent, the Pro-Slavery character of the proceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, and its arbitrary, proscriptive, and unchristian measures toward those of its members who have been actively engaged in the present Anti-Slavery enterprise, yet it appears to me, that the cause of truth and justice demands some further development of facts, and some additional examination of different points already taken into consideration.

“In the Address from the Meeting for Sufferings of that Yearly Meeting, issued in Third month last, we find a virtual claim to perfection, in regard to Anti-Slavery principles and practices. Now, if this claim be valid—if it be true, as they declare in this Address, that it is an ‘untrue and unfounded charge,’ to say, that ‘Indiana Yearly Meeting by its measures, is countenancing and supporting slaveholders, slave-holding, and Slavery, or that apathy and the fear of popular sentiment, have been suffered to get possession,’ then it must be evident that the reverse of these is true, and consequently that they are doing all that can reasonably be asked for in the promotion of the abolition of Slavery. But let us examine this matter for a few moments.

“Was it giving Henry Clay, the great slaveholder and Pro-Slavery politician, no countenance for the Clerk of the Yearly Meeting to take him in his carriage to the meeting-house, to lead him about by the arm, and for Friends to introduce him into one of the most conspicuous seats in the meeting-house—to gather round him in crowds, with manifest eagerness to shake his hand, and be introduced to his notice? Did he not give public demonstrations, that he regarded the principles of the Society as coinciding with his own, when he declared that ‘they take the right ground in relation to this subject; that the slaves must be prepared for freedom, before they can receive that great boon?’ Where can we find anything of recent date—among all the productions of

slaveholders or Pro-Slavery presses, either North or South—a word spoken against the Society of Friends, especially of Indiana, on account of its opposition to Slavery? Nay, on the other hand, do we not find laudatory notices of its actions in regard to the Abolitionists in these Pro-Slavery vehicles?

“If Indiana Yearly Meeting is at the present time in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation, as insisted upon by individuals, and if its testimony against Slavery has recently been growing stronger, and the members of that body have no fear of popular sentiment, as they virtually declare, why have they not corrected Henry Clay’s public statement in regard to their principles? This declaration, coming as it did, from such a noble character, has been circulated far and wide over the United States, and not a word is heard from that Yearly Meeting or its representatives, disclaiming the sentiments attributed to them. Why this death-like silence on a question of so much importance to the present and eternal welfare of millions of our fellow-beings, as that of saying whether they should now be set free from the galling chains of Slavery, or should remain bound for an indefinite period, to become prepared for freedom, under the absolute control of tyrant masters? One of three things at least, must be true. They are either not in favor of immediate emancipation, or else apathy or the fear of popular sentiment has been suffered to get possession; their assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

“That a ‘fear of popular sentiment’ prevails, we have only to refer to the Minutes of Advice of 1841, where they express such a warm desire to ‘retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land.’

“These rulers being elected according to the will and sentiment of the people, may very properly be regarded as the very essence of public sentiment, and it was for fear of losing place, influence, etc., by a contrary course, that Friends were advised not to unite with the Abolitionists. What else could have induced them to make the expres-

sion? If the rulers of our land had been Anti-Slavery, and such as had been chosen by Abolitionists, there would have been no danger of losing 'place and influence' with them, by uniting with their constituents in the promotion of a common cause. This is certainly a plain case. It was because popular sentiment was against the Abolitionists, that Friends were advised not to associate with them. And indeed, individuals of high standing have not hesitated to avow it in direct terms. Whether in all this, there is no manifestation of a fear of popular sentiment, let others judge. And if they are in favor of immediate emancipation, how can it be possible they entertain the proper zeal and concern for the promotion of this cause (which, to deny, they say is an unfounded charge), and at the same time neglect to correct the public misrepresentations of Henry Clay, in regard to their principles?

"Inasmuch as great pains have been taken by the ruling party in the Yearly Meeting, to prostrate the character and influence of Charles Osborne, a minister who has long been extensively known in the Society, not only in the United States, but also in Europe, it appears to me but an act of justice, that the position he has occupied before them, in relation to the Anti-Slavery cause, and some, at least, of the treatment he has met with at their hands, should be more generally made known, while at the same time, a desire not to wound unnecessarily the feelings of individuals of our opposing Friends, who have thus acted, dictates the withholding of their names from the public.

"In the Meeting for Sufferings at the time of Yearly Meeting in 1841, when that Epistle was about to be issued, advising Friends not to open their meeting-houses to Anti-Slavery societies, Charles Osborne, after having opposed its being issued, without effect, being aware that such a course would identify the Society with the opposers of the Anti-Slavery cause, at least without a clear and decided declaration in favor of the principles held by the Abolitionists, and apprehending that if such

must be the course of the meeting, it presented an imperious call so to do, requested that the meeting issue a declaration to the world, stating what plan of emancipation it was in favor of, as it was well known there was a diversity of sentiment in the Society; some were in favor of Colonization, some gradual emancipation, while others were in favor of immediate and unconditional freedom. But the meeting refused to say anything whatever on the subject.

“Here again, let us call to mind the assumption, that apathy does not prevail—that their testimony has been growing stronger, etc.; and at the same time reflect that many members, some in high standing, have contended, at least in Quarterly and Monthly Meetings, as the query asks: ‘are Friends careful to bear a testimony against Slavery?’ that, therefore, the framers of it did not mean a *faithful* one; and in more private circles they have advanced the idea, that the query was formed in wisdom, because of the difficulty there is to encounter in maintaining such a testimony, and hence, that we were very properly required only to bear a testimony. Some of this class have taken the position, that it is evidence of our maintaining such a testimony as the Discipline contemplates if we do not hold slaves, or speak in favor of it; and yet, after all this, we are gravely told, that it is an unfounded charge, to impute apathy to them in regard to the subject.

“In relation to the measures put in operation toward Anti-Slavery Friends, they say, ‘we have felt ourselves religiously concerned to proceed to do such duties as were required at our hands, in mildness, tenderness, and under the influence of Heavenly love and forbearance.’ The exhibition of a few facts, will furnish data more fully perhaps than has yet been done, from which this assumption may be properly estimated.

“At the Meeting for Sufferings, at the time of Yearly Meeting last year, when Charles Osborne and others were reported as disqualified members of that body, he rose and observed in the meeting, ‘it will perhaps be expected that I should say something in regard to this

matter. I have done what I have done in the Anti-Slavery cause, in the integrity of my heart, as unto God, believing it better to trust in Him than in any man or set of men, and He knows my heart, and He knows that my prayers are for you, and for all men, and unto Him I commit my cause.' But pathetic as these remarks were, they availed nothing; the business progressed on, and they were shortly after reported to the Yearly Meeting as disqualified members, at which time he again remarked, 'I have but one request to make of the meeting. I am here reported, and several of my brethren with me, as disqualified members of the Meeting for Sufferings. My request is, that the cause of disqualification may be put upon Minute, that wherever it may come, there the cause may also appear. It is our due, justice demands it, the cause of truth and righteousness demands it, and the cause of suffering, bleeding humanity demands it. I have no wish to cast reflections on any body, but in my opinion, the proceedings are unjust, oppressive, cruel, and unauthorized by Discipline.'

"But the party which instituted these measures steadily prosecuted them, notwithstanding many Friends earnestly remonstrated against it. And here, it should be remembered, that neither he nor any of the others, thus publicly exposed, was ever informed that their names would be reported, previous to their being read in the meeting. Thus even the opportunity of requesting to be released from being members of that body, rather than be held up as objects of public censure, was denied them.

"Are these indeed, the fruits of Heavenly love and forbearance?"

"Some time in 1840, a company of Friends visited Charles Osborne, as he states, evidently in consequence of the circulation of a report, that he had led an Anti-Slavery lecturer into the gallery, and had taken him to his house, entertained him, etc. When they were informed that the report in regard to leading into the gallery, was not correct, they seemed to be much pleased to find he had not done 'this great thing.'

“Now let us call to mind the conducting of Henry Clay to one of the most conspicuous seats in the Yearly Meeting-house by this same class of Friends, and the leading of him about by the arm, by the Clerk, who was one of those who revolt at the idea of such treatment toward an Abolitionist. What are we to understand by this contrast in regard to what they deem proper treatment toward these individuals? Remember, apathy or a fear of popular sentiment, and consequently a love of popular applause does not prevail!

“The company above referred to, at the same time also interrogated him respecting his views, about forming Friends’ A. S. societies. He informed them that no such societies had yet been formed, and gave them some of his views, stating his conviction of the necessity of Friends being actively engaged in circulating suitable publications on the subject, which was one particular object proposed to be effected by such societies. But they all appeared to be utterly opposed to the formation of such institutions, insomuch that some of them asked him to promise to put a stop to the business. He promptly replied, that it was in vain to ask him to promise to do any such thing.

“A short time previous to the last Yearly Meeting at Richmond, four individuals, among whom was a minister from another Yearly Meeting, in an interview with him, observed to him, that although he had been highly approved, he was now fallen and out of the life, and that if he removed to Michigan (which was his prospect), *he was gone forever*, and that there was no chance for him but to stay where he was, in the bosom of Society, and make an acknowledgment that would satisfy his friends. Just before the close of the Yearly Meeting last year, Charles bore a short, though powerful testimony, and one very appropriate to the occasion, and suitable to the circumstances in which the Society was involved. After which, when the meeting had closed, he was taken aside, and some of the Elders of the ruling party gathered around him, and as he informs us, told him positively,

that the communication above referred to 'was out of the life.'

"In the course of the interview, although they said in substance they had known his principles for twenty years, and that they were the same now, yet they urged him to come back to them, and be as he had been. He then referred to what had previously been enjoined upon him, viz: that he must make an acknowledgment, etc.

"He was then told that if he would only go with them, they would take him without any acknowledgment; and one of them said he would willingly go with him as a companion, into Kentucky, on a religious visit; I suppose, to plead the cause of freedom, 'where the evil of Slavery exists,' instead of doing it here, where 'we have nothing to do with it.'

"Here, let us reflect for a moment. It is said by Ministers and Elders, virtually claiming by charging others with working in their own will and strength, to be acting in complete accordance with the Divine mind, that there is no chance for him, but to make an acknowledgment, and condemn his conduct to the satisfaction of his Friends.

"Again, the same class, making the same exalted profession, after demanding of him a condemnation of his conduct as required by Divine authority (because remember, they assume all the while to be laboring in the Lord's will and time), tell him in substance, he *shall not* 'be gone forever,' if he does not make an acknowledgment, if he will only go with them! But how go with them? Why, notwithstanding such a course would be contrary to the advice contained in the proceedings of a former Yearly Meeting, which in their late Address, they claim as their own, just be careful to cast discouragements in the way of those who are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation, whether such laborers be found within or without the pale of Society. Just throw his whole influence against the Abolitionists, and unite with their opposers in closing meeting-houses against them, and in denouncing them before the world. This is all

they could ask, for he had not joined any Anti-Slavery society contrary to their advice. True, he was an efficient member of one in Tennessee, more than twenty-five years ago, but then it was not contrary to the advice of any Yearly Meeting in the world. Of what here, have we an undoubted evidence? Does truth ever contradict itself? is the Divine will subject to such 'variableness, such shiftings' and turnings? Oh! how has the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed! as said the prophet to Jerusalem, formerly once the highly-favored city; and so may it now appropriately be said of Indiana Yearly Meeting. 'Thy silver has become dross, thy wine mixed with water, thy princes are rebellious, and *companions of thieves*; every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them.'

"If the cause of truth and righteousness and the course he had pursued, demanded of him a condemnation of his conduct before the brethren, how could they, for the sake of retaining one among them who was 'gone, fallen, and out of the life,' receive him without? If such was not the case, upon what principle did they demand the acknowledgment? Who cannot discover in all this a lamentable lack of moral integrity, a succumbing to that low principle of expediency and worldly policy, which is far beneath the dignified character of a true Christian or christian Church.

"It is well known that the sentiments of Charles Osborne in relation to this subject, are the same now, they were more than twenty-five years ago; and I am confident no person who was then, and is now acquainted with them, will deny it. In that length of time, he has traveled very extensively as a Minister of the Society, and with the approbation thereof, perhaps as fully as any person ever has. Thus we see, that he was recently censured, proscribed, and put down, for doing those very things, and entertaining those identical sentiments which he did previously, with the entire unity and concurrence of the Society.

“The above circumstances and various others of a similar character can be attested if called for, by numerous substantial witnesses.

“To the preceding document, the following note was appended.

“From our own personal knowledge, and from the statements of Charles Osborne himself, we the undersigned, have no hesitation in saying, that the foregoing statements are substantially correct.

“DANIEL PUCKETT,
WALTER EDGERTON,
H. H. WAY,

JACOB GRAVE,
JOHN SHUGART,
LEVI COFFIN.”

CHAPTER XXI.

Exposition of the Sentiments and Principles of leading Members of Indiana Yearly Meeting relative to Slavery.

The following extract from the editorial columns of the ‘Free Labor Advocate,’ of Eleventh month, 1843, may not be uninteresting to the reader as furnishing additional evidence of the real position of the parties.

“Just before the organization of our Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, Wm. Hobbs, on behalf and in the name of the Yearly Meetings Committee, appointed to visit the Subordinate meetings for the purpose of carrying into effect the arbitrary measures of the ruling party, made request, in the Preparative meeting at Newport, that if we, Anti-Slavery Friends, knew of any active Friends of fair standing, who held unsound views in reference to the subject of Slavery, such as we had sometimes attributed to them, and in a particular manner, if we knew of any such who were opposed to aiding and assisting fugitive slaves on their way to Canada, we

should furnish them, the said committee, with a statement of the case or cases, in order, as was pretended, that they might deal with them for their delinquency. This was the ostensible object of the request: but the sequel will testify whether the real object was not to involve us in difficulty. But Haman was hanged on his own gallows. On the morning of their called Meeting for Sufferings on the Third month last, a paper, of which the following is a copy, was put into the hands of Wm. Hobbs, and he requested to attend to it as there would be a fair opportunity during the meeting. He was informed that we should take no further notice of the matter until we should see that justice was not likely to be done. And now, after the lapse of more than half a year, and nothing been done to satisfy justice, I feel under an obligation to lay the matter before the public.

“Joel Dixon said, he did not like such secret business as hiding or assisting runaway slaves.

“George Carter said, he would not actively assist a fugitive slave in making his escape, even if he knew his master was in close pursuit.

“Aaron White recently said, that he believed that slaves, in their present condition, are not prepared for freedom; that if they get a little liberty they want all. He said he believed in emancipation, but he thought it right to be effected gradually.

“Jeremiah Hubbard has said, that he believed the Anti-Slavery Society ought to, and would go down, and Colonization succeed; he continues to speak against the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and has repeatedly, within the last two years, circulated his appeal to the citizens of the United States and Great Britain, in behalf of the Colonization Society.

“Thomas Arnett, in a committee of the Meeting for Sufferings, positively condemned the practice of assisting fugitive slaves in making their escape to a land of freedom, as being very wrong and inconsistent.

“Thomas Wells, when on a religious visit to the meetings constituting Alum Creek Quarterly meeting,

some time ago, made a practice of censuring for assisting fugitive slaves, and in some places said it would be better to advise them to return to their masters. For the truth of this statement, refer to Thomas Cowgill and William Pearson, of Gohen Monthly meeting, and to John Lewis and wife, of Alum Creek Monthly meeting.

“But a few years ago (and we know not but it is the case yet), many leading Friends of Miami Quarterly meeting, and particularly of Cæsar’s Creek Monthly meeting, decidedly and earnestly opposed the practice of actively aiding fugitive slaves, many times characterizing it as theft; among whom are Robert Furnas, John Spray, Jesse Spray, etc., etc., etc.

“The above statements are made in compliance with a request of the Yearly Meetings Committee through William Hobbs, that we should furnish them with facts in relation to these matters, and not out of any resentment or ill-will to the persons named. Some of them are particular friends of some of us, and we continue to cherish for them feelings of high regard.

“If any of the above charges should be denied, we will furnish good authority. Let it be understood that we have not pretended to give the language of the persons named *verbatim*, but we think we have given the substance correctly.”

“P. S. If time and space would admit of it, and if we thought necessary, numerous instances might be given of Friends more or less active in Society, holding sentiments similar to the above, and even more glaringly inconsistent; but our only aim is to comply with the request of the committee, by furnishing statements respecting a few of the most prominent and influential members.”

CHAPTER XXII.

“An Expostulation to those who have lately seceded from the Society of Friends.”

ABOUT the time of the publication of the above, another document made its appearance in public, in the form of a tract, entitled, “An Expostulation to those who have lately seceded from the Society of Friends.”

To this the author ventured to place his name. I will here insert it.

 AN EXPOSTULATION

TO THOSE WHO HAVE LATELY SECEDED FROM THE
RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“Although you have frequently published to the world the causes that you say have led to your secession, it remains a subject of surprise to me why men, heretofore believed to be of sound and discerning minds, should have separated from, perhaps, the only religious society in America, that denies church-membership to slaveholders, let them reside where they may, because it was not opposed to Slavery. Neither is the Society silent in bearing its testimony against the evils of Slavery, but is on the contrary, both by its Discipline and Advices, frequently calling the attention of its members to the subject. Now let us seriously examine your alleged causes, and see of what they do really consist.

“You say you seceded because the Yearly Meeting advised its members against joining in the popular associations of the day for the promotion of the Abolition of Slavery. Yet do you not find that in nearly or quite every instance in which it has done so, it has called the attention of its members to its testimony against that evil, and exhorted them against apathy or indifference

on the subject? Beside which, I find you claiming to YOUR OWN INFLUENCE, and to YOUR MEMBERS while with us, the authorship of the Epistle in 1836, and of the Report in 1838, they being the two first instances in which such advice was issued. Now, if through your influence the advice was given in 1836 and in 1838, how can it be any cause of your secession because it was renewed in 1840 and 1841?

“ You give it as another cause of your separation from the Yearly Meeting, that it ‘ directed its meeting-houses closed against the advocates of emancipation.’ But when we turn to the Minutes of the meeting to see whether it really did direct its meeting-houses closed against the advocates of emancipation, we cannot find such directions. Had it done so it must have directed them closed against all its consistent members. We do, however, find that it advised against the practice of opening its meeting-houses for the purpose of holding Anti-Slavery meetings and delivering lectures, as being contrary to the general usage of Society and of hurtful tendency to its members. Now if this advice, as you say, has a tendency to weaken the cause of emancipation and strengthen the bands of Slavery, why did you ever publish it? Why did you tell the slaveholder of it? Was it because you wished to strengthen his hands, and weaken those of such out of the pale of our religious society as the Yearly Meeting has said, it was ‘ a satisfaction to it to find were awakened to a lively sense of the iniquities and horrors of Slavery, as now existing in the United States, and are made willing to become, on gospel principles, the open advocates of suffering and degraded humanity, and are laboring on the grounds which we, as a religious society, have for many years occupied in relation to this subject;’ and which it has said, it ‘ desires to encourage in this good work,’ and exhorts its members to be so alive to our testimony against Slavery as to throw no discouragements in their way? You give it as a cause of your secession that it would have such an effect; then, if so, why did you so far

disregard the aforesaid advice of the Yearly Meeting as to publish it, and that, too, in the worst light you could? Discouraging as you say it was to them, it appears that it was not as much so as you wished it to be.

“ You say it DIRECTED, which you say on other occasions is very different from ADVICE. You say it DIRECTED them CLOSED against the advocates of emancipation; whereas it only ADVISED against the PRACTICE of OPENING them for the purpose of holding ANTI-SLAVERY MEETINGS and delivering LECTURES. Now I cannot see how you could have separated on this account, for if it is objectionable at all, you have made it worse—if the advocates of emancipation, out of the pale of our religious society, would be weakened by it, you alone published it to them—if the slaveholder would be strengthened by it, you gave him that strength; WE did not, for whenever WE appear before him we appear on the side of the cause of Abolition.

“ I must, therefore, seek for other causes than these for your separation, but before I do so I wish to ask you a few questions: Even admitting your beloved theory, that the Anti-Slavery cause means YOURSELVES, is it a greater one than the salvation of the immortal soul? Now if a portion of your members were in the practice of opening your meeting-houses for the purpose of holding meetings to pray by APPOINTMENT for the salvation of the immortal soul, and to deliver sermons in, having for their object the same most righteous cause, would you not discourage the practice as being contrary to the general usage of Society, and of hurtful tendency to your members? and if so, would you be justly chargeable with going against the cause of religion, and strengthening the hands of the infidel? And if those members should disregard your advice and publish you to the world and other Christian professors as having thrown your influence on the side of anti-christianity, and offer, as an evidence, that you directed your meeting-houses closed against the advocates of the Lord Jesus Christ, would you not think you were used very unfriendly? Would

you not call such publications base slanders? I believe you would; but with no better grounds than we have to call yours such, in the case before us.

“This comparison, which I believe to be a just one, might be viewed a little further. You might not only be accused as above, but if the supposed separatists were to indulge in the same spirit some of you appear to indulge in, they would in all probability endeavor to unchristianize you altogether in the view of the public, not only because (as they would say) you had directed your meeting-houses closed against the advocates of the Christian religion, but would offer as an additional evidence that you were no Christians, because you were not actively laboring in THEIR way in endeavoring to enlighten the public sentiment on the subject. That you would not preach for its advancement yourselves, unless divinely moved thereto; nor suffer your members to hire others to do so. Thus they might endeavor to make the public believe that you had no just claims to the Christian religion, but were on the contrary, actively engaged in endeavoring to suppress it, with full as much regard for the truth as you have in endeavoring to show that Indiana Yearly Meeting is actively engaged in endeavoring to suppress the abolition of Slavery.

“You publish, as another cause for your separation, that the Yearly Meeting, by a special act, deprived you of ‘any privilege in regard to the transaction of any of its important business,’ and that ‘subordinate meetings were advised to pursue the same course of conduct down to the most remote and subordinate branches.’ The above is what you tell the world, whether to weaken the hands of those out of the pale of our religious society, who are honestly laboring to promote the cause of emancipation, and to strengthen the hands of the slaveholder or not, I shall not pretend to decide. But here is what the Yearly Meeting did say: ‘Friends are advised to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to any of the important stations or committees in Society, so that faithful and trusty Friends may be chosen; as we believe

that those who have distinguished themselves by opposition or disregard to the advices and travail of the body, are manifestly unsuitable for important services in it while they remain in that situation.' Now, is this the first time you ever knew Friends to advise to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to important services in Society? Why is it objectionable now, and never before? Or is it, really, not its advice on this subject that you object to (although you say it is), but the expression of a sentiment that those who have distinguished themselves by opposition, etc., are not suitable to fill important stations in Society, while they remain in that situation? I suppose THIS is what you intended to say caused you to secede. But is it not good also? If any of its members were so regardless of the Advices of the body as to be engaged in endeavoring to throw discouragements in the way of such out of the pale of our religious society as were honestly laboring on gospel principles for the abolition of Slavery, by telling them and the slaveholders that the Society of Friends who had heretofore been distinguished for their zeal in promoting the cause of the abolition of Slavery, were now throwing their weight and influence in the 'Pro-Slavery scale,' and were now actively engaged in endeavoring to put down the cause of emancipation, would such be suitable to fill important stations in Society? Would not such as had DISTINGUISHED themselves by promoting the publication of such libels against the Society, be manifestly unsuitable for important services in it? I THINK THEY WOULD; and that, wherever meetings were enabled to put in practice the advice of the Yearly Meeting, 'to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to important stations or committees in Society,' such were excluded. Let us view this cause for separation a little further; and allow me, without offense, to ask you candidly: did you INDEED secede because you were not appointed to important stations and committees in Society? Do you own that you seceded because you could not be appointed to some station that you desired? If not, why do you give it as a

cause of separation? There is some evidence at least, beside your giving it as a cause of your separation that such was the fact, in what I am informed took place at one of your caucus meetings at Newport, during the time of our Yearly Meeting, in 1842. The object of the meeting appeared to be to endeavor to devise means to secure your standing in Society, thus showing that your desires for appointments were so great that you would even hold meetings to endeavor to secure them.

“Another cause as given by you for your separation, and so published to the world, is the removal of some members from the Meeting for Sufferings without giving the causes. This was not unprecedented in our Yearly Meeting, ‘your assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.’ In the year 1828 a number of members were reported by the Meeting for Sufferings to the Yearly Meeting as delinquents, and released accordingly, and other Friends appointed in their places. There was a number of members of that meeting appointed by the Quarters in like manner reported, but as their names are not on the Yearly Meeting’s Minutes, I can refer to them only from recollection. You will perhaps say, here was a reason given, and that too, one recognized by Discipline. But here again your desire to have it so, has got before the facts. The Minute does not say for delinquency in the attendance of the Meeting for Sufferings, as the Discipline does, but simply ‘delinquency;’ beside which it was well known that most of them were diligent attenders of those meetings up to near or quite the one that reported them, and one or more of them were present at that meeting. Neither had they all gone off in the separation that had then taken place. There were at least three of them that I remember had not, and two of those three never did. Of those released in 1842, all have seceded. You particularly complain of no reasons being given for the removal in 1842, which it seems to me you must see, upon the least impartial reflection, would have been very improper and directly opposed to good order. I think the Yearly Meeting has never given a reason for

a removal from appointment in any case (and such removals have been frequent), except in cases of death, disownment from the Society, removal, or request. To do so would, in my opinion, be a direct violation of that clause of Discipline which says: 'And to prevent the introduction of all UNNECESSARY and PREMATURE complaints to meetings of business, it is advised, that if any member shall have cause of complaint against another, it be mentioned to the Overseers, who are to see that the party complained of has been treated with according to gospel order, previous to the case being reported to the Preparative or Monthly meeting.' Now, if it is a violation of our order to introduce a complaint, into any of our Preparative or Monthly meetings, until after the case shall have been inspected by the Overseers, it would certainly be a greater one to introduce it into a Quarterly or Yearly Meeting. If those Friends who were released had been guilty of a violation of our Discipline, and had on that account been reported as disqualified, and the meeting had named and recorded the violation, they would, in my opinion, let them have been ever so guilty, have had just cause of complaint against the procedure. What would or could the Yearly Meeting do in such a case? Would, or could it disown them? Would it appoint a committee to treat with them and report to next Yearly Meeting? Or, would it have directed the case to the Monthly meetings to which they belonged, thus taking upon itself the business of a Preparative meeting, a meeting subordinate to a Monthly meeting? What would the right of appeal be worth to a member disowned by such a course of proceeding, the highest appellate body being the accuser?

"I know that you say the Friends removed in 1842 from the Meeting for Sufferings, WERE charged—publicly censured before the world, etc. I own that they were reported to the Yearly Meeting by the Meeting for Sufferings, as disqualified for usefulness in that meeting, and released from the services thereof. But did that charge them with any violation of Discipline, or any immoral

conduct whatever? We know it did not, nor was it so intended. How often have good and worthy members of our society been named on committees, and to fill important stations in Society, and not appointed because they were believed not to be qualified, or in other words disqualified for discharging the duties thereof? Even for as important stations as those of Ministers and Elders, individuals are sometimes named in our Monthly meetings, after having been approved by the Preparative and Quarterly meetings of Ministers and Elders; and there objected to as not qualified. What but a spirit of 'self-confidence,' could make a member even think of seceding from the Society, because he was judged not qualified for the important station of an Elder, Overseer, Clerk, or member of the Meeting for Sufferings, or of the African or Indian Committee? And what better evidence of disqualification can there be, than a desire for appointments to important stations in Society, whereby to rule the Church of Christ? Perhaps you will say that in all such cases as I have alluded to, as being in some degree common in our society, they were never published to the world—they were only among Friends—brethren of the same family, etc.; whereas those judged disqualified in 1842, were, to use your own words, published to the world as transgressors, and I confess in this you have cause of complaint. But who are guilty? Who told 'the world' of any such procedure? Your public prints, and yours only, so far as I know or believe. Our printed Minutes, and the Address to our members immediately after your separation, in which alone the circumstance is alluded to, were to our members alone, and not for the public. I need not endeavor to show you how the publication, in the light in which you have held it up before the world, would be calculated to weaken the hands of those out of the pale of our religious society, who are honestly laboring on gospel principles for the abolition of Slavery, for you have done it sufficiently yourselves, and upon your heads it must rest.

“In addition to the removals, in 1828, from the Meet-

ing for Sufferings, which I have already noticed, there were a number released from the standing committees of the Yearly Meeting, on African and Indian concerns; without charging them with any immoral conduct, or any departure from our faith, doctrines, or testimonies. In the case of those removed from the former committee it was, I believe, exactly in the words of the removal, in 1842, of which you complain, that is, for DISQUALIFICATION. In the other case, they were merely reported and released without saying they were delinquents in any respect, or in any way disqualified; which is perhaps in general, the better way. As an individual, I am inclined to believe it is, yet while the meeting carefully avoids charging the individuals with any violation of our order, but simply stating that they are disqualified, or delinquents; if objectionable at all, it is certainly not sufficiently so to justify a secession from the Society. If it was in 1842, it certainly was in 1828, for a part of those released from the African Committee and 'held up to the world as transgressors' (just as much, so far as Society was concerned, as in any subsequent cases), had not then gone off in that Separation, but were there present in the meeting, but afterward seceded. Now the question is, was the Yearly Meeting of 1828 justly chargeable with his or their secession? You will perhaps say no, for you know that several of you were then active in reporting and releasing them. But if it was not a justifiable cause for leaving our society and joining in the Separation then, why is it now? I leave it with you to consider.

“I think I have now abundantly shown that the act of removal, in 1842, even if it was not the best that might have been, is fully sustained by previous proceedings of the Yearly Meeting, in which you, in common with other members, took an active part; it therefore only remains for me on this head to notice your charge of its being contrary to Discipline. In some of your publications you say it was contrary to the plain letter of Discipline, while in others you are a little more moderate and only say it was unauthorized by Discipline. The latter you may

BELIEVE, but I can not see how you can the former, although you plainly charge the Yearly Meeting in your Declaration, intended for the information of the public, that it was contrary to the 'plain letter of Discipline,' and thus cause, I have no doubt, many to be deceived. What plain letter of Discipline was violated? Can you pretend to say it was contrary to the plain letter of the following clause, viz: 'Any [members] declining, or greatly neglecting their attendance, the Meeting for Sufferings are to notify said meeting or meetings [the meeting by which they had been appointed] of such delinquency, in order that the places of those may be supplied by new appointments.' This is a plain letter of Discipline for notifying the Yearly or Quarterly meeting, as the case may be, of delinquency in the attendance of meetings, but for no other delinquency; yet are we on that account to suppose that any other proceeding, though in no way violating this or any other clause, is not only unauthorized, but CONTRARY TO the plain letter of Discipline? Certainly not. The Discipline directs that QUARTERLY and MONTHLY meetings should appoint committees annually, to nominate Clerks; now if a Preparative should be in the practice of doing so also, would it be a plain violation of Discipline? In either case the Discipline is silent, and therefore neither can be a violation of it. Again, according to the grounds taken by you the plainest cases of disqualification, even that of mental derangement, could not be removed unless the subject greatly neglected the attendance of the meetings, without a violation of the plain letter of Discipline.

"It seems to me that I have now answered all the leading causes given by you for your separation from our religious Society, and that if you will in like manner view the FACTS of the case impartially (instead of the version given by them in your publications), you can find no better grounds for your secession than are shown in the foregoing remarks. In the situation in which you are now placed, I think I am in a good degree sensible of the difficulty that will attend all your efforts (should

you be disposed to make any,) to enter into an impartial examination; for, in order to do so, it will be necessary to divest yourselves as much as possible from the party feelings you have been leavened into by the course you have already taken. I, however, from a degree of experience, would most earnestly entreat of you, to make the trial, individually. I say, from a degree of experience; for, many years ago, I became convinced in my mind, and that too in a great measure through the ministry and public declarations of my friend, Charles Osborne, that it was best and most safe for Friends, in the maintenance and support of their Christian testimonies, to dwell much alone, and not be reckoned among the nations. O how I have heard him in times past declare in the love and fervency of the Gospel, the danger of Friends being drawn away from the purity and simplicity of our profession, by mixing in the popular associations of the day, even for the promotion of works purely benevolent. Although we might rejoice that others had become convinced of one or more of our Christian testimonies, it would not do for us to leave our standard to go and help them exalt theirs, for in so doing we should lower our own. But rather, he used to say, let us thank God, and take courage, rallying close to our standard, exalting it as an ensign to the people, that others seeing our good works, might glorify our Father who is in heaven. Thus he used to plead with us, frequently naming the temperance, Anti-Slavery, and peace societies. With me and many others, such appeals to our religious feelings were not in vain. But when in relation to Anti-Slavery societies it was proposed that Friends should form an association of their own on that subject, I did not see any danger or inconsistency in our doing so, but, on the contrary, feeling as I did, and still do, much interest in the promotion of the cause, I thought it might advance the work. In this situation I remained a considerable length of time, being prevented from pushing forward such an association only through the judgment of other friends, and although I believed they wished me well, I found it hard

work to believe they wished as well to the Anti-Slavery cause as they ought. I thought if they did, they could not object to such an association as was proposed. Thus the accuser of the brethren was finding entrance, and it was not without a considerable effort, that I was enabled so far to overcome my prejudices in favor of such an institution, as to give the subject a candid and impartial examination. But when I succeeded in doing so, I thought, and still think, that such a course would be calculated to divide and scatter us, both in feeling and action; and thus lessen, instead of increase, our ability to do good for the advancement of the cause for which the association would have been intended. Beside which, other Friends might, with equal propriety, form a Friends' Peace Society, others again a Friends' Temperance Society, and so on, until we would, or might be separated into as many divisions as the Jews were at the time of the siege of Jerusalem, or as we have testimonies to bear to the world. For it is to be presumed that the members of each association would consider such Friends as were not connected with them, as deficient in their particular testimony. I thought I saw, that instead of having our whole influence to bear against the several evils of war, slavery, intemperance, and a number of others that might be named, as it now does, we would at least, be in great danger of having a part only, and could not in any event have more than all. Perhaps some of you may say my reasoning is not good, for the Society of Friends are not Anti-Slavery, but Pro-Slavery. To such I would say, is it an evidence that YOUR SOCIETY is in favor of war, because you have not formed a Friends' Peace Society? or that it is in favor of oaths, because you have not formed a Friends' Anti-oath Association? etc., etc. I have now, in addition to my expostulation with you on the causes that you say forced you to secede, told you how it fared with me in relation to a Friends' Anti-Slavery association, mainly because the opposition to it is urged by you as an evidence of our unsoundness in relation to our testimony against Slavery, when issuing

Advices against our members joining in the popular, or mixed associations of the day, and would here conclude this Address after again earnestly entreating you once more to give the whole subject a serious and impartial examination, were it not for that pernicious publication issued from the press at Newport. Unless the character of that paper is changed, and made what it professes to be, an ANTI-SLAVERY paper, instead of an ANTI-QUAKER one, vain will be your attempts to give the subject an impartial examination, while you believe its version of affairs. It is true that sometimes there are Anti-Slavery pieces in it, but they are few and far between. Its leading object appears to be the condemnation of another class of friends of the slave. One thing that appears as inconsistent to me as your secession itself, and which, like that, I scarcely know whether to attribute most to selfishness or delusion, is your continually holding forth to one another and the world, that the Anti-Slavery cause, or cause of emancipation, means YOURSELVES and YOUR MEASURES ONLY. It reminds me of the grounds taken by the Church of Rome against all other religious societies in arrogating to itself the title of the Catholic Church, and holding that all others are spurious. That it, ITSELF, is THE Church of Christ on earth, just like you assume to believe, that YOU are the Anti-Slavery CAUSE. 'How much better would it be,' in the words of our late Yearly Meeting, 'if those who profess to be opposed to Slavery were to bring their testimony to bear on the system itself, rather than to waste their strength and influence, by publishing criminations against others.' Such appears to be the present course pursued by the Cincinnati Herald, with the exception of a few pieces, generally written by some of you, and which the editor appears to think he must admit in order to maintain the character of the paper as a free press. He says in a late number, as near as I can remember (not having the paper before me), that he is determined not to quarrel, or impugn the motives of any man or class of men, however they may differ from him in reference to the MODE of advocacy, if

they are honestly engaged on the subject. A noble resolution, and far better would it be for the cause, if all the friends of the slave would adopt a similar course. Look at the two publications, and you will soon see that while one is laboring to bring all the Anti-Slavery feeling to bear upon the system of Slavery, and to expose its evil both on the master and slave, and its encroachments on the free States, the other appeared to be as zealously engaged in pushing away all feeling, all influence, all acts, that come up and join its ranks. You say much against proscription, while you are full of it yourselves. Look at the resolutions passed at almost any Anti-Slavery meeting where you are the ruling members. Proscription has become so much the order of the day with you, on the subject of Abolition, that you are ready to introduce it to aid other reforms also. At a late temperance meeting, where two or three of your members were present, one of them introduced a resolution to the effect, that all who did not sign the pledge were giving their aid and strength to support drunkenness. In advocating such a resolution you were virtually saying that many of YOUR OWN MEMBERS were giving their aid to support drunkenness, just like you say our Society is giving its aid to strengthen Slavery, because it advised ITS MEMBERS not to join the mixed Anti-Slavery societies of the day, and at the same time claim to YOUR INFLUENCE the Epistle of 1836, and Report of 1838, in which the Advice was first issued. To what shall I attribute such proscription from the Temperance, or Anti-Slavery cause, as would induce you (though no doubt inadvertently) to condemn yourselves, if not to blindness, in your course? You also say in your public paper, that at the close of the meeting on First-day, at the Yearly Meeting, in 1842, you saw greater honor shown to Henry Clay than you had ever before seen Friends show to any man however good or great—'such eagerness to shake his BLOOD-STAINED hands,' etc. You then go on to say, it may however be pleaded as an extenuation of the great honors bestowed upon him by their eagerness to shake his blood-stained

hands, their strong desire to evince to his mind their determined opposition to Abolitionists. Now why all this, but to endeavor to show that Friends shook hands with him BECAUSE he was a slaveholder; and for what, I would ask, did you shake hands with him! I confidently believe that in proportion to the relative numbers in attendance at that place, there were more that shook hands with him who were members of Anti-Slavery societies than of those who were not. I allude to Friends only. Of those in one large Preparative meeting, so far as I know or believe, they were ALL enrolled members of Anti-Slavery societies; which has led me to believe it was in a good degree so in other places also. Now the question occurs, did they do so to 'evince to his mind their determined opposition to Abolitionists?' I do not believe they, or anybody else did. I wish it distinctly understood, that I do not blame them or anybody else for shaking hands with Henry Clay or any other man, provided it be done in a friendly and becoming manner; but that to which I would call your attention is the construction you put upon it.

"Many other instances of a like character to the foregoing might be pointed out; but I have already written more than I intended, and would now, in conclusion, soberly and candidly ask of you, what can possibly be gained either to you, as Christians, or to the Anti-Slavery cause by continuing in such a course? If the testimony of Friends against Slavery has, in times past, had any influence in the world, are not such things calculated to do it away? Is not telling the slaveholder and others who connive at that system of injustice and oppression, that the Society of Friends are throwing their influence against the cause of emancipation, strengthening their hands (so far as your words are credited), as far as our Society and its testimony against that evil can have any effect? It seems to me that it is, and that it is a subject that ought to claim your serious consideration.

"But so long as you are building one another up with such false insinuations, as I have endeavored to point out, and many more that might be mentioned, you will

find but little place to give your whole course of conduct an impartial examination; which makes me the more earnestly entreat of you to endeavor to divest yourselves of their baneful influence. Seek for ability to enable you to cast down the accuser of the brethren, that you may be enabled to see your situation as it really is, and to return again to the Society from whence you have gone out. Be assured that notwithstanding the unmerited abuse that some of you have poured upon us, we would rejoice at your return; believing that many of you have been drawn away by being made to believe that you had no other alternative, but to forsake the cause of the slave or our religious society. With what grounds an impartial examination will show; which, that you may give it, is the earnest desire of your friend,

“GEORGE EVANS.

“SPICELAND, *First Month*, 1844.”

CHAPTER XXIII.

“A Reply to a Document entitled ‘An Expostulation to those who have lately seceded from the Society of Friends.’

“It is matter of astonishment, that any person pretending to advocate the doctrine of unconditional submission to the Advice of the ‘body’—that it is the duty of members of Society to comply with such advice, right or wrong, as the author of this document *has done*, even in a Monthly meeting, and at the same time act in open violation of it, as he has in thus writing and publishing this pamphlet. In 1841, the Yearly Meeting declared, in regard to an Address, written by a Friend, on the subject of one of our important testimonies, and circulated without undergoing the examination of a Meeting for Sufferings, that they felt called upon to express their *disapprobation of such proceedings*. How then dare he, holding, as he does, that it is a duty to submit in all

cases whatsoever (for he made no exception), thus notoriously to distinguish himself by opposition and disregard thereto. He is, by his own showing, manifestly unsuitable for the important stations he occupies. [See 4th page of 'Expostulation.']

"And it is equally astonishing that, advocating this doctrine, which, as to its effects upon individuals and the cause of Truth, must be the same as the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, he should find fault with others if they should take the same ground; that is, the position of the Church of Rome in regard to her claim of being the only true Church, and consequently that all should obey her mandates. By comparing his position with that of this Church, we shall find him cast in the shade. She holds that the Church cannot err, and, therefore, all should obey. He holds, that if she does err, it is our duty to obey. Thus, in either case, submission is positive duty. Thus far they are alike. But she does not broach the astounding absurdity of our author, that it is right to do wrong, and, of course, wrong to do right; and hence he is much behind her in point of consistency.

"When opponents exhibit a spirit of candor and a disposition to elicit the Truth by stating matters of fact only, and representing truly and fairly the point at issue, a discussion can be prosecuted with pleasure; but the course ours have taken in every document they have issued, makes it a very unpleasant task, because we are under the necessity of exposing and contradicting them.

"It is worthy of remark, that the writer of this document, like his predecessor, the author of the anonymous Review of our Declaration, has, in endeavoring to make our reasons for seceding appear as insignificant and contemptible as possible, represented us as saying, that we seceded because of the existence of some *one* circumstance named in the 'Declaration;' and that perhaps incidentally spoken of, or referred to, as one evidence of the existence of the two grand defects which we deemed just cause of separation, as set forth in the first Minute of our Yearly Meeting, namely, a departure, on the part

of Indiana Yearly Meeting, from the true and genuine principles of Friends in regard to our testimony against Slavery, and for its arbitrary, proscriptive, and unchristian measures toward us. For instance, he says, on his first page: 'You say you seceded because the Yearly Meeting advised its members against joining in the popular associations of the day for the promotion of the abolition of Slavery.' If the reader will turn to our Declaration and trace the history of that advice up to the Yearly Meeting of 1842, he will find that the object was to show the unsoundness of the ruling party, inasmuch as some of them who were endeavoring to enforce submission to this advice, were actively engaged in mixed associations of a different character, and in supporting, to some extent, the Colonization scheme, contrary to the advice of the same body. And again, rendering this advice against joining Anti-Slavery societies equivalent to a positive injunction, was referred to, among other things, in justification of our course in seceding, or as exhibiting a necessity for it, for thereby liberty of conscience was prohibited, that dearest of rights, on account of the prostration of which many of our forefathers suffered even unto death. These were the objects in speaking of this advice, and not to give the fact of its being issued as a cause in itself of separation. But if such had been the case, what boy of ten years old, after reading the Declaration of American Independence, would think of referring to *one* out of the long catalogue of abuses there charged upon the king of England, and then declare that the American Colonies *said they seceded* from the British crown because the king had done this *one* act; but there would be just as much sense in it, as there is in his asserting, that we seceded because of the issuing of this advice, even if we had given it as a reason. Much that is said in the Declaration is a mere history of facts. Why did he not say also that we declared we seceded because the Yearly Meeting issued the advice to cast no discouragement in the way of those who are laboring to promote universal emancipation? This also is mentioned as well as the other

advice. By a comparison of the facts referred to, arguments are derived, establishing the position taken in the Minutes of our Yearly Meeting already quoted. For example, the treatment of HENRY CLAY and C. C. BURLEIGH, by Friends, is referred to; but who cannot see, except our writing opposers, that these circumstances were spoken of to show with whom they had the most sympathy, a slaveholder or a modern Abolitionist, and that the comparison was instituted to prove the grand point, a departure from genuine principles, and that they were not mentioned as in themselves causes of separation! And here I would call the attention of the reader to the fact that they have never once noticed any of our arguments derived from the sources just alluded to. Why is it thus? I say let the intelligent and impartial decide.

“Our author queries, ‘do you not find that in nearly or quite every instance, in which it (the Yearly Meeting) has advised its members against joining in the popular associations of the day for the promotion of the abolition of Slavery, it has called the attention of its members to its testimony against that evil, and exhorted them against apathy or indifference on the subject?’

“It appears that it was not consistent with the object of his Expostulation, professedly conducted under a disposition to make an ‘impartial examination,’ to explain the consistency of such calls and exhortations, with the efforts of some of their delegations to the Legislatures of Ohio and Indiana, to convince the members thereof that the Society of Friends were not Abolitionists, and held no connection with them. It was doubtless foreign to his object to show the consistency of such profession of Anti-Slavery zeal with the conduct of some of their leaders in assuring HENRY CLAY that the Society had no hand in getting up the petition, presented to him at Richmond, asking him to liberate his slaves; or with the conduct of the Yearly Meeting, in rejecting the accounts from different Quarterly meetings, that a deficiency existed among Friends in regard to our testimony against Slavery;

declaring Slavery, in opposition to such evidence, that no such deficiency appeared; such accounts being mainly predicated, at least, in our author's own Quarterly meeting, as he well knows, upon the fact that the abolition of Slavery was objected to by one or more, and that one even argued that Slavery was right. All these, and a host of other circumstances of a similar character, which might be enumerated, showing conclusively, that their professions and actions were totally irreconcilable, it seems, did not come within the sphere of his impartial investigations.

“Page 1, he says: ‘Now, if through your influence the advice (not to associate with others) was given in 1836, and in 1838, how can it be any cause of your secession, because it was renewed in 1840 and in 1841?’ This perhaps has been sufficiently answered already, inasmuch as I have shown we never gave that as a cause; but the reader should bear in mind, that it was the Anti-Slavery publications, ‘the Minutes, Epistles, and Address,’ of Indiana Yearly Meeting of former time, which *our opponents held up as evidence of their Anti-Slavery character*, which we asserted were most, if not all, brought forth by the influence of those they have since proscribed, and whom they at that time opposed, and, in so doing, tried to prevent the adoption of the aforesaid documents. [See both sides of the question, page 11.] It was not that advice of which he speaks, which we claimed, for it was that which they opposed at the time of its adoption; but this they were anxious to have inserted. We admitted, however [see printed Minutes, first Yearly Meeting, page 10], that some of the real friends of the cause of immediate emancipation at first were opposed to mixing with others, but they were consistent. They were opposed to joining any mixed association whatever: but not so with the opposite class, as was evinced by their conduct. And they seized the opportunity of assisting to issue this advice, but with very different motives. They were prompted to action by opposition to modern abolition societies. [For proof, see anonymous Review, which was, no doubt, written by some of those very indi-

viduals.] The former class were induced to favor the advice, through a fear that uniting with others might lead to a compromise of our principles, not discovering what use might be made of it; for they never thought of its being converted into anything more than *mere* advice.

“But it should be remembered, that the advice issued in 1836, was *merely to consider* whether the time had not arrived, in which it would be most safe for members of our religious society to refrain from becoming members of other societies, etc. Now, although there is in this an apparent distrust of there being a propriety in our becoming members of benevolent societies, yet I conceive that those who took the subject under consideration, as suggested, let them have acted as they might afterward, acted in accordance with the advice. And if it had been ‘renewed in 1840 and ’41’ in this form, and left upon the same ground upon which it was originally given, it would have caused no difficulty. The advice contained in the last paragraph of the Report of the committee on the concerns of the People of Color in 1838, of which he speaks, ‘to abstain from mixing with these associations,’ is a production of their own, and the adoption of it was opposed by some, if not all, of the Abolitionists present at the time it was made out. It is no Anti-Slavery advice, neither did they hold it up as evidence of their Anti-Slavery character, and, therefore, we did not claim it. And I ask those acquainted with our documents, if we have not heretofore given them credit to a full share in the authorship of this advice, even in its original form? Why, then, pretend that we claimed it to ourselves?

“But it is a little remarkable that the writer of the document before me, after the demonstrations we have had, should endeavor to palm it upon the minds of the people, that the ruling part of Indiana Yearly Meeting desire to cast no discouragements in the way of modern Abolitionism, or Abolition societies. This is obviously his aim. Now it is well known that he is one among the many who sanctioned the anonymous Review of our

Declaration, which was commended and widely circulated by leading members of that party. We then hear him on the back of his pretensions of love to that cause, in reply to the assertion that Abolition societies have done much good, saying, 'not modern Abolition institutions it should be remembered,' these hold principles and practices unworthy of such good men as Mifflin and Pemberton. Various other expressions are used in that document showing that he holds them in contempt. Truly, I hope, to use his own words, we will give this subject an 'impartial examination.' And in doing this, it will be necessary, as he makes profession of having come out of error in regard to Abolition, and, therefore, I suppose, thinks he is prepared to give advice, in order that it may have its just weight, to notice some particular facts. About the time 'the accuser of the brethren' had got possession of his mind, or 'was finding entrance,' he was heard to ask the question, 'how much worse is it to *hire* a slave to work with us, and pay the master, than to let the slave work under the immediate control and treatment of the master, and we pay him for what the slave produces?' This was the substance of the interrogatory. This makes it evident that he saw the matter clearly as it is. But since the accuser of the brethren has been cast out, he has been heard frequently to say he 'can't feel conscientious in regard to using slave-labor produce,' and when on being asked how it happened that he once took sides with Charles Osborne in advocating the *rightfulness and necessity* of abstaining from the use of such productions, he replied, he did it to encourage others who did feel conscientious. He is aware that the slave is held in bondage in order to obtain the produce of his labor for consumption, but he cannot feel conscientious against consuming it, and of course, to be consistent, cannot feel conscientious against holding slaves. When the accuser of the brethren was operating in his mind, he declared himself in favor of voting for Abolitionists, but when he cast him out, he went and voted for Harrison, the Pro-Slavery man, and

Tyler, the slaveholder ; and since then, when a thorough-going Anti-Slavery man was before the people as a candidate for Congress, instead of voting for him, he cast his suffrage for a stanch opposer of the Liberty Party, and a villifier of the Abolitionists. When he was under the influence of this accuser, he was strongly in favor of helping fugitives to Canada, but since he has got from under it, he justifies the proceedings of North Carolina Yearly Meeting in censuring for such a practice in any way whatever. And finally, to cap the climax, he comes out with the document under review, which is a tissue of unfounded accusations, either directly or by insinuation, almost from beginning to end. But here I would remark, that I am far from representing a person as acting under the influence of the accuser of the brethren, for stating *truly*, in a proper manner to them their position (no matter what they have done), in order to correct that which is wrong. If I were to, I should apply this epithet to all the prophets, apostles, and good men, in every age and clime.

“Page 2d, he says : ‘But when we turn to the Minutes of the meeting, to see whether it really did *direct* its meeting-houses closed against the advocates of emancipation we cannot find such directions. Had it done so, it must have directed them closed against all its consistent members.’

“I suppose he means such consistent members as he is himself, who advocate emancipation by voting for slaveholders, and paying the master for holding the slave, and extorting his labor by the lash, and villifying modern Abolitionists. Now it will be seen, by examination, that in this there is an effort to make something out of nothing. He represents us as saying that the Yearly Meeting *directed* its meeting-houses closed. I should like to know where he finds what he has quoted. It may be possible that some individual may have thus represented the matter, but I feel confident that, as a Society, we never have, and we do not think of charging Indiana Yearly Meeting with uttering what is written in this document

under consideration, only so far as it may indorse it. But we did say that the Yearly Meeting 'refused the use of meeting-houses to Anti-Slavery meetings,' 'closed the doors of meeting-houses against them,' etc., and was not this the fact? Perhaps he will say they were never opened; but such was not the case, for they were ever open by common consent to Anti-Slavery societies, until a few years back, as a history of facts will abundantly testify. I know that the Advice in 1841 says, it was contrary to the general usage of Society, for meeting-houses to be opened to Anti-Slavery meetings, but it is so far from the truth, that it is a matter well known, that from the time the testimony was taken up, down to that at which manumission societies prevailed in North Carolina and Tennessee, Friends' meeting-houses were always open, and in those States just referred to, in particular; for whenever a society wished to hold a meeting in the neighborhood of Friends, it was just appointed at their meeting-house without the least consultation, and even a meeting for Ministers and Elders has been known to evacuate the house in order to accommodate an Anti-Slavery meeting. At Richmond also, in this State, the same kind of meetings were held in their meeting-house, *and never was there any other usage* in the Society since the testimony was taken up against Slavery, till the Colonization scheme spread its pestiferous influence among Friends, and dried up to a lamentable extent the fountain of brotherly love.

"As we have, at different times, shown that the Yearly Meeting, in closing meeting-houses against the Abolitionists, violated its own former advice to cast no discouragements in the way of those who are faithfully laboring to promote universal emancipation; our author, no doubt, aware that it was impossible to refute this charge, resorts to the ridiculous subterfuge of endeavoring to make us accountable for the evil effect of their misconduct, merely because we have taken the liberty to express publicly our disapprobation of such proceedings, and thus furnishing those advocates out of the pale of our

religious society with the *encouragement*, that all of the Society were not disposed to treat them in such a manner.

“In one of these efforts he observes: ‘If any of its members were so regardless of the Advices of the body, as to engage in endeavoring to throw discouragements in the way of such, out of the pale of our religious society, as were honestly laboring on gospel principles for the abolition of Slavery, by telling them and the slaveholders, that the Society of Friends, who had heretofore been distinguished for their zeal in promoting the cause of the abolition of Slavery, were now throwing their weight and influence in the Pro-Slavery scale, and were now actively engaged in endeavoring to put down the cause of emancipation, would such be suitable to fill important stations in Society? Would not such as had distinguished themselves by the publication of such libels against the Society, be manifestly unsuitable for important services in it? I think they would.’

“Here he has charged those Friends removed from the Meeting for Sufferings, as well as others, with promoting the publication of a libel against their society, and has averred that ‘such were excluded’ from important services in Society, on that account.

“Now, mark his declaration on page 6, the tenor of which means, if it means anything at all, that their removal was not intended to imply that they were guilty of any violation of discipline or immoral conduct whatever. Thus we hear him avowing that they were removed from that important station in Society, and pronounced disqualified for further services in it *because* they promoted the publication of a libel against the Society; and then, again, in another place he, in effect, declares, equally positive, that they were not removed on account of any violation of discipline or immoral conduct whatever. The publication of a libel, it would seem then, is no violation of discipline or immoral conduct with him. Really! is this an exponent of our author’s system of ethics? We might readily suppose so from the liberal-

ity with which he indulges in such publications, as I trust I shall demonstrate before I am done. But he will, perhaps, not like to admit that such conduct is not contrary to discipline or immoral. I shall, however, leave him to lay hold of whichever horn of the dilemma he may choose, either to admit this, or that he has pointedly contradicted himself in the two statements, and, therefore, that one of them, at least, is a falsehood.

Again he says: 'Now if this advice (against opening meeting-houses), as you say, has a tendency to weaken the cause of emancipation and strengthen the bonds of Slavery, why did you ever publish it?' And in another place: 'Now I cannot see how you could have separated on this account, for if it is objectionable at all, you made it worse.'

"It will be seen from this and his quotation from the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting, that he has virtually taken the position, that if the Society of Friends had ever become so corrupt as to alter their Discipline, so as to allow members to hold slaves, and we should make known the fact, we should be chargeable with violating the advice to cast no discouragements in the way of the advocates of suffering and degraded humanity. Now, he gives us to understand that he approves of the general course of the editor of the Cincinnati 'Herald.' That course he, and every one acquainted with the paper, knows, is, to expose the deteriorations and corruptions of the Whig and Democratic parties in regard to human rights, when, according to his doctrine, if the course of these parties 'is objectionable at all,' the editor is making the matter worse; he is casting discouragements in the way of Liberty men; he is weakening them and strengthening the slaveholder, by telling him these great parties are in his favor, and much more so than in former time. Thus, if we are to believe in his logic, we must suppose he approves of strengthening the slaveholder. These arguments show to what extremities our opposers are driven. It appears that our author would have us understand that the way to uproot evil is to say

nothing at all about it. But the Divine command is, 'Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, show unto the people their transgressions, and to the house of Israel their sins.' Such doctrine as his, suits those who 'love darkness rather than light,' and for the very good reason that 'their deeds are evil,' and they do not wish them exposed.*

"Again he says: 'Now I cannot see how you could have separated on this account (the issuing of the Advice against opening meeting-houses), for if it was objectionable at all, you made it worse—if the advocates of emancipation out of the pale of our religious society, would be weakened by it, you alone published it to them—if the slaveholder would be strengthened by it, you gave him that strength, we did not; for whenever we appear before him, we appear on the side of the cause of Abolition. 'Not modern Abolition, however, it should be remembered;' for some of them, eager to let all know whether slaveholders or not, who felt interested about it, introduced the Advice, bearing against Anti-Slavery societies, into one or more anti-abolition papers of Cincinnati, which circulated in the South, from which it was, no doubt, copied into Southern papers, and Indiana Yearly Meeting highly eulogized for its course by the slaveholders. There is very little probability of its having been taken from the 'Advocate,' because but

* I would here revert to an expression passed over in its proper place. Although in the instance alluded to, as in most other cases, he makes the charge in an indirect and underhanded manner, yet it is no less a charge on that account. In this way he avers we have been engaged in endeavoring to cast discouragements in the way of the Abolitionists, out of the pale of our religious society, by telling them and the slaveholders, etc.

Now I am confident that he and every one of his party, must know there is not one particle of truth in this statement. If we should admit that publishing the treatment toward them as wrong, would have a tendency to discourage them (which is perfectly absurd), what evidence is there that we, in doing it, were endeavoring to discourage them. We endeavoring to discourage those with whom we have united, and spent our time and substance for years in the promotion of a cause alike dear to us and them!!

very few, if any, slaveholders will read it, it is so completely anti-Quaker. But he knows very well that we never published it for the sake of telling the slaveholder they were on his side, nor to discourage the friends of the cause out of the pale of Society, notwithstanding his assertion, that 'discouraging as you say it was to them, it appears that it was not as much so as you wished it to be.' It is not making known the existing opposition to a good cause which constitutes a discouragement to those who wish to advance that cause, but the opposition itself; for to those who really desire its progress, it is a source of discouragement to have matters kept dark, as our author wishes to have them. They are glad to know the whole amount of opposition against which they have to contend, that they may direct their operations to suit it.

"But a word or two more in regard to the assertion, that they did not publish their proceedings against the modern Abolitionists, to advocates of the cause out of the pale of Society, or to the slaveholders. They have printed them annually in five thousand copies of their Minutes, and thrown them, as it were, broadcast over the State of Ohio and Indiana, wherever there were any Friends, and in various instances, much farther; and every person had, and now has, the privilege of reading that can get hold of them. No obligation has ever been imposed upon members to restrict the reading of those documents to themselves. They stand upon precisely the same ground that all other approved writings do, which are in common circulation, and yet, he declares, they were not published at all. I would ask him to answer seriously; did the Yearly Meeting intend that those advocates out of the pale of Society, who constitute in part, the Anti-Slavery meetings spoken of in the Advice, and to which the Yearly Meeting refused the use of the meeting-houses, should never know that they were thus refused the use of meeting-houses? It is indeed, astonishing to me, that any person 'heretofore believed to be of a sound and discerning mind,' should become so com-

pletely blinded or infatuated, as to make such assertions. Was it not telling those advocates of it in the most forcible manner, and in a way not easily to be forgotten, when a large concourse of them met at Spiceland, in the fall of 1841, just after the issuing of the Advice, with the expectation of holding the anniversary of the State Society, in the meeting-house, and found it closed against them contrary to previous usage, and were thus forced to retire to the woods and organize the meeting standing, or perchance, sitting upon some old rotten logs, while the bleak winds set them to shivering like the houseless outcast whose grievances they had met to redress? Was it not telling the world of their course toward us, to publish it as some of them did, in the 'Philadelphia Friend,' a paper taken by every person who chooses so to do? At the time of Yearly Meeting, in 1840, a request was made on behalf of Thomas Robson, in the Meeting for Sufferings, for a copy of the Epistle of Sixth month, 1840, issued by that meeting and approved by the Yearly Meeting; the reason being given, that Thomas was going to travel in the South, and wished to carry a copy with him, and particularly, as he expected to call on Henry Clay, and the Clerk was directed to furnish him with one. How does this, together with other circumstances to which I have adverted, comport with his assertion that they do not tell the slaveholders of it! I say, it is completely out of his power to cite to one instance in which we have manifested such a desire or even any desire at all, to tell the slaveholders more than others of their proceedings. The principal difference, however, between us in this particular, is, that we publish their proceedings as wrong, and they publish them as right.

“‘If,’ says he, ‘the advocates of emancipation out of the pale of our religious Society would be weakened by it, you alone published it to them; if the slaveholder would be strengthened by it, you gave him that strength, we did not, for whenever we appear before him, we appear on the side of the cause of Abolition.’

“I have no doubt he has here spoken the truth in re

gard to one point, unintentionally. He tells us that *they* do not publish that advice to the slaveholder, for whenever *they* appear before him, they appear on the side of the cause of Abolition, and, of course, the idea is, publishing it, would not be on that side, even if they did it themselves.

“This is exactly owning the truth of our position, that just so far as they make known to the slaveholders their treatment of Abolitionists, they give him their strength, their weight and influence, unless they should appear before him in order to condemn their conduct, as we have done, so far as we have appeared before him at all, in which case, they, like us, would be far from giving him any strength by publishing it. But I have already shown that they have willingly made known to the slaveholder their conduct toward Abolitionists, and that officially, and for the purpose of showing their opposition to modern Abolition, and therefore, according to our author’s own admission, they have been strengthening his hands, which he calls a libel when we utter it.

“It will be observed, that in denying that the Yearly Meeting directed its meeting-houses closed against the advocates of emancipation, and saying that had it done so, it must have directed them closed against all its consistent members, the idea is clearly conveyed also, that it did not advise against opening them to advocates of emancipation, but against opening them for *Anti-Slavery meetings*. Thus we hear him virtually denying that those who constitute *Anti-Slavery meetings*, are advocates of emancipation. Whose is the ‘beloved theory,’ that ‘the cause of emancipation, means themselves? Let the intelligent and impartial decide.

“On page 10, after charging us without producing the slightest evidence of its truth, with claiming that the cause of emancipation means ourselves and our measures only, he remarks: ‘It reminds me of the grounds taken by the Church of Rome against all other religious societies, in arrogating to itself the title of the Catholic Church, and holding that all others are spurious.’ In this, as in other accusations, he has charged us without

proof, with that which he is by his own words positively guilty of himself. He gives us to understand on page 3, that he considers the Society of Friends as the peculiar or chosen people of God; so much so, that he compares them (by referring to what he says, was formerly Charles Osborne's declaration) to the chosen people of Israel, formerly, and all other people, whether of 'religious societies' or not, to those heathen and idolatrous nations with which it was said that people were not to be reckoned. Further comment is unnecessary. But why did he not, in referring to Charles Osborne's former sentiments on this point, state also, that at the same time he was equally earnest in the love and fervency of the Gospel, to warn Friends to cast no discouragements in the way of the advocates out of the pale of Society—and that he was opposed to closing meeting-houses against them.

“After noticing *two* circumstances to which we referred, he, in his peculiar way of reasoning, comes to the conclusion, ‘I must therefore seek for other reasons than these, for your separation.’ He does not once think of showing the people that what were set forth as facts by us, were false statements—those facts which we gave as evidence of the departure of Indiana Yearly Meeting from the true principles of the Society. The exercise of a tender conscience, for which our worthy predecessors suffered so extremely, and from which we were prohibited in the Society, as set forth in the Declaration, is such a trivial matter, that it is unworthy of notice, in taking a view of our alleged causes. But to proceed, he says: ‘Even admitting your beloved theory, that the Anti-Slavery cause means yourselves and your measures only, is it a greater one than the salvation of the immortal soul?’ And again, on page 10, he says: ‘You are continually holding forth to one another and the world, that the Anti-Slavery cause, or cause of emancipation, means yourselves and your measures only.’ It is a little remarkable, that a person professing to desire our return into fellowship with himself, should utter such a wanton insult. Would we not have a brotherly time in

such a fraternity? Who of us ever exhibited such a 'theory? Who ever made such a claim? There are various measures resorted to in the different parts of the country, to arouse the people to the subject, that we do not make use of; and again, we make use of some measures that others do not; for we generally vote against Slavery, while some others do not vote at all; and where or when have we held forth to one another, that these do not support the Anti-Slavery cause at all—that we do all the business? I defy him to point out one single instance. It is the undeviating course of the 'Advocate,' to recognize all kinds of Abolitionists; its columns are open to them all, to advocate the cause in the way they may think right, within the bounds of Christian morality. But it seems, because we have undertaken to repel some of the slanderous imputations preferred against the Abolitionists in general, as well as ourselves, and to vindicate our course in the face of the world, we are to be loaded with this calumny also. In an attempt to cast dust in the eyes of the people in regard to the true cause of their opposition, by feigning that it is on account of a fear of compromising principles, by opening meeting-houses, he institutes the following inquiry: 'Now, if a portion of your members were in the practice of opening your meeting-houses for the purpose of holding meetings, to pray by appointment for the salvation of the immortal soul, and to deliver sermons, having for their object the same most righteous cause, would you not discourage the practice, as being contrary to the general usage of Society, and of hurtful tendency to your members?'

“His argument here, being based upon that which is not the point at issue, is but labor lost. The advice was not against opening meeting-houses to those who practiced that which is contrary to our principles, but against opening them to *Anti-Slavery meetings*, without making any distinction in regard to their practice—against opening them to those whom the Yearly Meeting before pronounced Christian philanthropists, laboring upon the *same ground* which it had long occupied.

“It will be observed, that he insinuates on page 3, that we were in the practice of supporting a hireling ministry, or that which is equivalent to it, by going contrary to their advice. Now, if this was the case, why were we not dealt with for a disregard of our testimony on this subject. It is evident, he does not believe it himself, notwithstanding such insinuation or otherwise, that it was not the intention of the Meeting for Sufferings, in reporting those eight members of that body, as disqualified, to do it for what they were guilty of; for he observes on page 6, ‘but did that charge them with any violation of our discipline, or immoral conduct? We know it did not, nor was it so intended.’ And he well knew that some of those were the most active in paying the expense of Anti-Slavery lectures, which is undoubtedly the subject to which he alludes. But why should he pretend that to ‘hire,’ (to use his own expression,) an Anti-Slavery lecturer, is supporting a hireling ministry! He would feel no scruple in hiring a man to plead his cause before a court, were he like to be defrauded out of a large amount of property, in order to maintain his rights; or, if he had been defrauded, to reinstate him in his rights. The slaves have been defrauded, not merely of all the property they would have accumulated their whole life long, but of themselves also—of the dearest of all rights—personal freedom; and is it not right for colored people to make use of the same privilege he does—to hire some one, or more, to plead their cause; and if so, have not the Friends a right also to assist them, especially when they have been defrauded to such an extent as to have nothing to hire with? Their cause can be pleaded effectually, only before the court of the people, and whenever the people shall give judgment in their favor, their rights will be restored. But let us examine his position a little further. He would have us understand, that he is in favor of supporting such papers as the ‘Cincinnati Herald.’ He has no objection to paying a man to lecture the people with his pen, one who makes a living by that almost exclusively; but if the

same person should undertake to talk to the people, instead of write, as he sometimes does, why then it would not do at all to pay him anything for what he could do; it would be supporting a hireling ministry. He would close the meeting-houses against him, and if we should denominate him an eminent philanthropist, pleading the cause of millions of our suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, who are not permitted to plead for themselves, we should hear him exclaiming with the writer of the anonymous 'Review,' 'a great flourish this, when the words, an abolition lecturer, would have expressed the whole affair.'

"Again, says he; 'You have been endeavoring to show that Indiana Yearly Meeting is actively engaged in endeavoring to suppress the abolition of Slavery.'

"Now I would ask why he did not represent the case as it was, namely; that we gave facts, showing their opposition to 'modern Abolition societies,' as they term them in contempt—the opposition of some of their leaders, at least, to immediate emancipation, and their partiality to the Colonization scheme, granting always, however, that the greater amount of opposition was based upon a desire to retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land, which they could not do without disclaiming the hated Abolitionists. This is just what we have done in regard to this matter; and who, of common sober sense, does not know that people may hold these sentiments, and thus be desirous of popular favor, without being *actively engaged in endeavoring to suppress the abolition of Slavery*, which is a charge we have never made against the Yearly Meeting.

"On pages 3 and 4, he treats upon the subject of our having published our grievances—the proscriptive measures of the Yearly Meeting, whereby we were deprived of the privilege of Society, except at the expense of our conscientious principles. It will be seen, he pretends not to understand the object in thus making it known; 'whether,' says he, 'it was to weaken the hands of those out the pale of our religious society, who are honestly

laboring to promote the cause of emancipation, and to strengthen the hands of the slaveholder, I shall not pretend to decide.' As it is evident that he is acquainted with our documents, can any one believe there is a particle of candor in such remarks?

"After quoting the proscriptive Advice referred to, he says: 'Now is this the first time you ever knew Friends to advise to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments to important services in Society? Why is it objectionable now, and never before?' I answer, this is not what was objected to at all, as he and every one knows who has read our Declaration. Why this continued effort to mislead the reader? The objection was, that the Yearly Meeting gave as a reason for urging this course, that those who had 'distinguished themselves by opposition or disregard to the Advices and travail of the body, are manifestly unsuitable for important services in it, while they remain in that situation;' and then appointed open violators of such Advices, who were opposed to modern Abolitionism. If the rule had been applied to all impartially, who were opposed to the Advices of the Yearly Meeting, and not to those who were opposed to one kind of Advices, the subject, of course, would not have been named in the way it was. It is a very convenient way to be weighty and deliberate in making appointments, to make violation of the Yearly Meeting's Advice a test question whereby to ascertain the fitness of persons for services in Society, and then, knowing themselves to be guilty of such violations, 'deliberately' exempt themselves from the operation of the rule and be 'weighty' in applying it to others. Every one acquainted with the proceedings of the ruling party, knows that Abolitionists were the only violators of Advice, to which this rule was applied; but our author never once thinks of explaining why this was the case. It would seem, it never entered his mind, that it was the injustice of such proceedings, the prohibition of liberty of conscience, and the opposition to modern Abolition, which it evinced, that occasioned our remarks, notwithstanding this object

is so clearly set forth in the Declaration. And now, in turn, let me query; has it ever before been the practice of the Yearly Meeting to tell a portion of its members, that another portion of their fellow-members, holding conscientiously different sentiments in regard to Christian duty, are unworthy of their fellowship—aliens to the commonwealth of Israel—and should be treated as such? Is this the way to keep the ‘unity of the spirit in the bond of peace?’ And let me ask again, whether such is not an open violation of the ‘plain letter of Discipline,’ contained in the following sentence: ‘Liberty of conscience being the common right of all men, *and particularly essential to the well-being of religious societies, we hold it to be indispensably incumbent upon us to maintain it INVIOLABLY AMONG OURSELVES.*’ Had this clause of Discipline been carried out by the ruling party, there would not have been any division at all in the Society. This must be obvious to all, notwithstanding his insinuation to the contrary, on page 3, for we never tried to urge them into our measures; we merely wished to have liberty to perform what we believed to be our duty. But it seems, we are now to be treated with contemptuous ridicule for making known our grievances, as though it was a mere desire for preferment that induced a separation. Just think of it for a moment; Charles Osborne, Daniel Puckett, Martha Wooton, George Shugart, and various others whom they charge with being at the head of the secession, separate for the sake of appointments! Now, even if they had desired such preferments, they were already occupying the most important stations in Society, and could have continued to occupy them unmolested if they had been willing so far to have violated their consciences, as to submit to the requisitions of the body. Is it not the strongest evidence of the purity of their motives, that they should be willing to sacrifice everything like society preferment in order to maintain a conscience ‘void of offense’ before God? And is it not conclusive evidence of the love of that party for the honor that cometh from man—those society preferments

of which he speaks, that they should suppose we could be induced to violate our conscientious views in regard to supporting modern Abolition societies, if we should find that they were determined to deprive us of them if we did not?

“They have presented this inducement in various forms. Sometimes by appointing to some station those who were tinctured with Abolition, thus placing them under an obligation for such a favor, to be like they were themselves. And they have actually succeeded in some instances in drawing Friends from the support of the A. S. cause by promptly seizing the opportunity, where a want of firmness was discovered to make its appearance in regard to their principles, to appoint them immediately on some business, even while they were still in open violation of the advice not to associate with others, and thus distinguishing themselves by opposition and disregard to the advice of the body not to appoint such, were, therefore, by their own showing manifestly unsuitable for the stations they were occupying.

“Now, if prohibiting liberty of conscience is not a just cause of secession, to exhibit which every one knows was the object in referring to the proscriptive advice, I should like to know what would constitute a just cause? Does he believe there ever was or can be such a cause? We might suppose from his doctrine of unconditional submission to the body, that he does not; and hence he should return to the ‘body,’ the good old mother church, the Church of Rome, from which all other churches seceded, or in opposition to which they were established.

“The very existence of the Society of Friends, according to his view, is wrong. They should all return to that body and submit to its requirements—cast the responsibility upon it, they would be clear! This is what he tells us in regard to submission to the requirements of his Yearly Meeting.

“In regard to what he says he is informed took place at one of our caucus meetings at Newport, the object of which, he says, appeared to be to endeavor to devise

means to secure our standing in Society, is about like his other statements. There was no meeting held for such a purpose at all. But we have proof at hand that some of his party held a caucus before Yearly Meeting, and there planned out the proscriptive course to pursue toward us, which we heard of some time before Yearly Meeting, and Thomas Arnett proposed it in the meeting, accordingly, as though it was from immediate inspiration. So that it is evident that their 'desire' to put down the Abolitionists was so great that 'they would even hold a meeting to endeavor to devise means to secure' that object.

"Commencing at the bottom of page 4, he remarks, 'another cause given by you for your se aration, and so published to the world, is the removal of some members from the Meeting for Sufferings without giving the causes. This was not unprecedented in our Yearly Meeting, your assertions to the contrary, notwithstanding.'

"The obvious design, here, is to create the impression that he had detected an error in the statement of A. S. Friends. But our statement was substantially this (See both sides of the question, page 18):

" 'We believe no instance is on record in the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting, so far as we have examined (which is as far back as 1827), of the removal of any members from the Meeting for Sufferings (until disowned from Society), on any other account than request to be released, or *delinquency*. And, if we are not mistaken, in all such cases the reason is given.' This, it will be seen, he contradicts, and in the next breath relates an account of a removal in 1828 for DELINQUENCY, thus at once confirming our statement. If it was not the delinquency recognized in Discipline for which they were removed, we cannot help that, our statement is still correct. But if the representation is true, that the Meeting for Sufferings did, at that time, report any of its members as delinquents, appointed either by the Yearly Meeting or Quarters, who were diligent attenders of its meetings;

and chargeable with no violation of Discipline or immoral conduct whatever, it only shows that it transcended its bounds.

“But the main point in our statement in regard to this matter was, that ‘the only instance on record of a member being stated to be *disqualified* and no cause of disqualification mentioned, is that of an individual who was disowned and had appealed to the Yearly Meeting, and that meeting had confirmed the judgments of the Quarterly and Monthly meetings,’ thus making it unnecessary to state it any farther than what was already on Minute. Now as those removed in 1842 were declared to be disqualified, and no cause given, contrary to previous proceedings above referred to, it is indeed strange that any person professing candor, with these facts before him, and knowing that this was the main point at issue, as he surely must, should gravely declare that he ‘thought he had abundantly shown that the act of removal, in 1842, was fully sustained by previous proceedings of the Yearly Meeting,’ without even attempting to deny our statement in this particular, or reconcile their proceedings with those of former times. And it is equally astonishing that he should make such declaration, knowing, as he surely must, that if those removed in 1828, to which he refers, had been declared disqualified, there would still have been a vast difference in the two cases. They did not request the meeting to state the cause of disqualification on Minute, that wherever it appeared the cause might also appear, as those did in 1842.

“It is evident that a person conscious of having violated the Discipline, or of having committed an immoral act, would be willing to lie under such a vague charge as this. The more atrocious the act, the more willing or desirous would he be to have it so: while, at the same time, a person not thus conscious would not be willing to submit to it at all. It is, therefore, most certainly conclusive proof that those who have made the request felt conscious of their innocence; and the refusal to grant it shows clearly also that the meeting was conscious that

its grounds for such proceedings would not bear the test of investigation, or they would have complied with the request. It is indeed profoundly absurd to suppose, as he remarks, that 'if those Friends who were released had been guilty of a violation of Discipline, and had on that account been reported as disqualified, and the meeting had named and recorded the violation, they would have had just cause of complaint against the procedure;' against the meeting *for granting their most earnest request!* If they had been guilty, and had *not* made such request, they might have had cause of complaint, if it had been given and recorded, but not otherwise.

"But he has, with his peculiar genius, artfully endeavored to represent the existence of the Meeting for Sufferings as based upon the same ground as that of the committees having the care of the African or Indian concerns. But it will be recollected there is no Discipline in regard to these committees at all. The Yearly Meeting has made no laws by which to be governed in regard to these; it may change such committees every year if it should see proper.

"The cases, therefore, are not at all parallel. But if the meeting did, in 1828, represent any of the members of those committees as having disqualified themselves, and removed them accordingly, who were 'good and worthy members, and had been guilty of no violation of Discipline or immoral conduct whatever,' it was not only a contradiction in itself, but very wrong indeed; and I hope if there are any among us who had a hand in the transaction, that they will be very far from justifying it.

"I do not recollect of ever reading the production of an author that embraced so much insidious, circumventive, underhanded maneuverings as are contained in the one before me. With this kind of artifice he has endeavored to identify the case of those removed in 1842, with that of "good and worthy members," who had not been put upon certain appointments because it was supposed they had not attained to that perfection of qualifi-

cation which others had, or which in case of recommending Ministers and appointing Elders, it was necessary they should.

“Now it was a perfect understanding at the time, among all parties, by their being reported as they were, that they had disqualified themselves by what was considered their bad conduct, for further service in that body. Will he or any person in his party deny it? I know they cannot do it in truth; and yet by his sly insinuations, he would make his readers believe they were really charged with nothing at all, and that their being thus declared disqualified, was just an ordinary circumstance, of not appointing, where it was believed a qualification for the service proposed to be performed, had not been attained!

“Are we to understand they were esteemed as good and worthy members by the ruling party, when it was obvious to all present in the meeting, that that party were determined to pay no attention to what they had to say? Even one of the most pathetic appeals for justice—a request that they should state on Minute the cause of their disqualification, that wherever it appeared the cause might also appear, was rejected in the same way. Such a pretense, is nothing short of an insult to the common sense of those who were present. And supposing they were such as he pretends they were esteemed, I ask, if it does not prove our assertion correct, that the measures of his party were unchristian measures? Where is the person who is disposed to do right, who would think of treating good and worthy members in such a manner?

“Page 5, ‘You particularly complain of no reason being given for the removal of the members of the Meeting for Sufferings in 1842, which, it seems to me, you must see upon the least impartial reflection, would have been very improper and directly opposed to good order. I think the Yearly Meeting has never given a reason for a removal from an appointment in any case (and such removals have been frequent) except in cases of death, disownment, removal or request. To do so, would, in my

opinion, be a direct violation of that clause of Discipline which says, 'etc. Then follows an extract from the Discipline, regulating the introduction of complaints into meetings of business. There is something a little remarkable in this. 'It would be,' he says, 'directly opposed to good order, to give reasons for removing members from the Meeting for Sufferings, except in cases of death, disownment, removal or request.' What then, is there not excepted in which it is opposed to good order to report them. It is evident from his quotation of the paragraph of Discipline, and his remarks thereon, that he alludes to cases of individuals who conduct themselves so as to require the action of a meeting for discipline. The cause then why the reason was not given, was, that it would be introducing that into the 'Yearly Meeting' which belongs to a Preparative meeting, a charge of violation of Discipline, or immoral conduct. Now put this by the side of what he says on Page 6th, 'but did that [reporting them as disqualified] charge them with any violation of Discipline or immoral conduct? we know it did not nor was it so intended.' Now I ask at which time did he tell the truth?

On page 6, he again repeats the astonishing absurdity, that they did not publish their proceedings against us. In addition to my former remarks, I would observe, that although he declares that we alone have published the treatment toward those removed from the Meeting for Sufferings in 1842, yet *they* have printed nearly or quite 5000 copies of it in the Minutes, and 5000 copies of a *justification* of it, in an Address, making nearly 8000 copies more than *we* have. And I have no doubt they have circulated it four times as much in the United States as we have. And even in England their Address justifying it, was published in the British Friend and was desired so to be by leading members in his Yearly Meeting, and yet with much seeming candor, he avers that *they have not published it at all*. And what reason does he give for making such assertion? Because, says he, 'those documents were for our members alone.'

“Now I suppose, any person not a member of Society would have as good a right to read one of these, as the Advocate if he could get hold of it, and I think neither our author or any of his friends would hesitate to lend them to their neighbors, unless it should happen to strike their minds, that by so doing they would not appear before them on the side of the cause of Abolition. Therefore, according to his ‘beloved theory,’ if we had so worded our documents as to address them to Anti-Slavery Friends alone, no matter how far they might circulate, we should not have published the account at all.

“Page 7, he makes the following quotation from Discipline. ‘Any (members) declining or greatly neglecting their attendance, the Meeting for Sufferings are to notify said meeting or meetings (the meetings by which they had been appointed) of such delinquency, in order that the places of those may be supplied by new appointments.’ This, he remarks, ‘is the plain letter of Discipline for notifying the Yearly or Quarterly meeting, as the case may be, of delinquency in the attendance of meetings, but for no other delinquency; yet are we on that account to suppose that any other proceedings, though in no way violating this or any other clause, is not only unauthorized, but contrary to the plain letter of Discipline? certainly not.’ Here it will be observed that he undertakes to prove, that it is not contrary to the plain letter of Discipline to remove members of the Meeting for Sufferings under any pretense whatever, from the fact that it does not in this place prohibit it in direct terms. This is his meaning, as I gather from his illustration. Let us now turn to the Discipline.

“After stating the object of the Meeting for Sufferings, how it is constituted—fixing the time for it to convene, &c, the first paragraph winds up by saying, and ‘*is to be subject to the following rules.*’ Then follow the rules, five, in number. The fourth one is the paragraph he has partly quoted. This rule, he admits, does not touch the question of removing from membership in that body for any other delinquency than that of neglect or non-

attendance of its meetings. Can any person define how the meeting can be subject to five rules and at the same time institute a sixth one, embracing a matter not touched in the five? Cannot any person see that the latitude given by the addition of the sixth one, in the case now before us, would be much greater than without it, and would the meeting then, under such circumstances be subject to, or governed by, those five rules which the Discipline says it is to be? Were I to adopt his reasoning, I might with equal propriety contend that it would not be contrary to the plain letter of Discipline for the Meeting for Sufferings to add another, and a seventh rule, and report half of their number every five years, that new ones might be appointed. There is plain letter of Discipline for reporting when delinquent, 'yet are we on that account to suppose that the meeting has not a right' to report half of their number every five years, in order that a change might take place? The Discipline is as silent in this case as the other, and therefore according to our author's reasoning cannot be a violation of it. But he remarks further, 'according to the grounds taken by you the plainest cases of disqualification, even that of mental derangement, could not be removed unless the subject greatly neglected the attendance of the meetings, without a violation of the plain letter of Discipline.'

"The Discipline provides, that in order that the Yearly Meeting and its several branches may be properly represented in its recess, they shall each appoint a certain number of Friends which shall constitute a Meeting for Sufferings. And I should suppose common sense would dictate, that an insane person could not represent them any more properly than a deceased person. And for this reason, no doubt, the Discipline is silent on the subject. It is astonishing with what pertinacity he and his party adhere to a position directly opposed to that taken by Friends in the former secession, or at least in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, where their Discipline is substantially the same as with us in regard to this matter. We have taken the ground that *they* did.

“The arguments of our author against our position will, therefore, apply with equal force against that of his own party in Philadelphia. [See Foster’s Reports—examination of Wm. Evans and Holliday Jackson.]”

“Before leaving this subject I would state, that the proceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting were contrary to the plain letter of Discipline in another point of view, and which was particularly had in mind in making the statements in the Declaration. The Discipline recognizes the right of the Quarters to be represented in the Meeting for Sufferings. But that body reported a part of the representatives from one of the Quarters as disqualified, and sent on the account to that meeting in order that a new appointment might take place, and the Yearly Meeting sanctioned the proceedings, and then adopted a rule to disqualify all who should oppose the ‘travail of the body,’ which, of course, included that to make this change. The Quarter, no doubt, wished those persons to represent it, but those proceedings cut it off completely from enjoying that privilege. If this is not a violation of the plain letter of Discipline I think there is no danger of its ever being violated.

“Page 9, ‘But, when in relation to Anti-Slavery societies, it was proposed that Friends should form an association of their own on that subject, I did not see any danger or inconsistency in our doing so, but on the contrary, feeling as I did and still do, much interest in the promotion of the cause, I thought it might advance the work. In this situation I remained a considerable length of time, being prevented from pushing forward such an association only through the judgment of other Friends, and although I believed they wished me well, I found it hard work to believe they wished as well to the Anti-Slavery cause as they ought. I thought if they did, they could not object to such an association as was proposed. Thus the accuser of the brethren was finding entrance, and it was not without considerable effort that I was enabled so far to overcome my prejudices in favor of such an institution, as to give the subject an impartial exam-

ination. But when I succeeded in doing so, I thought, and still think, that such a course would be calculated to divide and scatter us, both in feeling and action, and thus lessen instead of increase our ability to do good for the advancement of the cause for which the association would have been intended.'

“It will be seen that our author professes to place much confidence in impartial examination. Now if he really desires to make it, why does he not, when stating his belief, that forming associations among Friends, would be calculated to divide and scatter us, etc., tell us how it happens that a Bible Association of Friends has been existing for a number of years in the United States, as well as other benevolent institutions of a different character, without producing the disastrous consequences he pretends to foresee. And in regard to dividing and scattering us in feeling and action, it could not possibly be worse than for some Friends to associate in mixed societies, while others did not, for the promotion of similar objects; and why did he not show the frightful results in former times in this particular? Why did he not show us that some of our most worthy Friends, both in England and America, produced divisions among Friends, by joining such associations? The reason is obvious, there were no such results. And the reason there were no such results is, there was little or no opposition to Friends being thus engaged.

“Now it is well known that he is perfectly acquainted with all these facts. Would any one then, suppose that he really desires an impartial examination? It is, surely, representing the Society in a very unfavorable light, to say that it would divide and scatter, for Friends to be allowed to form such benevolent associations as they might feel interested in establishing. He must suppose that Friends are very intolerant, indeed, or otherwise exceedingly jealous of what they might ‘deem a tax upon their own just praise,’ if he believes that for one set of Friends to engage in active operations, for the promotion of one branch of Christian duty, while

others did not, would set them at variance one against another. Does he believe there is any such thing as individual and special duties, or was the apostle mistaken when he said, there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit.

“Now if an individual—such for instance as Elizabeth Fry, of England—should engage more ardently in alleviating the condition of the poor than others, it is to be presumed, according to our writer’s argument, that such person would consider those Friends, who were not equally ardent in that cause with herself, as deficient in the good work she was engaged in supporting; and, therefore, she should abandon it, and let the poor take care of themselves till Friends all got ready. No individual should advance beyond the mass; for if one might, another might also; and they would be sure to associate together in some way or other for their own mutual help and encouragement, in the promotion of a common cause.

“But, in regard to the ground of his opposition to Anti-Slavery associations of Friends, if I am to believe his own statement, which I heard him make just after he had succeeded in overcoming his ‘prejudices in favor of such associations,’ it was, that such societies would inevitably be merged into the mixed associations, (modern Abolition Societies), or be in some way connected with them, and that if we should go on in forming such associations, Charles Osborne would probably be with us, and if he should be, he would lose his influence in Society, and thus a great deal of harm would be done by it. (I give the substance). And many of us having so frequently heard him speak of losing influence, by laboring in Anti-Slavery associations, and of the necessity of abandoning them, in order to retain it, by which it was clearly understood that, by so doing, he and others would retain such favor with the body, as to receive appointments and keep their important stations; that his interrogatories, insinuating that we seceded in order to secure preferments in Society, come with a peculiar ill

grace from *him*, and are truly worthy of their author. It is well known that he was formerly an Abolitionist; for at that time he, doubtless, thought Abolitionists were going to be popular in Society, as Charles Osborne was one, and also one of the foremost Friends in the Yearly Meeting. It is also well known, that some of his fellow-members of the 'body,' have been dissatisfied with his former abolition conduct, and have stated at different times, that he ought not to be made use of in Society, unless he should make an acknowledgment. He, therefore, no doubt, found it more agreeable to his feelings to do it by publicly abusing the objects of their hatred in a printed document, and as it were, incidentally introducing an admission into it, that the accuser of the brethren was finding entrance into his mind when he was an Abolitionist, than to do it in any other way. And I have not a shadow of doubt that he thought it necessary in order to 'secure his standing in Society;' and that it was done mainly for that purpose.

"After endeavoring to show the impropriety of Friends forming associations of their own to promote a good object, he says: 'Perhaps some of you may say my reasoning is not good, for the Society of Friends are not Anti-Slavery but Pro-Slavery. To such I would say, is it an evidence that your society is in favor of war, because you have not formed a Friends' Peace Society?'

"Here he tacitly admits, that if the Society were Pro-Slavery, his reasoning would not be good. That is, his reasoning would not show that in that case it would divide and scatter, to allow members to form Anti-Slavery associations. But if they were so perfect as to be completely Anti-Slavery, why then it would divide and scatter, in feeling and action, to allow them to do so. But the object of these expressions, no doubt, was to insinuate that their not having formed Anti-Slavery associations of their own, was of the character of evidence which we are in the habit of adducing to prove their unsoundness, and was intended, no doubt, to divert the mind of the reader from the real cause of the separation. We

have never instanced that as a proof that they were Pro-Slavery. And I doubt whether ever an individual of us has done it. But the opposition of his party to such select Anti-Slavery associations was referred to, to prove that their objections to joining Anti-Slavery societies was not based upon a fear of mixing with other people, as they pretended.

“Again, page 10, he says: ‘Unless the character of that paper (the Advocate) is changed, and made what it professes to be, an Anti-Slavery paper instead of an ANTI-QUAKER one, vain will be your attempts to give the subject an impartial examination, while you believe its version of affairs. It is true that sometimes there are Anti-Slavery pieces in it, BUT THEY ARE FEW AND FAR BETWEEN.’ I should like extremely well to know what he calls anti-Quaker. That paper has exhibited facts, and I believe nothing but facts, in regard to the opposition of Indiana Yearly Meeting to modern Abolition, and the corrupt conduct and practice of some of its leading members. And the editor has repeatedly, of late, offered the use of the columns of his paper to those who may think themselves or others misrepresented, to make such corrections as they might think proper. Or, if they would furnish satisfactory evidence that any statement in the ‘Advocate’ was incorrect, he would take a pleasure in correcting it. And our author has been a reader of the paper, and a familiar one, too, if we are to suppose he knew what he was saying when he described its character. Why, then, has it so happened that neither he nor any other person among them, has ever attempted to correct ‘its version of affairs,’ knowing that they had the opportunity? I think there can be but one valid reason given, and that is, they knew that nothing but facts were stated, notwithstanding his insinuation to the contrary.

“It would appear then, that Quakerism, in his view, means, that which the editor has exposed in the conduct of leading members of Indiana Yearly Meeting, which they do not attempt to contradict. Such, for instance,

as that of Thomas Arnett uttering a falsehood, which was proved upon him by some four or five witnesses, and he was acquitted by the adherents of the 'body,' and that of another prominent member who declared, in a Preparative meeting, that Abolitionists were guilty of conveying away fugitive slaves to a land of freedom, which was, in fact, stealing and secreting other men's property. Such sentiments and doings as these are opposed in Quakers as well as in others, by the paper, and if this opposition makes it ANTI-QUAKER, what, I would ask, could possibly make it a Quaker paper but taking the opposite side, and advocating what it now exposes and condemns? If this is Quakerism, it seems to me the less there is in the world the better. But I challenge him or any of his party to prove out the first article written by the editor of any Anti-Slavery Friend in that paper which controverts one single principle or testimony professed by the Society of Friends.

“Will he say that exposing the corruptions of the Society is what he is alluding to as constituting the character he is pleased to affix to the paper? Then I would reply, that his own favorite one, the 'Cincinnati Herald,' is an Anti-Republican paper, because it exposes the corruptions of this professed Republican Government. And it is also in the same way an anti-Quaker paper. Some of the severest articles ever published against the position taken by Friends, have been published in that paper, and I believe, were written by the editor himself. His remarks concerning the last address of Indiana Yearly Meeting, show that he esteems those constituting that body, just about such Abolitionists as the Whig Party. It is true he has of late devoted his paper more to the political bearings of the question than he did formerly, and, therefore, does not now say so much about the opposition of any religious society as he did.

“It may be proper here to state that we were driven to the necessity of seceding in order to enjoy liberty of conscience, the Yearly Meeting prohibiting us from supporting the present Anti-Slavery enterprise as we be-

believed it our duty to do. Those acquainted with the origin and process of those difficulties know perfectly well that the onset was first made upon us, that we were represented as working in our own will and strength, running before our guide, etc. Now, as the cause of the slave was near to our hearts, some of us felt it right to endeavor to refute those charges, and set the matter right, but for so doing we were censured and charged as disturbers of Society, I mean by individuals. Advices became more and more positive, and thus we were driven to the necessity of endeavoring to show the impropriety of such Advices. Then came the charge of insubordination—an intention to scatter and divide Society. It was still deemed a duty by some to stand up in defense of what they believed to be right, against such encroachments, and to some extent exhibited by argument the cause of such proceedings, but nothing could change the determination of some of our opposers to prostrate the cause we had espoused and its advocates in Society. When by the measures taken against us, we were driven to the necessity of seceding, it became an imperative duty to set forth the grounds of such an important step. This required the development of many facts and circumstances before unknown to many. For this statement we have been again and again falsely accused, and we have as often defended ourselves against their aspersions. Thus, from the commencement we have stood upon the defensive, and upon that ground alone as a society. And is there to be no end to their calumnies and abuses?

“Individuals, it is true, have, since the Yearly Meeting, become, both by connivance and otherwise, the defenders of corrupt principles and practices touching the subject of Slavery, exposed to some extent its position and the conduct of prominent members, for the purpose of condemning and correcting such errors, and I believe very properly too.

“While ever a religious society does not in any way defend that which is wrong or sinful, it is the duty of its members not to expose the evil conduct of one individual

out of Society. But whenever it undertakes to support such individual in his course, then it becomes a duty for those who are in the right, to expose and condemn both his conduct and that of the body that sustains him in it.

“But to return to the quotation: he says it is true, that sometimes there are Anti-Slavery pieces in it (the Adv.), but they are few and far between.

“What, let me ask, would a stranger to the paper infer from what is here presented?

“Would he suppose that there was one column in a number, that was not what our writer terms ‘anti-Quaker matter?’ But the fact is, out of some thirteen or fourteen which I have examined, taking in a number of those which contain the longest articles, there is not more than one-tenth part of the reading that has any allusion to the Society of Friends, or its opposition to modern Abolition.

“And I do suppose that if all the articles were summed up, that have been published in that Journal since the Separation, in regard to the opposition of Friends to the cause, there would not be more than one-twentieth part of its contents that touches the subject at all. And if we should admit that such articles are not Anti-Slavery (which we do not, but believe their publication as necessary to the advancement of the cause as that of any others), there is scarcely one beside, to be found in it, or but very few, but what combat the evil of Slavery in some way or other. Even the articles taken from the Anti-Slavery paper he pretends to approve, which it contains, no person, it seems to me, of veracity, acquainted with it, will say are few and far between. So it is impossible to characterise his statement truly without pronouncing it false. And if he is acquainted with the paper, as it would seem from his remarks, it must be willfully so. If he is not, it is about the same thing in substance, for supposing that to be the case, he has given his readers to understand he knew what he at the same time knew he did not know.

“The only extenuating circumstance that I can think

of, if it will be considered as such at all, is, that in all probability it was made under the influence of a paroxysm of anger. His 'party feelings,' it would seem, must have so completely swallowed him up, that a sober, candid thought was not allowed to produce its legitimate effects upon his mind. Is it not passing strange that any person should come out, under the pretense of entering into a candid and impartial examination—an expostulation with us, the seceders, expressing great desire that we may get from under the influence of party feeling, and at the same time exhibit such an intense party feeling in himself, as to manifest such a complete departure from all truth as our author has done in the case before us?

“He remarks, ‘How much better it would be, if those who profess to be opposed to Slavery were to bring their testimony to bear on the system of Slavery itself, rather than waste their strength and influence, by publishing criminations against others.’

“It would have been well if he and his party had thought of this sooner, for this is the very course they have pursued toward us, and the Abolitionists in general. Even in the last Address of their Yearly Meeting, to Christian professors, the Abolitionists are slanderously charged in a covert manner, by insinuation, with resorting to measures of confusion and violence.

“These criminations are what we, as well as the editor of the Advocate, have endeavored to ‘push away,’ and not any Anti-Slavery acts of theirs, because they ‘do not come up and join our ranks.’ Now, if he and the leaders in his party are the true friends of the slave, as he pretends [and happy should I be if circumstances did not render it impossible for me to believe it], would we not find them doing that which he represents to be so excellent in the editor of the Cincinnati Herald, that is, ‘laboring to bring all the Anti-Slavery feeling to bear upon the system of Slavery, and to expose its evils both on the master and the slave, and its encroachments on the free States?’ Can we believe that they regard such as a good work, when making Slavery a political question has

been so frequently objected to by leaders among them, as utterly wrong in the Abolitionists? If it is a good work they should certainly be at it. Will they do it, and cease publishing criminations against those who are at it? And will they, with the Herald, support and advocate the Liberty Party movement, and vote for Abolitionists instead of slaveholders and Pro-Slavery men, as they have heretofore done? We shall see.

“In order to prove that we ourselves are proscriptive, he professes to give a history of a certain temperance meeting. Now, this meeting was held not half a mile from the writer’s residence, and the fact is, there was one member of his own Yearly Meeting, and but one of ours, instead of two or three, as he states, and that one did not advocate the resolution alluded to, as he represents, nor was he in favor of its adoption, while the member of his own Yearly Meeting did advocate it. Thus, according to his own theory, the true history of this meeting proves the proscriptive character of Indiana Yearly Meeting. All it seems that he could found his statement upon was, that this one Anti-Slavery Friend voted against this resolution being laid on the table. Thus it appears, first, that but one Anti-Slavery Friend was present; secondly, that the resolution presented was offered *merely* for discussion; thirdly, the Friend only voted against laying it on the table, and lastly, that a member of his own Yearly Meeting voted in the same way and in addition actually advocated the resolution.

“Now, even if his history of the temperance meeting was correct, and it would prove us proscriptive, then we should have no difficulty to prove that Indiana Yearly Meeting is Pro-Slavery; for one of the overseers now active in taking up Anti-Slavery Friends has been heard to say, she would be afraid of her life if the slaves were set free. And at another time, that she would be afraid to go to a neighbor’s house if they were set free. And again, another overseer, although he owned he would have no objection to helping a free colored person to Canada, or anywhere else, yet he would not help a slave

on his way to a land of freedom. Another Friend, who has been somewhat active in assisting to disown the seceders, has been heard to say he would as soon harbor a horse-thief as a runaway negro; and yet another, who has in the same way been active, has stated that Slavery could not be wrong, for if it was, the first ship, that ever sailed after slaves, would have been sunk to the bottom of the ocean by Providential interference; and all these in our author's own Monthly meeting. Many such circumstances might be brought to view, but according to his logic I have instanced individual cases enough to establish the Pro-Slavery character of his Yearly Meeting. But we do not pretend to charge that body with everything that any of its individual members have been guilty of, only so far as it supports them in it, or connives at their conduct, as he would most unfairly and ungenerously have done in the instance before us, even if his statement were correct. And it is worthy of remark, that in nearly or quite every instance he has represented *us* as saying just what any individual may have chanced to say. Now, it must be a familiar circumstance to all acquainted with the course pursued by our opposers, that if they can discover anything in any of our writings, which they can construe to mean a charge upon the Yearly Meeting (although it was not so intended), which was only an individual act, they represent it as very unfair indeed. Why then do some of them turn round and actually do the very same thing they have been trying to detect in us? And here let me say, that notwithstanding the extraordinary demonstrations of unsoundness in regard to our testimony against Slavery, in a number of the leading members of Indiana Yearly Meeting, I have no doubt but there is a large amount of good Anti-Slavery feeling in that body. Many persons remain in that connection to whom I feel a strong attachment, being well assured that it is the conduct of but a few, comparatively speaking, that keeps them from acting out their Anti-Slavery principles, and therefore I could not conscientiously charge them with what their leaders have done,

only so far as they continue to countenance them by submission to their dictation, whereby they support them in their corrupt course and practice.

“But let us proceed with his remarks. He says, ‘you say in your public papers that at the close of the meeting on First-day, at the Yearly Meeting, in 1842, you saw greater honor shown to Henry Clay than you had ever seen Friends show to any man however good or great—such eagerness to shake his blood-stained hand, etc.’ You then go on to say, ‘it may however be pleaded as an extenuation of the great honors bestowed upon him by their eagerness to shake his blood-stained hands, their strong desire to evince to his mind their determined opposition to Abolitionists.’

“In the first place, I would say in regard to this, why does he insinuate that we, as a Society, have a public organ, and that through such an organ we published this to the world! I am confident he knew it was not so. The object undoubtedly was to create the impression that, as a Society, we had made the Advocate our special organ, and were accountable for everything published in it. But leaving this, why should he, professing so much impartiality, garble the language of the editors. Instead of what he represented, the remark is this: ‘the Friends, of both sexes gathered around Clay, *apparently* eager to shake his blood-stained hands.’ By a comparison of his pretended quotations with what *is* said in the paper (See Advocate, Vol. II, No. 31), it will be found that the whole is unfairly set forth. The editors say, ‘though we believe such special honors, *such marked attentions* were never before PUBLICLY paid by Friends to any man, however good or great, as were on this occasion paid to this prince of slaveholders;’ but our author, it would seem, carefully excludes the word *publicly*, which all must see is of much importance in conveying their meaning. And beside this, those remarks were preceded by a notice of the fact that some Friends, no doubt of the leaders, waited on Clay to inform him that the Society had no hand in, and disapproved of, the presentation of the peti-

tion asking him to liberate his slaves. I ask if this did not furnish just grounds for the editors to suppose they might wish to evince to his mind their determined opposition to those who did present the petition—the Abolitionists? And why did not our author notice and explain this affair so as to show it was not a manifest demonstration of opposition to Abolitionists, before denying that his party had any such intention of manifesting it to Clay's mind by their marked attention to him?

“ Again, he says, ‘ now, why all this, but to endeavor to show that Friends shook hands with him *because* he was a slaveholder, and for what, I would ask, did you shake hands with him? I confidently believe, that in proportion to the relative numbers in attendance at that place, there were more that shook hands with him who were members of Anti-Slavery societies, than those who were not—I allude to Friends only. Of those in one large Preparative meeting, so far as I know or believe, they were all enrolled members of Anti-Slavery societies, which has led me to believe, it was in a good degree so in other places also.’

“ I suppose the object of the editors was to show what kind of a faithful testimony those Friends were bearing against Slavery, while thus opposing the Abolitionists, and rendering such signal honor to this prince of slaveholders. But as he applies his remarks to us, I would say, so far as we have alluded to this transaction, our Declaration shows plainly what was our object in alluding to it, viz: to compare this conduct of Friends toward a popular man, though a slaveholder, with their treatment of an eminent ‘ modern’ Abolitionist, for the purpose of exhibiting their departure from genuine principles in regard to our testimony against Slavery. There was no intention of saying they did it merely *because* he was a slaveholder. We had no doubt but with their disposition, as manifested by their conduct, if slave-holding had been as unpopular as Abolitionism, and Abolitionism as popular as slave-holding, their conduct would have been reversed. And we have the strongest ground for believ-

ing so from their own words, for they give it as a reason why they should not be identified with the Abolitionists, that they may thereby retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land. It was to gain the good opinions of Henry Clay, who, they supposed, would be one of the rulers of the land (for that was what he was seeking to be made), and being a noted Whig, they were willing to help forward the work, which induced them thus to act. But if it should so happen that the sentiment of the people should become so changed, as to elect Abolitionists, why then, according to their doctrine, they would treat them with the same respect under similar circumstances, in order to retain a place and influence with them, the rulers of the land.

“But it would seem from his statement, that there was quite a number of Anti-Slavery Friends who gathered around Henry Clay, to shake hands with him, even *more in proportion*, than of other Friends. ‘ALL,’ it is said, in one large Preparative meeting who did so, were enrolled members of Anti-Slavery societies. Now, ‘why all this, but to endeavor’ to deceive. We know very well what Preparative meeting he alludes to, and the fact is, there were but two Anti-Slavery Friends from it that did so; and but three that were enrolled members of Anti-Slavery societies, and one of these is now a member with himself. One of these told me that being near the scene of action, he was himself introduced to the slaveholder by the Clerk of Indiana Yearly Meeting (though ‘not as Clerk,’ it should be remembered), and that he did not then know, and has not since learned, that any but one other Abolitionist, than those referred to, did shake hands with him on that occasion, making four enrolled members in the whole Yearly Meeting, and but three Anti-Slavery Friends, among the hundreds that did. But in this, according to his wonted course, he has endeavored to divert the reader from the point. It was the ‘*special honors, the marked attentions*, paid to this prince of slaveholders,’ by their apparent eagerness to shake his blood-stained hand, that were objected to, and

not an ordinary shaking of hands, with which he endeavors to identify this man-worshiping transaction. It was their gathering round him in almost an impenetrable crowd in their eagerness to salute him. One or more of the women mounted over the backs of the benches, in a fruitless attempt to get at him. Some of the old Friends in the yard with their hats in hand, to save them from abuse, were seen pushing through the crowd to get near the 'distinguished man.' No Anti-Slavery Friend, I suppose, would object to shaking hands with the greatest rogue in the world, provided it was not done in a way which would countenance him in his wickedness.

"At the bottom of page 11, he asks: 'What can possibly be gained, either to you as Christians, or the Anti-Slavery cause, by continuing in such a course?'

"I think the reader, by this time, will see that we have not been in such a course at all as he represents; neither have we been building one another up, as he asserts, with such false insinuations as he has been endeavoring to point out, but has utterly failed in the attempt. Our course has been to repel the slanderous charges our opposers have preferred against us, and the Abolitionists in general, by the exhibition of Truth, and I believe, nothing but the truth. And we expect to continue to gain the reward of an approving conscience, if we also continue in well-doing as Christians, and then the gain to the Anti-Slavery cause by our course, will be, in one point of view, according to our humble abilities, a defense thereof, and its advocates against, not only the assaults of open enemies, but the foul aspersions of pseudo-Abolitionists.

"Again, he observes: 'If the testimony of Friends against Slavery, has in times past had any influence in the world, are not such things calculated to do it away?' Is not telling the slaveholder and others who connive at that system of injustice and oppression, that the Society of Friends are throwing their influence against the cause of emancipation, strengthening their hands?'

"In addition to my former remarks, in regard to simi-

lar sentiments, in another part of the document, I would say; I believe the testimony of Friends in times past has had a powerful influence; and it is a source of consolation to believe, as I confidently do, that all the efforts of their professed successors at the present time, in opposing and villifying Abolitionists, will not be able to do away the effect of that testimony. It is for endeavoring to maintain it inviolate, according to the dictates of our consciences, that we have suffered untold contumely and reproach by these false brethren. Their own acts, and not ours, in exposing and condemning them, have done away the influence of their testimony. I recently witnessed an occurrence, giving positive proof of it, and a number of others will testify to the same. In a collection of Whigs, when one of their chief speakers had declared himself opposed to immediate emancipation, and avowed that this was the Whig doctrine, an Abolitionist (a member of the body), turning to a Friend, reminded him, that that could not be the true doctrine of the Whig party, for the members of the Society of Friends were generally Whigs, and believed in immediate and unconditional emancipation. But he was stopped by this Whig, a man who had been in the Legislature of the State, and told that such were not the principles of the Society of Friends. He was willing to admit, they had held such formerly, but they did not now, and gathered up one of their recent documents to prove the point, and one or more of the Anti-Abolitionists of the 'body,' present publicly united in sentiment with him. This conclusion, it should be remembered, was arrived at without the aid of any of the Abolitionists, and one even opposed coming to such a conclusion. The people have the documents of Friends themselves, and they know what they say. It is from this source, and the general carriage of Friends toward modern or immediate Abolition, that the opposers of the cause get their information, and not from us, for they do not so generally read our papers.

“It would require a considerable extension of this reply to notice all the errors, contradictions and false insin-

nations contained in the pamphlet under consideration. It seems to me there are but few sentences in it but what contain something of the kind. As a specimen of what I have passed over, I will instance his very first sentence, in which he supposes that Friends constitute the only religious society in America, that denies church membership to slaveholders, and virtually charges us with saying, it is 'not opposed to Slavery.'

"Little as I know about the matter, I could name some half dozen religious societies in America which deny church membership to slaveholders; but we cannot, with him, suppose their doing so is any certain evidence they are right on the subject. We, however, never stated that Indiana Yearly Meeting was not in any degree opposed to Slavery, as is here insinuated. A person who advocates gradual emancipation, shows that he is to some extent opposed to Slavery; yet who cannot see that he is not completely Anti-Slavery, but is in favor of continuing the system for a time, and therefore so far Pro-Slavery. As our author is doubtless acquainted with our concessions at different times, in regard to this matter, and our statement of their position relative to the subject of Slavery, which I have already noticed, giving a different view from what he has presented, I cannot but regard this effort and others not brought to view, as a willful and deliberate attempt to deceive.

"In conclusion, I would present the reader with a synopsis of this most extraordinary document. The author notices a few of the circumstances or proceedings of the Yearly Meeting, to which we referred, for the purpose of comparing them with other proceedings of the meeting, in order to prove a departure from genuine Anti-Slavery principle, and then declares that we gave them as our reasons for seceding. But our arguments, derived from these comparisons, he never once notices at all; thus proving conclusively, at least one of two things, either that he is devoid of common understanding, or else careful to avoid that impartial examination he professes to desire should take place. He represents us as having

seceded for the sake of appointments, because we made known our grievances; but he never deigns to notice the fact so clearly exhibited, that we did it mainly to show that liberty of conscience was denied us. He has endeavored to palm it upon the mind of his reader, that their declaring and recording those members of the Meeting for Sufferings, was just as an ordinary circumstance of merely not appointing persons at certain times, when judged not to be the appropriate ones for the service proposed. He represents us in various instances, as saying or doing, or taking a position that we never did at all, and then brings forward his arguments to subvert it; thus, it would seem, erecting a man of straw, for the purpose of showing his dexterity in demolishing his own fabrications. In almost every instance, he has endeavored with the most underhanded maneuvering to divert the reader from the point at issue—to shift off on to a different ground from that of the true one. He has even descended into that which one would suppose a wise man would blush to find himself engaged in, such being so perfectly foolish, contemptible, and insignificant, giving evidence that he could not, or would not understand the plainest common-sense documents. And I confess, when I look at the positions which I have had to examine, and the statements to which I have had to reply, it appears like very small business indeed, but as they were of such a character as to cast much odium if believed, upon the cause of truth, I can conceive of no better way than to meet him upon his own positions and statements, foolish and absurd as they are.

“That an impartial examination of the conduct, sentiments, arguments, and positions exhibited on both sides may take place, is my sincere desire; and that it was not the intention of the writer of the ‘expostulation,’ to elicit such examination, but to divert the reader from it, I trust I have abundantly demonstrated.

“I should indeed feel greatly rejoiced to meet with an evidence from him or his party, that they were disposed to listen to the convictions of conscience. And let me

say, Friends, suppress it as you may (which I have the strongest evidence a number of you have done in regard to this matter), the time will come when you can no longer stifle its voice. It will speak, and speak terror to the guilty soul, to those who have stubbornly disregarded its injunctions.

“Happy, thrice happy, will those be at that awful day, who are prepared ‘to meet their naked hearts alone.’

“WALTER EDGERTON.”

“SPICELAND, *Fifth month, 1844.*”

CHAPTER XXIV.

Address to the Meeting for Sufferings of London.

IN the forepart of the year 1844, the Meeting for Sufferings thought right to issue the Address which I give below. It is one of much importance as unfolding the true position of the parties involved.

“From the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, to the Meeting for Sufferings of Friends in London.

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“Notwithstanding, on the return of our friend, Arnold Buffum, from London, who carried over our former Epistle, we learned that it was not accepted by you, we feel that it is right again, in brotherly love, to address you.

“We know of no reason why we should not regard each other as brethren, united by one common bond of Christian fellowship, entertaining like views of Christian duty, and practically carrying out our views by like measures.

“The religion of our faith teaches us that we are to

know men by their fruits—that as a good tree bringeth forth good fruits, so a good man will manifest the character of his faith by his works.

“Taking this for a criterion of judgment, we regard you as one in faith with ourselves, and we feel that a loss will be sustained to the cause of humanity, should two bodies thus circumstanced permit any minor consideration to estrange them from each other. It is true, we have assumed a term of designation which you do not use; in our case, there was a necessity for it for the purpose of distinction; with you, happily, no such necessity exists.

“There is no body of people in your land, bearing the title of Friends, who do not actively co-operate with others in promoting those measures which are needful for procuring the restoration of their rights to the enslaved millions of our fellow-men; with us it is otherwise. The body with which we were formerly associated under the common appellation of Friends, left us no alternative but to cease from our labors in support of Anti-Slavery societies (whether acting in connection with other people or by ourselves alone), or submit to a system of proscription and disfranchisement approximating at every step to that of complete disownment therefrom (which, from the measures put in train, was most undoubtedly the determination ultimately to accomplish without a withdrawal of our support from those societies), the former we could not do and be guiltless, the latter would greatly defeat the object of our labors—deprive us of those privileges which we hold most dear, and of the power of giving that aid to the cause which justice and duty demanded at our hands.

“We are aware that those from whom we have separated, profess to bear a faithful testimony against Slavery; but if they really do so, why did they adopt those proscriptive measures which forced upon us the alternative of silence or separation? Did they allege that we were guilty of any violation of good order, except our disre-

gard of their injunctions to refrain from giving our support to the present Anti-Slavery movement?

“When a call came from your land over the signature of one of your most beloved ministers, who has since been called from his devoted labors to the enjoyment of his reward, summoning the friends of the enslaved to meet in a general Convention in London, in the Sixth month last, to promote measures for procuring their deliverance from oppression, did our opposers, by responding to that call, give evidence of their sympathy with the oppressed?

“Have they read in any of their meetings, or circulated even in their families, the Address to Christian professors, unanimously adopted by that Convention? Do they contribute to the support of any periodical which is devoted to the advocacy of the immediate and unconditional emancipation of the enslaved?

“Are they engaged in any systematical course of measures calculated to arouse the nation to the enormity of the crime of enslaving one-sixth part of the children born in our land?

“Do they not, on the contrary, manifest far greater hostility to every effort for promoting the cause of universal emancipation, than the abominations and wickedness of Slavery?

“Do they not, more than any other religious denomination in our country, close their doors and their own ears against those who are pleading the cause of the oppressed, so that if all others were to follow their example in these respects, those who are thus engaged would obtain no houses to speak in and nobody to hear them?

“Do they not, by their persevering hostility to the abolition enterprise, give the weight of their influence to the perpetuation of Slavery?

“Has not one Yearly Meeting on this Continent, recently promulgated its condemnation of the act of giving shelter, in any way whatever, to a fellow-creature escaping from his cruel oppressor?

“A faithful answer to these inquiries would exhibit the practical testimony of their Society as bearing against Abolition rather than against Slavery.

“On referring to the list of names constituting the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, we find that a considerable majority of them are among the most highly esteemed members of the Society of Friends in England. In the Address issued by that Committee, shortly after the formation of the Society, we find a Resolution unanimously adopted by the society, in these words: ‘That it be recommended to the Anti-Slavery Friends, throughout the world, to form Auxiliary societies upon the principles of, and in connection with, this society.’ In the same Address they say, ‘The committee would have felt delighted to have referred particularly to the gigantic efforts made by the Abolitionists of the United States of America, to purge their institutions from the stain, and their people from the guilt, of Slavery * * but their limits forbid.’

“Again, in the third annual Report, we find the following language of encouragement to faithfulness in the cause held out to us by a society measurably controlled by the most prominent members of your Yearly Meeting: ‘*Resolved unanimously*, That this meeting regards with deep interest the enlightened efforts and noble sacrifices of the Abolitionists of the United States of America in the sacred cause of human freedom; and, while it sympathizes with them in their struggles, heartily rejoices in the more extensive prevalence, and in the certain and not far distant triumph, of their principles; and publicly renews the offer of its warm and steady co-operation.’

“By the same Report we learn, that ‘the standing committee of the Society of Friends, from funds at its disposal,’ presented to the Anti-Slavery society the sum of £800, giving a practical demonstration of the effectual concurrence of English Friends with the Anti-Slavery cause.

“What Yearly Meeting in America has given any evidence of this kind, of the reality of its testimony against Slavery?

“ We believe that in addition to our duty as members of religious society, we have high responsibilities devolved upon us as men, as citizens of the State, and as members of the human family; and we sincerely pray that we may be preserved from that spirit of selfishness which would as effectually shut us from the exercise of Christian philanthropy, as would a seclusion from the world within the walls of a monastery. We remember that our divine Master prayed his Father, not that he should take his disciples out of the world, but that he should keep them from the evil.

“ So long as intemperance, oppression, and war abound in the world, we believe there is something for us to do, beside merely sending out an annual expression of our testimony against those great abominations.

“ We believe that those terrible evils are to be done away by the dissemination of light among the nations, impressing upon the understanding and the conscience of the people a deep and abiding conviction of the great immorality of those popular customs, which sink the mass of mankind into a condition of wretchedness and woe, and tend powerfully to perpetuate among them moral degradation and crime. We know of no instrumentality by which this important work is likely to be accomplished, but by the organization of associations expressly for this purpose; and we feel it to be consistent with our own peace of mind, and with the best interests of Society, that we should, like you, co-operate with Christian philanthropists of all denominations who, by their willingness to devote themselves to so good a work, give the best evidence that they are influenced by the spirit of Divine love.

“ We have been encouraged to go forward in this way, in our endeavors to promote the abolition of Slavery and to establish the true doctrine of human rights, not only by your example and recommendations, as already cited from the Anti-Slavery reports, but more especially, by the triumphant issue of your labors in the cause of bleeding humanity, as evinced in the abolition of Slavery in

the British West India colonies, and by the repeated Advices issued from your own body and from the Yearly Meeting of Friends in London, urging Friends in America to greater faithfulness in advocating the cause of the down-trodden and oppressed.

“ In the 23d number of the Herald of Peace, published in London, we find a statement exhibiting the very important fact that, by the timely interposition of the Peace Society of New York a war between the United States and Mexico was most happily averted. Had no such society existed, it appears highly probable that instead of peace being preserved, the American Continent might ere now have been watered with the blood of men slain in the field of battle. Shall we rejoice at the good results of the philanthropic labors of other men, and refuse ourselves to participate with them in their labors? This instance, to our mind, furnishes a striking illustration of the blessing of Divine goodness attendant on the Christian efforts of associated action in promoting the peace and happiness of mankind. Although we cannot but feel conscious, as we before observed, of the existence of a similarity of religious principles and views of Christian duty between us, yet having once tendered to you the right hand of fellowship, we should, perhaps, have been contented not to have repeated it, had it not been for a deep and abiding conviction resting upon our minds, that the enlargement of our brethren and sisters in suffering and bonds is deeply involved in the matter. While the relation, which now exists, continues between us, the opposers of the Anti-Slavery cause will refer to it as positive evidence that our Anti-Slavery course, and consequently that of the Abolitionists of the nation, is wrong, and, therefore, should not be countenanced in the least degree whatever, for our opposers have openly, in a recent anonymous publication, declared in the most unequivocal terms their hostility to modern Abolition societies. Again, it is, and will continue to be referred to, to prove the oft repeated and senseless assertion, that Abolition in this country is entirely a different thing from

what it is in your land, and thus the whole weight of your influence is and will be made to bear against the whole Anti-Slavery movement in our country. Under this view, which is most certainly a correct one, the subject assumes an aspect of the utmost importance. And here permit us to quote to you the language of your Yearly Meeting, to Friends of Indiana, in 1836. 'It is with lively feelings of interest in the welfare and prosperity of your country, that we venture to suggest to your consideration whether there are not indications of an approaching crisis in this momentous question, in which it will *mainly depend, under Divine Providence, on the faithful conduct of those who act on Christian principles, whether Slavery shall be abolished in your land by peaceful legislation or by confusion and violence.*'

"This sentiment has been effectually sealed upon our minds; and hence it is that we deem it of the first importance, that those who act on Christian principle, should be faithful, consistent, and uncompromising in their course, otherwise will they not inevitably condemn themselves in the things which they allow?

"In humble reliance upon the God of the oppressed, we have come out from among those who sought to abridge our rights, to plead the cause of the suffering and the dumb, and we have taken our stand on the same ground, so long and so successfully occupied by you, and we now, once more come to you, tendering the hand of Christian fellowship in your labors of love, in which we shall rejoice, in our humble sphere, to co-operate with you for promoting the removal of the abuses which brutalize and degrade men, and fill the world with wretchedness and crime, asking of you a brotherly return.

"Should you deem this proposal of a friendly correspondence worthy of acceptance, we ask the favor of having this communication read also in your Yearly Meeting, with a request of that meeting to forward to us a few lines, opening the way to a permanent correspondence.

"And now may the God of all grace guide and direct

both you and us in all our labors for the advancement of the cause of the Redeemer's kingdom among men, and to Him be all the glory, now and forever, Amen.

“Signed in and by direction of the meeting aforesaid, held by adjournments on the 22d and 23d of Second month, 1844. “BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.*”

CHAPTER XXV.

Address to the Members of the Society of Friends individually constituting London Yearly Meeting—Postscript touching the Treatment of Dublin Yearly Meeting.

Two Epistles, one from London and the other from Dublin, were sent this year to the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting and put in circulation, containing serious reflections upon the Society of Anti-Slavery Friends. In consequence of this, when the annual meeting of that Society was held, it addressed the following to Friends individually of London Yearly Meeting, and appended a postscript thereto, touching the treatment of Dublin Yearly Meeting. It was induced to pursue this course, because those meetings had refused to accept any communication from it, and there appeared to be no other way to be heard.

“ ADDRESS

“*To the Members of the Society of Friends individually, constituting London Yearly Meeting.*

“DEAR FRIENDS:—

“We have at this time received a copy of a Minute of London Yearly Meeting, which, it seems, was intended

for our last Yearly Meeting, but which did not come to hand till it had passed; showing that our Address to that body was not read or accepted by it. And as this seems to be the only opportunity now left us, whereby we can unburden our minds to you, we have thought proper thus publicly to address you. In the first place, we would observe that it is with feelings of much regret that we feel constrained at the present time, to notice a document recently put in circulation by the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, purporting to be an Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings of London Yearly Meeting, evidently containing reflections of a serious character against us.

“The first sentiment to which we would refer, is the following: ‘While the irregularity of the proceedings of those who have separated themselves, is thus altogether discountenanced by Friends in this country, we feel bound to observe that the designation of ‘A. S. Friends,’ assumed by them, implies a surrender on your part, of the testimony of the Society against Slavery; which we are fully convinced is unwarranted.’ The question here occurs, what is meant by the term, ‘irregularity of proceeding?’ We are informed by the Minute of London Yearly Meeting that that Yearly Meeting was of the judgment that it would be a departure from good order to accept the communication of our Yearly Meeting, sent to that body last year. It is evident, therefore, that their being ‘fully convinced,’ as they observed in regard to the premises, proceeded from testimony all on one side, as that from our Yearly Meeting could not be heard. Does our law, as Friends and as Christians, condemn a man unheard, and without even listening to the evidences he may offer in his favor? If not, by what rule are hundreds of persons condemned at once in the same way? Is it any less wrong, because many are affected by it? They tell Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting, that they are especially desirous that the manifestation of an open and brotherly feeling toward us, should be cherished by them. The very anomalous position which our Friends

of that Yearly Meeting have taken, in various respects, warrants us in remarking, that example speaks much louder than precept. While they recommend this course to Friends of the old Yearly Meeting of Indiana, they, themselves, are so far from an open and brotherly feeling toward us, that they will not even hear us in our own defense. Is this brotherly? Is it kind? We do not forget the reasons assigned, that it would be a departure from good order to read or accept a communication from us; but we have yet to learn what right order would thereby be violated. Would they not read and accept a respectful address from almost any body of professed Christians in the world, who make no claim of being Friends? And if they are disposed, as the American Yearly Meetings have been, they would read one from the Indians with much pleasure; even from such as make no pretensions to Christianity at all. Receiving and reading our Address need not necessarily imply an acknowledgment of the correctness of our course. They could, after an examination of the evidences, if they had thereby found to their satisfaction that we were wrong, have recorded their judgment and the reasons whereon it was founded. That would have been right. If they really feel concerned for our welfare, why should they not speak *to us* in 'an open and brotherly manner,' as they recommend to our opposers, and show us, as brethren ought to do, wherein we are wrong? If it is contrary to good order to read our communications, or to speak to us, we cannot see how it is in accordance with good order to speak about us, and *against us*, without first, at least, hearing our defense.

“And to shift the subject a little; can any person suppose, that if a majority of Friends in America, or even a majority of the leading influences alone, of Indiana Yearly Meeting, had adopted our course, and the minority had seceded and left us on that account, that they would not have acknowledged our course to be right? It cannot be. We are confirmed in this view, from various circumstances, and first, our course, in regard to this

question, is that which they have pursued in their country. Secondly, they have individually, in the capacity of members of the Executive Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and in various other ways, given their countenance and support to the Anti-Slavery movement in this country, set on foot in the very manner, for activity in which we were driven to the necessity of seceding, which, we suppose, is the irregularity to which they refer. Hence it is plain that they would have been heartily glad if Friends generally in this country had been actively engaged with those they have, as members of the Executive Committee, so highly eulogized, and to which their Yearly Meeting exhorted in plain and unequivocal terms, in the General Epistle of 1830.

“What, then, is the principle by which they are governed? It is nothing short of this; the majority should rule. It is scarcely necessary to remark, as all must readily see, that this is in direct opposition to one of the fundamental principles of the Society.

“And to what point, dear friends, will such principles and measures lead us? If the existing organization of Society, and the preservation of the common order of setting up a Yearly Meeting, be considered of more importance than righteousness and purity, are we not fallen back into papal heresy? And if this doctrine had been adhered to, by George Fox and all the early reformers, could there have been such a body in the world as the Society of Friends at the present time? Hence it is, that we are constrained to declare, that justice and right did, and still does demand an impartial examination into the facts relative to the controversy, totally independent of numbers or originality of organization, and a decision according to the evidence from both sides, before declaring that they were fully convinced that we were in the wrong, as is the evident import of their expressions. If, however, they had been so kind as to have manifested an open and brotherly feeling toward us, sufficient to have accepted our testimony or evidence in our own

defense, they would have seen that the designation, Anti-Slavery, did not attach itself to those we have left, according to their own showing.

“They declared it to be of hurtful tendency, to members of Society, to open meeting-houses for the purpose of holding Anti-Slavery meetings. It was not against opening them to a particular, designated kind, whose practice was shown to be wrong, but against opening them to Anti-Slavery meetings, in the broadest sense of the term. They also, in another Minute of Advice, where they caution Friends not to join in the over-active zeal of A. S. societies, virtually and in effect, charged all Anti-Slavery societies with being over-actively zealous. In a Minute of Advice issued by the Select Yearly Meeting in 1842, to the Select Quarters, they made the following declaration: ‘The meeting, in an especial manner, was exercised in regard to some of the members of this body joining *Anti-Slavery* societies in opposition to the repeated advice of this Yearly Meeting.’

“From what has been said, it is clear that they opposed Anti-Slavery in its broadest and most unqualified sense, and not any particular kind of Anti-Slavery action, and, consequently, that they opposed and proscribed us for being Anti-Slavery. And to us it is clear, that, although we adopted the designation alluded to, the circumstances under which we were placed, and the language and treatment of our opposing friends, naturally imposed it upon us. And if it implies an entire surrender on their part, of their testimony against Slavery, as is clearly signified by the document under consideration, our opposers themselves are accountable for it, inasmuch as they publicly surrendered all affinity of feeling for all Anti-Slavery measures and actions. We would not, however, be understood to say that they did not, at the same time, profess to be firmly opposed to Slavery. We are aware that this was the fact. But the explanation of this incongruity is their business and not ours.

“An examination of our writings will show that we have not, at any time, charged them with not being in

any degree opposed to Slavery. And we are totally unable to see why the assumption of the distinctive appellation of Anti-Slavery on our part, should imply an entire surrender of their testimony.

“Let us illustrate. A Yearly Meeting, after having held and advocated the doctrine of immediate emancipation, changes its opinions, and adopts the sentiment that gradual emancipation is the best plan. Now, who cannot see that in this there would be a partial surrender of our testimony against Slavery, and that should a portion of that Yearly Meeting continue, at the same time, to hold the doctrine of immediate emancipation, the term Anti-Slavery could, with much more propriety, be applied to them than the others. And we have given the evidences, which our opposers have never pretended to controvert, showing that their testimony is, indeed, a crippled one, independent of their opposition to modern abolition societies. Witness the actions of their members in voting for slaveholders and Pro-Slavery men, and their free use of slave-labor produce, and the prohibition of the examination of the abstinence question, in the Yearly Meeting, together with the eulogies passed upon them by some of the open and avowed advocates of perpetual Slavery, in one of which it was stated, that they took the right ground in relation to this subject, that is, that the slaves must be prepared for freedom before they should receive that great boon. This declaration being publicly made, has never since been contradicted, though they have been reminded of it at different times.

“And if it were not harsh to quote our London Friends against themselves, we could show that they had apprehensions that the testimony of our opposers against Slavery, was not as it should be; for they say they ‘believe if they were sufficiently alive to the bearings of this great subject, upon the welfare, temporally and spiritually of mankind, they would be more prompt in finding, and faithful in availing themselves of opportunities for individual effort, and thus be instrumental in hastening

the time when all unchristian prejudices and distinctions should be swept away.' This is, truly, our sentiment. And it was because we were more prompt in finding and faithful in availing ourselves of opportunities for this individual effort, which they say is our duty to do, and which efforts our opposers endeavored to prohibit, that we have been forced to the necessity of assuming a correspondent distinctive appellation from those who refused to be thus prompt and faithful.

"In another place, the Meeting for Sufferings of London, observes: 'it has seemed to us, that the circumstances of the case which have been the immediate cause of your addressing our meeting, call in an especial manner, for the exercise of patience, forbearance and charity; we would also express our warm and affectionate desire, that Friends may, in the feeling of Christian love and interest toward those who have left, be enabled in the meekness of wisdom, to extend to them the language of invitation to return to the unity of the body, and that the way to this desirable end, may in all respects be made as easy as a due regard to the order of truth will permit.'

"Now, the question occurs, what would be a due regard to the order of truth, in the estimation of our transatlantic Friends? Would it not be for our opposers to undo all that they have done, contrary to the known practice and advice of those Friends? Are we to suppose they would advise to a course contrary to the order of truth, if they knew it?

"Viewing those Friends as consistent, we must suppose that their idea of an observance of a due regard to the order of truth, would induce our opposers to rescind their advice against opening meeting-houses to Anti-Slavery meetings, and that against Friends joining with others in the Anti-Slavery cause, and all others, casting odium upon it, for all these are contrary to the order of truth, in the view of our English Friends, as is evinced by their continued and persevering action in direct oppo-

sition thereto. It must also necessarily embrace an obliteration of all the Minutes and proceedings standing against us for going in opposition to that which is contrary to the order of truth, in the view of those Friends, for it would surely take all this to make the way for a return, as easy as a due regard to that order would permit. If this is the idea intended to be conveyed by our friends, which it must be, if they are consistent, we approve of the exhortation.

“It is in this way alone, unless our judgment should be convinced that we are in error, that a re-union can be effected, while we retain our allegiance to Him whose right it is to rule in the hearts of all men, and who declared, I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.

“Can we suppose that they would have us obtain a unity with those we have left, at the expense of our Anti-Slavery efforts, in regard to which they have spoken so highly of us, we being of the American Abolitionists, which they as members of the Executive Committee, referred to in such terms of commendation. Such a supposition would be placing them in a very unfavorable light indeed. Nor yet would it place them in a much more favorable position to suppose they do not know, that to return to a unity with the body, while those advices remain unrepealed, would be an actual abandonment of those very efforts which they have exhorted us to be prompt in using.

“And we would here observe, we hope and trust there never will be a re-union while that body retains the position it has taken in regard to the Anti-Slavery cause, unless we should be convinced that we are mistaken in relation to this point. And in order to a just settlement of the controversy, we ask investigation. We hold ourselves ready, should any body of Friends, either in England or America, feel disposed to do us the justice to examine the evidences on both sides, and act as umpire

between us and our opposing Friends, to make all necessary arrangements on our part to bring about such an event.

“Such a course is not unprecedented. An instance of this kind may be found in Gough’s history, in case of the separation of Wilkinson, Story and others. There is, however, a difference in the two cases, so far as the present has been tested, and it remains for time to show, whether that difference will continue. Wilkinson and his fellow-seceders were unwilling to come to a public discussion of the difficulties between them and those they left, while the others were anxious for it. In the present case, the seceders have been all the time very anxious for such a discussion, while those *they have left*, have manifested a great aversion to it.

“It is highly probable that you are not aware of many things with which we have to contend, as many of them have not come to the public eye, one of which we will here mention, and which, we believe, did more to prostrate the friends of the slave in Indiana Yearly Meeting, than any other act, owing to its secret character, and although we may be thought by some to violate a faith reposed in us, by making public that which was designed only for the benefit of one department in Society, yet if there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid, that shall not be made known, we trust, under the present peculiar circumstances, we shall be excused for setting it forth in our own defense. We allude to the Epistle of Advice, issued by the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders of Indiana, in 1843, which we have quoted in the foregoing, but of which, we deem it proper to give a more full account. That meeting found on the reports from one of the Quarters, an answer (which originated in a Select Preparative, where there were none of that body who had in any way connected themselves with A. S. societies), to the query, ‘Are Friends in unity one with another, and with the meetings to which they belong,’ that they *were*, except that they differed in their views relative to Friends joining A. S. societies; where-

upon a committee was appointed, to take the subject into consideration, and if way should open, to prepare an Address or Epistle of Advice to the subordinate meetings, and to propose the names of a suitable number of Friends to attend with it, and labor where such deficiencies existed. That committee reported at a future sitting, an epistle, together with a committee of twenty-seven Ministers and Elders to carry it down to the subordinate meetings, and see to the enforcing of the advice therein contained, which report was received, the committee appointed, and they directed to proceed to their work of suppressing all Anti-Slavery labors, which were then being carried forward by individuals connected with that body. We will not here state the extreme lengths to which this committee went, for the removal of every vestige of Abolitionism within their jurisdiction, but we will take a few quotations from their document, and ask our English Friends, how many Ministers and Elders they had at that time, who were not offenders in the opinion of that Select Yearly Meeting. Take the following quotations:

“ ‘The meeting in an especial manner was exercised in regard to some of the members of this body joining Anti-Slavery societies, in opposition to the repeated advice of the Yearly Meeting. And in respect to others who are giving their strength and encouragement to those individuals who have thus acted.’ ‘The spirit which would set at naught the advice of the Yearly meeting, it is believed, is not qualified to administer the discipline. If Ministers and Elders disregard the solemn acts of the Yearly Meeting, the example to our young Friends would be highly injurious.’ Here, the reader will perceive that the exercise of the meeting, was in regard to some of its members joining *Anti-Slavery societies*, and not for joining societies of other kinds, and that the meeting was also exercised on account of others, who were giving their strength that way, but who had not connected themselves with any Anti-Slavery organization. And here are the reasons. The Yearly Meet-

ing had advised against Anti-Slavery action, on the part of its members, and if ministers and elders should disregard that advice, and continue to labor, their example would induce young Friends to do so likewise. Friends would soon be called Abolitionists, and lose 'their place and influence with the rulers of the land.' Therefore all ministers and elders who remained in connection with Anti-Slavery organizations, or favored those who were thus connected, were believed to be under the influence of that spirit which disqualified them for administering the discipline, even in a Preparative meeting. Thus being borne down and pressed upon, many who had hitherto given proof of much usefulness in the Anti-Slavery enterprise, were induced to cease their labors, and now stand numbered with that host of opponents against which the friends of the bondman have to contend.

“ But to return to the subject. Where would the ministers and elders of London Yearly Meeting have been, if the same measures had been forced upon them, which were upon us? Even the departed W. Allen, would have been numbered with transgressors for the labor which he wrought in his day, as certainly as that Charles Osborne, and others now bear reproach for their labors in the same cause, on this side the Atlantic.

“ In conclusion, dear Friends, we would remark, that in our opinion, a very great responsibility rests upon you individually, in regard to this matter, both as respects the character and usefulness of the Society in America, and the cause of the suffering slave, whose chains are riveted by the acts of a great majority of Friends in this country. We feel deeply and firmly attached to the principles, doctrines, testimonies and practice of the Society, as originally held and maintained; and hope ever so to remain, being assured that they are those of Truth; and although your Yearly Meeting may not acknowledge us as Christian brethren (notwithstanding we have carefully put in practice its advice), but has taken sides with those who have deprived us of the privileges of Society

for obeying its injunction, yet we hope ever to remain fellow-laborers with you in the cause of Christ.

“Signed on behalf of Indiana Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, held at Newport, Wayne county, Indiana; Ninth month, 1844.

“WALTER EDGERTON,
REBECCA EDGERTON.” } *Clerks.*

“P. S.—We have at this time received a copy of a Minute from the Yearly Meeting in Ireland, stating that that meeting can neither read nor accept any communication from this Yearly Meeting or any of its subordinate branches. We find also in a document purporting to be an Epistle from the Standing Committee of the same Yearly Meeting, to the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana, now in circulation in this country, similar information. And as this is the only way we can come before the members of that body, we would offer to them a few remarks thereon.

“In that Epistle, they observe ‘no communication from that called Indiana Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, having been offered to our Yearly Meeting, it was spared the necessity of manifesting its disunity with a movement so inconsistent with the good order of our Society, by issuing a declaration of refusal to recognize or correspond with a body thus constituted. How constituted? Self-organized, no doubt. This is evidently the reason intended to be given, for refusing to correspond. Now, it is a fact well known, that some years ago, a small body of Friends in Baltimore seceded from the body, and organized a Yearly Meeting of their own. Their case and ours are exactly parallel as regards the manner in which their meeting was constituted, except that they separated by Minute of adjournment, but this could not possibly make any difference in the principle. Did the Yearly Meeting of Ireland or London on that occasion, declare that movement to be inconsistent with the good order of our society? Nay, did they not sympathize with and commend them for the act? And if there were

such an occurrence to take place among Friends in America now, as did then, would they make such a declaration in relation to it? We believe those who seceded in that instance, proceeded to issue a declaration disowning the body *en masse*, as we have done in the present instance, and that for thus seceding, the body disowned them individually, as our opposers have us. But your Yearly Meeting holds correspondence with them (the seceders,) and refused us the right hand of fellowship *for doing* as these Friends did.

“It must, we think, be obvious to all, that the reason assigned for their course is not the real one. As an additional evidence of this fact, we quote their own words as follows:

“We rejoice in believing that the testimony of our Society against the complicated iniquities inseparable from the system of Slavery, continues to be FAITHFULLY upheld by our beloved brethren in various parts of America.’ Now this, if it is not designedly ambiguous, all must see was intended to contradict the representations of those publications (probably some of ours), which they say were in circulation among their members. The substance of these representations, if they were ours, were, that our opposers were not bearing a *faithful* testimony against Slavery. It is a matter of serious regret that a body of Friends should so obviously be led by such a temporizing spirit, for it is sufficiently plain, from what we have just quoted, that they did not believe our statements, and consequently that we had no just cause of separation, as Friends of Baltimore had. Why then did they not state that fact? Why do they evade coming to the point, by giving that for the reason, which, by their own showing, as we have above exhibited, was not the reason?

“They make much profession of attachment to the cause of our Holy Redeemer, and strongly recommend to listen to the voice of the true Shepherd, and not follow the voice of the stranger.

“Now let us say to the members of that Yearly Meet-

ing, it is painful to find our confidence in the professions of such a body wrested from us by the above considerations. Would listening to the voice of the true Shepherd lead to such a policy? Would it lead your Yearly Meeting to reject the evidences in our favor while receiving the bare assertions of our opposers, unattended by a particle of evidence whatever? Did not this true Shepherd command his followers, 'As ye would that men should do unto you do you even so unto them.' And were they doing as they would be done by in their proceedings against us? We appeal to the witness for God in your consciences for an answer.

"We KNOW, and the world knows, but more especially the slaveholders know, that Friends in America do not bear a faithful testimony against Slavery. The evidences of this are to some extent before you in the documents we have issued, which we would hope have been duly circulated among you. Those evidences our opposers have never the first time attempted to controvert, but have contented themselves with denying the existence of that which those evidences establish."



CHAPTER XXVI.

Committee appointed by London Yearly Meeting to endeavor to heal the Breach—The Address of that Meeting to those who had left Indiana Yearly Meeting.

THE Anti-Slavery party, among Friends, had, as already shown, entertained a high estimation of the Anti-Slavery character of Friends in England, and although after the Separation they seemed to be held at a distance, they were unwilling to believe that the body of Friends there could be so warped aside as ultimately to reject those, though the smaller number, who claimed to follow their own example, without a thorough examination and

investigation into the alleged causes of Separation. Under these views the information of the appointment of a committee, by London Yearly Meeting, to endeavor to heal the breach and produce reconciliation, was received with some cheering hope on the part of Anti-Slavery Friends, that justice, though delayed, would come at last.

The committee was appointed in Fifth month, 1845, at which time the Yearly Meeting also adopted an Address and directed it, not to a Yearly Meeting of Friends, nor to *Friends* even, but to those who had withdrawn from Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends.

Those who were deputed to bring it over, and labor to induce a compliance with its injunctions, were Wm. Forster, George Stacey, Josiah Forster and John Allen. Here it is:

“From our Yearly Meeting, held in London, by adjournments from the 21st of the Fifth Month, to the 31st of the same, inclusive, 1845.

“TO THOSE WHO HAVE RECENTLY WITHDRAWN FROM INDIANA YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS:

“DEAR FRIENDS:—This meeting has from time to time been introduced into a feeling of much brotherly concern and interest on your behalf, in consequence of your having withdrawn from the body of Friends in Indiana Yearly Meeting; and those feelings are attended with an earnest and affectionate solicitude for your re-union with them.

“We have a strong sense of the preciousness and the safety of true gospel unity. We are enjoined to submit ourselves one to another in the fear of God; to be subject one to another, and to be clothed with humility. This subjection one to another in love, greatly promotes that individual growth in grace which all the faithful followers of Christ can not but desire may be their blessed experience.

“The considerations which have led us to address you are confirmed by reflecting on the comfort and strength

which have arisen from that Christian fellowship and harmony which have prevailed in our religious society, to so large an extent, from its rise to the present period; which we can only ascribe to the power of the Holy Spirit, so conspicuously manifested in its first gathering; and every interruption to which blessings, must be regarded as a very serious evil.

“ We cannot adequately set forth the sense we have of the extent to which, where the precious bond of religious fellowship is seen to be in danger, we are individually called upon to refrain from insisting on our own judgment, rather than do anything which could contribute to its dissolution. The living members of the body will watch carefully against such a tendency, seeking to be endued with all long-suffering, meekness and love.

“ Trusting that on the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and on the spirituality of divine worship, there exists no essential difference between you and the body from which you have withdrawn, we have felt much concern and sorrow on hearing that you have discontinued assembling with them to present yourselves before the Lord. Accept, we beseech you, our earnest and affectionate entreaty, that you will relinquish your separate meetings for this purpose—will wholly discontinue them, and again assemble for the public worship of Almighty God with those with whom you have been accustomed thus to meet.

“ In extending this invitation, we are not insensible to those humiliations by which the accepting it may be accompanied. We feel tenderly for you in thinking of your present circumstances. But, whatever may be the sacrifices which attend such a course of conduct as that which we thus venture to recommend, we believe that were it taken in the reverent fear and love of God, with a single eye to his honor, and to the service of our Lord and Redeemer, it would bring that peace to the soul which passeth understanding; that the blessing of the Most High would rest upon it, both as it affects you and your beloved offspring; and that in your latter days, a retrospect

on this course would bring a comfort to the soul which would amply compensate for all that you may have to do or to endure in connection therewith.

“With sincere desires that the wisdom which is from above, which is pure, peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, may be granted to every one of you on the perusal and calm consideration of this our affectionate Address, we are your friends.

“Signed in and on behalf of the meeting, by

“GEORGE STACEY,

“*Clerk to the meeting this year.*”



CHAPTER XXVII.

Epistle of Advice and Statement of Facts, etc.

THE deputation arrived in this country in time to attend the Yearly Meeting, at White Water, in Tenth month.

It would be difficult for the reader to form any just conception of the feelings of A. S. Friends, as every vestige of hope vanished, by the successive developments of the object and plans of the committee as set forth in the following Epistle of Advice and statement of facts, issued by the Meeting for Sufferings shortly after the committee commenced its business:

“EPISTLE OF ADVICE

AND

STATEMENT OF FACTS, ETC.

“At a special meeting of the Meeting for Sufferings of Anti-Slavery Friends, held at Newport, Indiana, Tenth month 13th, 1845,

“The following document was produced by a committee appointed for that purpose, and read; and after due deliberation was united with and adopted, and directed to the particular attention of all Anti-Slavery Friends:

“DEAR FRIENDS:—As a body set apart to represent the Yearly Meeting during its recess, we feel it to be a solemn duty, to address you at the present time, on a subject which we deem of vital importance to the prosperity of our religious society, and to the general interest of humanity and the credit of the Christian religion. Our object is to exhort you to faithfulness and steadfastness in the maintenance of those principles, and religious, social relations whereunto we have been called, and in which we have so often experienced the solemnizing presence of the holy Head of the Church, covering our assemblies as with a mantle, filling our hearts with love to God and love to man, and confirming our souls, without doubt, in the belief that the Lord owned, and graciously condescended to be with us in our religious meetings.

“We are apprehensive that a time of trial awaits us; and our earnest desire and prayer is, that all our members may dwell so deep in the fountain of Divine love, and live so near to the spring of life, keeping a single eye to the pointings of Truth, as to be preserved from being led away from the path of rectitude by the influence of man.

“You are aware that the late Yearly Meeting in London appointed a committee to come to this country, in consequence of the division that had taken place in Indiana Yearly Meeting. And though we could not ascertain, previous to their arrival, the precise nature of their appointment, or the extent of their mission, yet we understood they were to bring over an Address from their Yearly Meeting, to us, and from various sources of information, we were led to believe, at least to hope, that they would examine into the cause of difficulty among us, see which party, or whether both parties had erred, and offer

their advice, as friendly mediators, to either or both parties, and thus endeavor to produce a reconciliation upon the ground of truth and justice. With this view of the subject, we rejoiced in the prospect of their visit, and looked forward with hope to the commencement and final result of their labors.

“We well remember that London Yearly Meeting had repeatedly, in its Epistles, earnestly entreated Friends in this country to increased activity in behalf of the slave, and once, in its General Epistle (in 1830), advised Friends everywhere, to take part *with their fellow countrymen*, in this and other works of humanity. We knew that Friends in England were largely engaged in this cause, in the same manner with ourselves, and that at least two of the committee (Josiah Forster and George Stacey) were eminently conspicuous among the Abolitionists of Great Britain; and we could not conceive that either the Yearly Meeting of London, or its committee, would, when they fully understood the matter (and we hoped the committee would take measures to get full information on the subject), virtually uphold our opposers, in placing us out of the unity and harmony of religious Society, and effectually depriving us of its blessed privileges, or that they would unite in placing us under condemnation, for following the Advice of that Yearly Meeting and imitating the practice of its most conspicuous members, and even of the committee now among us, when at home; particularly without an impartial examination of the merits of the case. The committee may say, as many of the members of Indiana Yearly Meeting have said, that they do not censure us for our Anti-Slavery course, but for setting up separate meetings. But it is all sophistry! The setting up of separate meetings was the natural and legitimate result of the proscriptive measures heaped upon us for our Anti-Slavery course; as there was no other possible way for us to enjoy the benefits of religious society; and any censure placed upon us for setting up separate meetings, is censure for our labors in the cause of the slave.

“But we must proceed to make some development of the present posture of affairs; and, so far as they have come to our knowledge, the future prospects of the committee. This we shall do in a hasty sketch of events which have transpired since their arrival at Richmond. The sources of information from which the following statement is compiled, we believe to be entirely reliable:

“On the first day of the Yearly Meeting at Richmond, the Minute of the appointment of the committee was read, and one of their number made some remarks relative to their mission. They also proposed the appointment of a committee, by the meeting, to give them such information as they might wish for. The meeting complied with the request, taking the precaution to have every name approved before it was taken down by the Clerk. With this committee the London committee have had several interviews, of the nature of which we are not fully informed.

“They attended the Yearly Meeting throughout, and we are informed, some of them expressed much satisfaction at finding Friends doing more for the colored people than they (the committee) anticipated.

“They expressed no disapprobation of their course in regard to A. S. Friends, of their general bearing toward the Anti-Slavery cause, nor of their voting for slaveholders and Pro-Slavery men.

“The information of what passed in the meeting was communicated by their own members.

“The day after the meeting concluded, being the day on which the mid-week meeting of the ‘body members’ was held at Newport, the London committee attended it, went to the house of a ‘body Friend’ for dinner, and after dinner made a social visit to Charles Osborne, at Levi Coffin’s, of perhaps half an hour. They returned to Richmond the same evening. This is all the instance, so far as we are informed, of their paying any attention to A. S. Friends since their arrival, except as a few have sought an interview with them since that time. Several other Friends were present during their visit to Charles

Osborne, in the course of which some intimations of their intended course were given, and it was understood that they intended to set out for White Lick the next day.

“After they left Newport, several Anti-Slavery Friends thought it necessary to confer a little on the circumstances of the case, and the result of the conference was the following communication, which was delivered to them in Richmond, next day, by three of the Friends who had signed it:

“ ‘NEWPORT, *Tenth month 8th*, 1845.

“ ‘William Forster, Josiah Forster, George Stacey, and John Allen ;

“ ‘Esteemed Friends:—Being solemnly impressed with the importance of your mission to this country, and duly appreciating the arduous nature of the undertaking, we cannot but express our earnest desire and hope that your labors may be blessed to the promotion of the cause of truth and righteousness, and that when you return to your own land, you may bear with you the consoling reflection that, through the Divine aid, you have been instrumental in uniting Friends, in this country, in a hearty and efficient co-operation in their endeavors to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed millions in this land of boasted liberty go free.

“ ‘As you must be sensible that we, as Anti-Slavery Friends, feel a deep interest in the progress and final result of your labors, we hope you will duly appreciate our motives, and, at least, give us credit for candor in making to you the following suggestions :

“ ‘We understand that your object is to endeavor to re-unite Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting, who have been separated in consequence of different sentiments as to their proper course on the Anti-Slavery question, and of the measures which resulted from this difference of opinion. We are now two Yearly Meetings, and we have understood the object of your visit to be, to act as mediators between us, that we may become united again. Need we suggest to you the propriety of endeavoring to

stand, as much as possible, uncommitted to either side, and so far as information may be wanted to endeavor to procure it in that way which shall be least likely to lead you to partial conclusions, or to give either party room to distrust your impartiality?

““Now, so far as we have understood your course, since entering upon the object of your mission, and your plans for the future, we feel bound to say, we cannot view them in a light that is satisfactory.

““You have thrown yourselves, as it were, into the bosom of one of the parties, to the neglect almost entirely of the other, the only exception, that we know of, being a visit of a few minutes to Charles Osborne. You attended their Yearly Meeting throughout, and requested the appointment of a committee of information; with which committee, we understand, you have consulted as to your future operations, thus giving strength to the idea that you are altogether on their side. The result of your counsels, so far as we understand your plan of future operations, appears to us exceptionable in several particulars. We understand that you expect to call A. S. Friends together in their respective neighborhoods, beginning with some of the remote and small meetings, and to read to them the Address from the London Yearly Meeting.

““Our objection to this course will suggest itself to your minds without our naming it. It may be a master-stroke of policy to attack our outposts, for the purpose of weakening our forces, in an attempt to destroy our organization, if that is the object aimed at, but we very much doubt whether it is the course that can be reconciled with the object of your mission, as generally understood. Here, or at least in this vicinity, is the great body of A. S. Friends — here our Yearly Meeting is held — here, it was expected you would meet us in counsel, and for this purpose our aged Friend, Charles Osborne, is here, not doubting that if you had anything for us, here would be the place to receive it. And here, still seems to us, is at least the place to begin. We do

not presume to dictate, but we take the liberty to ask you to reconsider your proposed plan. Whatever course you may see proper to pursue toward A. S. Friends, or whatever advice you may have to give them, or propositions to make to them, we think it reasonable that they should be commenced here instead of at our remote and small meetings. And especially if you intend to convene A. S. Friends to hear the Address, we would request you to commence here. In conclusion, dear Friends, we would suggest to you, that if you persist in that course which evidently implies a design to weaken us by operating upon our remote meetings or outposts, we shall feel ourselves justifiable in taking such measures as may appear to be advisable to guard our Friends against any improper influence.

““Now we will just add, that if we are under wrong impressions, we hope to be set right, for it is painful to us to harbor an unfavorable thought respecting Friends for whom we have long entertained so high a regard as we have for those whom we are now addressing.

““We expected you would take steps to inquire into the particulars of our difficulty, see where the wrong was, and endeavor to remove it. But if this is not your intention, then we have been mistaken in the object of your visit. We have spoken plainly, but not in an unfriendly feeling, and hope you will attribute it to no other motive than a desire that the right may prosper.

““With the salutation of our love, we remain your sincere Friends,

““HENRY H. WAY,
ROBERT B. BAILEY,
CHARLES OSBORNE,
CATHERINE COFFIN,
MARGARET BALDWIN,
JAMES MAULSBY,
LEVI COFFIN,

BENJAMIN THOMAS,
BENJAMIN STANTON,
DANIEL PUCKETT,
RUTH MAULSBY,
JONATHAN HOUGH,
GEORGE SHUGART, JR.
SAMUEL CHARLES.’

““After they had read the communication, the three Friends who delivered it had an interview with them.

They were informed by the committee, that from the language of the communication, they supposed there was a mistake in regard to the object of their mission. Stated, in substance, that they did not consider themselves as mediators, that the concern of London Yearly Meeting, the purport of the Address, and their object, were simply to endeavor to prevail upon us to discontinue our meetings for *worship*, and to attend the meetings for *worship* of the 'body.'

“When asked if they would not advise that our meetings for *Discipline* should be laid down, as well as meetings for *worship*? they said they had nothing to say about our meetings for Discipline. It was stated to them that A. S. Friends had understood their object to be, to promote a re-union, and they were asked, if they would advise us to condemn our conduct, or make acknowledgments to the Monthly meetings by which we were disowned. They replied, that they had nothing to say, or it was no part of their business to say anything about our making acknowledgments. So that the object of their mission — the great object in view, in crossing the wide Atlantic and traversing a large portion of this western country, appears to be, solely, to annihilate the religious Society of A. S. Friends, and to persuade its members to attend those of the 'body.' A privilege not denied to any person.

“They seemed to have no view of inquiring into the circumstances that caused the Separation, but George Stacey said, that he could conceive of no possible circumstances in which he could be placed, that would justify him in suffering himself to be alienated from the body of Society. Thus fully indorsing the doctrine, either that the body of Friends is infallible, or that, let it become as corrupt as it may, its members are not justifiable in leaving it.

“And Josiah Forster said, that dearly as he loved the Anti-Slavery cause, he could not, under any circumstances, suffer it to be compared with the union of the Society of Friends. Our Friends, who had this interview

with the committee, do not pretend to give their words *verbatim*, but the substance.

“At parting, the editor of the Free Labor Advocate was advised to ‘be quiet,’ and a hope expressed, that if he would do so, their labors would be attended with success.

“It may be proper to state in addition, that during the interview, they were informed that if they wished to see Anti-Slavery Friends together and to read to them the Address from London, they might have the opportunity at Newport, at the close of the anniversary of the State Anti-Slavery Society, of seeing more than they would be likely to see at any other time or place. They assented to the probability of that being the case, but expressed the opinion, and asked our A. S. Friends if they did not think it was correct, that they would have more influence with our members by convening them in their respective little neighborhoods, than by meeting a large body in Newport; though they had previously asserted that they had no view to ‘outposts,’ or motives of policy in their proposed plan of visiting the remote neighborhoods and leaving the principal body of A. S. Friends in this vicinity till their return.

“The following morning, the three A. S. Friends who had the interview with the committee, addressed to them the following note, which, we suppose, was delivered to them before they left Richmond for the West, intending, as we are informed, to go pretty directly to Iowa.

“NEWPORT, IA., *Tenth month 10th, 1845.*

“William Forster, Josiah Forster, George Stacey, and John Allen:

“Esteemed Friends:—Since our interview with you yesterday, we have, upon due reflection, concluded to address to you a brief note, just to inform you that we are no better satisfied with your proposed course than we were before, but on the contrary, our dissatisfaction has increased, in consequence of the discovery that your object is the annihilation of our religious society of A. S.

Friends, without making any attempt to induce the old Yearly Meeting to do anything toward opening the way for our re-union, upon terms which we think we can consistently accept. Now, we wish you to know, that we, as well as you, highly value the unity and harmony of religious society, which we now enjoy in an eminent degree, and feel ourselves bound to endeavor to maintain our present position until there is a prospect of enjoying those privileges in some other way. We do not intend by this to ask you to alter your course, but to let you know that which A. S. Friends will take; that they are bound to take such measures as they deem best, to preserve our religious society in unity and harmony. And that neither the editor of the Advocate, nor any other A. S. Friend, will feel under any obligation to 'be quiet,' in the sense in which we understood the advice to be given yesterday.

“ ‘ BENJAMIN STANTON,
LEVI COFFIN, H. H. WAY.’ ”

“ Our object is to warn A. S. Friends that our religious society is assailed, with a view to its prostration. Our measures are purely defensive, and in these endeavors to preserve the unity, harmony, and integrity of our members, by warning them of the attack, we feel ourselves fully justifiable in setting forth the foregoing facts, remembering the Scripture declaration, that 'in vain is the snare laid in the sight of any bird.' We have thought it better to set forth the facts that have led us to the discovery of the objects which the committee aim at, rather than to state their objects, without confirming them by the facts.

“ And now, in conclusion, beloved Friends, we would again exhort you to trust in the Lord, remembering that in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength. Trust not in man, whose breath is in his nostrils. As we are thus concerned to dwell near the source of unfailing strength, the fear of man will be banished, and we shall be enabled to adopt the language 'the Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man shall do unto me.'

“ BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.* ”

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Account of the Proceedings of the English Committee in Iowa.

THE deputation, far from entertaining the least disposition to comply with the wishes of the body of Anti-Slavery Friends, immediately proceeded to the consummation of their plans in visiting the remote branches first.

The following is a short account of their first labors, commencing in Iowa, and was furnished by a number of Anti-Slavery Friends of that place :

“The committee having left Richmond pretty directly after the Yearly Meeting there, arrived at Salem on First-day evening, the 26th of Tenth month ; where they commenced their labors with A. S. Friends by calling all our members together, who met them in conference on Third-day the 28th inst., at 11 o'clock A. M. After the meeting had been gathered a few minutes, George Stacey arose to his feet, made a few remarks explanatory of their mission, read the Minute of their appointment, and then the Address from London Yearly Meeting to A. S. Friends, earnestly recommending the discontinuing of meetings for worship, and that we attend the meetings for worship of those with whom we were formerly associated in religious fellowship. A serious and deliberate consideration of the contents of the Address was earnestly recommended by the committee, each one of them briefly remarking on the great value of Christian fellowship and gospel unity, and of the exercise and travail of London Yearly Meeting on account of our secession.

“William Forster expressed, in a feeling manner, his gratitude for the opportunity with us, and bore witness to the precious solemnity that covered the meeting.

“The committee were informed that our English brethren did not know what they were asking of us, when they required our return to those from whom we have separated, without a removal of the causes of the separation.

“And Friends were feelingly and earnestly recommended to look to Him who is abundantly able to direct and protect his dependent followers as man cannot do. Near the close of their interview with us, the committee informed the meeting, that they had a wish to visit us in our families, and a few Friends expressed a willingness for them to do so.

“The committee then retired—A. S. Friends continuing in conference. After a pretty full and free expression of sentiment on the advice contained in the Address, and the labors of the committee, the meeting nominated a few Friends to draw up and present to the committee our views briefly on the subject, and the reasons why we could not accede to the proposition, or comply with their advice.

“The following is a copy of the address to the committee, which was presented to them early the next morning after the conference; and they informed that they had privilege to visit us in our families.

“SALEM, IOWA, *Tenth mo. 28th, 1845.*

“Esteemed Friends, William Forster, Josiah Forster, George Stacey, and John Allen.

“Upon duly considering the advice contained in the Address to us from London Yearly Meeting, to discontinue our meetings for worship, and attend the meetings for worship of those with whom we were formerly associated in religious fellowship, we believe it right to inform you, through this medium, that we cannot accede to the proposition, for the following reasons:

“First, because we occupy our present position more from necessity than choice, having no alternative left us, if we would enjoy the benefit of religious society. Second, because we believe it would be a virtual surrender of our A. S. principles. Third, because by so doing we would not be securing to ourselves the benefits of religious society, nor the fellowship and unity so desirable, unless we are acknowledged by those you advise us to return to, as Friends in unity, with full privilege to continue our

active exertions in the A. S. cause, as Truth may dictate, being accountable to the Society for violations of the discipline only: but, on the other hand, we should lose the benefits of religious society, and the fellowship and unity which stand not in word only, but in the life and power of the Truth; which fellowship we believe we have often been favored to feel since our separate organization. Fourth, because by so doing our influence in a society capacity will be lost, and thus, instead of advancing the cause of truth and righteousness on the earth, we would become a hinderance. And fifth, because we are in unity with Indiana Yearly Meeting of A. S. Friends, and believe the Advice should claim the attention of our Meeting for Sufferings.

“‘And, in conclusion, we would further state, that we can but view the course of London Yearly Meeting, and your course as a committee, as very extraordinary. That without ever entering into an impartial examination of the causes that led to the difficulty that exists between us, and those we were formerly associated with in religious fellowship, you enter into judgment, and require us to return, without an effort to remove the causes of the difficulty that separates us; which removal would open the way for us to return on principles that would have a tendency to restore the unity that is so desirable, but which cannot be restored without the removal of those causes.

“‘In love we remain your friends.

“‘Signed on behalf of the members of Salem Monthly meeting of A. S. Friends.

“‘Aaron Street, Jr., Thomas Frazier, Henderson Lewelling, Marmaduke Jay, Wm. Lewelling, Gideon Frazier, Elizabeth Lewelling, Anna Johnson, Hannah Blackledge, Cyrena Lewelling.’

“‘On Sixth day, the 31st of Tenth month, the Monthly meeting of the ‘body’ was held at Salem, which the committee attended, and we understand by some who attended, that one of the committee alluded to the subject of the Separation, and advised Friends, if any of the

seceders from them should return, to receive them again into fellowship; but said nothing about preparing the way for our return, by removing the causes of the separation.

“Some of our members felt that they could not be well satisfied to let the committee pass away from us, without soliciting another conference between them and A. S. Friends collectively; to which proposition they assented, remarking, at the same time, to those who made the request, that they had no liberty to enter into an examination or discussion of the causes of difference between us and those from whom we have separated, and should not feel bound to answer questions that would commit them.

“Another conference was accordingly held on the seventh day of Eleventh month, at 10 o'clock A. M., through the course of which a full and free expression was given by A. S. Friends, on the course pursued by our English brethren; and the committee was faithfully warned of the tendency of their labors among us, and that we were fully of the opinion that they would inevitably tend to widen the breach between us and those from whom we separated, instead of healing it, by placing censure on us for our course, and strengthening and establishing our opposers in their arbitrary, proscriptive, and unchristian measures toward us; and that it would have a tendency to retard the work of emancipation in the United States, by throwing the weight of the influence of the Society of Friends in England and America, against the honest laborers in the cause. That the most violent opposers to the righteous cause, and bitter haters of the colored man, and of his rights, that we have to contend with, feel it to be one of their strongholds; as they frequently throw up to us the position of the Society of Friends on this subject; and have already referred exultingly to the course of the committee, as an evidence that we are wrong.

“The committee remarked, that they supposed we would give them credit for their Anti-Slavery labors.

They were informed that we could not give them credit for any A. S. labors since they arrived in the United States ; inasmuch as they had carefully avoided attending the Anniversary of the Indiana State Anti-Slavery Society, and had not attended any other A. S. meetings ; and that it was our belief, if they had maintained their A. S. principles boldly and faithfully since coming to this country, and opposed the time-serving spirit of Friends in this country, they might have been instrumental in removing the difficulty existing between us and Indiana Yearly Meeting, and thereby have given strength to that righteous cause which they profess to love so dearly at home. The committee took the position that London Yearly Meeting had not the authority to act as a mediator between the contending parties here, as that meeting did not stand in the relation to Indiana Yearly Meeting, of a Yearly Meeting to a Quarterly meeting, and had no right to call it to an account for its acts ; and, therefore, they could not enter into an investigation of the circumstances of the difficulty.

“ They were informed that we were sensible of that fact, but that London or any other Yearly Meeting has the right, in brotherly love, to offer its services as mediator between contending parties in our religious society ; and that the same concern by which they profess to have been actuated in their course, would have justified them in offering their services in this case as mediators, and of entering into an impartial examination of the causes of the difficulty, and to have given such counsel and advice to either or both parties, as might have been appropriate, and calculated to remove the difficulty between us. And that they had just the same right to act in that way, as they have in the way they are acting. The committee at different times alluded to the circumstance of our agreement on the fundamental doctrines and principles of Friends ; and that the only difference between us and Indiana Yearly Meeting, was in the manner of carrying out our Anti-Slavery principles. They were informed that we believed the difference between us and members of the Indiana Yearly Meeting amounted to a

total lack on their part, of acting efficiently in the cause; which continues to be manifested by their refusing to identify themselves with the Abolitionists of the United States—by voting for slaveholders and Pro-Slavery men—by the indiscriminate use of the productions of slavery; and by refusing to open their meeting-house doors to A. S. lecturers, thus discountenancing the devoted laborers in the good cause, whatever may be their moral worth.

“These are some of the obstacles that stand in the way of a reunion; and our English brethren, in their efforts to effect a re-union, have entirely declined to examine into, and endeavor to remove those with other causes of difference.

“On one of the committee (Josiah Forster) expressing, as they had severally done in their family labors, an opinion that the circumstances in America are so different from what they are in England, that it is not best for Friends to unite with others in the A. S. cause as they do in England; he was asked for his reason for such a conclusion, and to explain the circumstances of difference; and he acknowledged he had no reason matured for it. They were then told that the objection had often been made to us, and the objectors had as often failed to give a reason for it; and that we believed the difference between the two countries, in relation to the Anti-Slavery cause, is, that in England it is popular, and in America it is unpopular; and that we should have to conclude that this is the only reason that can be rendered for the opinion that Friends here should not act in the A. S. cause as they do there. At which they were silent.

“One of the committee expressed that he thought the term ‘Anti-Slavery,’ attached to our name, very objectionable; for, he said, the principles of the Society of Friends are, and have been Anti-Slavery, for the last century. And they advanced the sentiment, that an investigation of the causes of the difficulty would be attended with deleterious effects, and would result in widening the breach. And they severally insisted that they had no

intention of placing any degree of censure on us for our course, or of justifying our opposers in theirs, and that their Yearly Meeting has always avoided doing so; and they again earnestly urged the consideration and adoption of the Advice from their Yearly Meeting. But they were again told that their course inevitably had that tendency, and they could not prevent that consequence while they continued therein.

“The committee, when questioned at different times, with regard to the course it would be necessary for us to pursue, to obtain the privilege of religious fellowship and unity with those they require us to return to, have never proposed any other plan than merely our attending their meetings for worship, without any privileges more than those have, who never possessed a right of membership in the Society.

“In conclusion, we would here state, that we have not undertaken to give the precise language that was used in the different interviews here narrated; but we have endeavored to give the sense and purport of what was said.

“Signed by direction of a meeting, and on behalf of the members of Salem Monthly meeting of A. S. Friends, Iowa.

“Anna Johnson, William Lewelling, Elvy Lewelling, Cyrena Lewelling, Aaron Street, Jr., Rachel Joy, Shannah Hiatt, Marmaduke Jay, James Comer, Jane Lewelling, Eli Jessop, Nathan Hammer, John Lewelling, Henderson Lewelling, Sarah Marine, Elizabeth Lewelling.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Proceedings of the English Committee at Nettle Creek.

As the committee passed along from place to place, they were very careful not to eat or lodge with the *objects of their solicitude* when it could be avoided. And in calling Friends together, they studiously avoided using the term Anti-Slavery Friends, professing to be restricted by conscience from so doing.

Neither would they in their language, acknowledge we had any meetings, but would speak of the "little company," in this, that, or the other place. Every movement on their part, showed that their ardent desire was to break up the organization of A. S. Friends.

When they chanced to come across one that could be diverted with the relation of some incident foreign to the object of their mission, or pleased with soft and oily words; they had sagacity enough soon to discover it; and then it was they were indeed communicative and sociable; but let any one put a few questions, as was frequently done, respecting the manner in which Friends in England acted touching the Anti-Slavery cause; or how they could persuade Anti-Slavery Friends to submit to a body which prohibited its members from doing as their own Yearly Meeting recommended to do, etc., etc., and they were at once dumb. Sometimes, however, they would converse a little together in a low tone, or whisper, and then inform the "little company;" they did not think proper to answer such questions.

It will not be necessary to narrate the proceedings with all the "little companies;" an account of one or two other of their conferences may suffice.

"At Nettle Creek, after they had taken their seats a few minutes, George Stacey stated that the object in calling them together, was to read an expostulatory Address from London Yearly Meeting, to those who had believed it right to withdraw from Indiana Yearly Meeting, and set up separate meetings to themselves. It was then stated, on the part of A. S. Friends, that from the course they, the committee, had pursued hitherto, it was understood that their sole object was, to lay waste the religious Society of A. S. Friends. To this they made no reply. They were plainly told that A. S. Friends felt called upon to watch upon the walls of their Zion, and to guard against the encroachments of the enemy; and they were requested to allow them the same privilege that Paul had, that is, to answer for themselves.

"To this the committee partially consented.

“The Address was then read. After which the committee made some remarks, censuring A. S. Friends, and justifying their opposers.

“They were repeatedly asked, if they had investigated the difficulty between us and those we had left. To which they gave no answer. But when they were told how one-sided they were in giving judgment before hearing both parties; they said they knew nothing of the cause of separation, and they had no privilege from their Yearly Meeting to investigate the difference between us; and they did not come here to discuss the matter, but were messengers to expostulate with us.

“They were then replied to in regard to their great mission, as being messengers of the Lord; and told of their inconsistency, by alluding to their standing in regard to the Anti-Slavery cause in England, and the different course they took in America; how they had advised us, heretofore, to join with our fellow-countrymen in this great work, and how they now advised us to return to that body which had rejected that advice and proscribed us for following it. One of the committee then said he wished to give some explanation in regard to the allusion that had been made to their being messengers of the Lord. He said they did not say, nor had they said, they were messengers of the Lord; they were only messengers of London Yearly Meeting (in this he said truly), and came here to carry the message from that meeting.

“They contended that the different Yearly Meetings in America bore a faithful and consistent testimony against Slavery. They were then asked, if they believed the Society of Friends in America, faithfully and consistently bore a testimony in favor of the Anti-Slavery cause in this country. To which George Stacey replied, that he was not fully acquainted with the character of the Anti-Slavery enterprise in this country; *it might be possible that it consisted of those who were infidels*; and if so, they in England would advise against joining with such associations. He was then asked, if he knew whether the Anti-

Slavery associations in England, were clear of all those who hold unsound principles? To which he made no reply. They were then told, that *'it might be possible'* there were some, both in Europe and America, engaged in the Anti-Slavery cause, who were not sound in principle; and that it was *quite as possible*, there were some in the Society of Friends, who were not sound in principle. To all of which they made no reply.

“Various questions were put to them, and among others, whether it was consistent with our testimony against Slavery, for Friends to vote for slaveholders? Which they refused to answer, though they were solicited to do so. They were then referred to the example of George Fox; how he answered all civil questions, investigated things, and never gave judgment without hearing both sides, etc.

“Toward the conclusion, a friend proposed asking them a few more questions. One of them rose and said, they should decline answering them. The questions, however, were put as follows:

“1st. Do you know whether there is any difference between the Body Friends, and Anti-Slavery Friends?

“2d. Do you know whether the charges made by the old Yearly Meeting against A. S. Friends, are true or not?

“3d. Do you know whether the charges made by A. S. Friends against the old Yearly Meeting, are true or not?

“4th. Is it the duty of a Christian, when there are two parties, to ask one of them to submit to the other, without an investigation, to see which is in the wrong?

“5th. Would it be right to ask others to do anything, without giving all explanations, and answering all questions, so far as is in their power to give or answer, relating thereto?”

But they were as good as their word, they made no reply to the questions.

CHAPTER XXX.

English Committee at Newport—A Response to the Address carried round by that Committee.

To read the Address and urge submission to its advice, seemed to be the sole business of the committee, and it was hard work to divert them in the least from it.

At Newport, however, they were induced to enter into some little discussion, and make some admissions relative to their connection with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and Anti-Slavery Friends pretty fully exposed their position and their course.

At the conclusion of the conference, the committee were asked, if they would carry back to their Yearly Meeting a response to the Address they had been carrying round to Anti-Slavery Friends? to which, they replied, they could see no propriety in sending such a communication, and refused to take one.

The following, however, was issued by the Meeting for Sufferings, and sent in another way:

“ To the Yearly Meeting of London; to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings constituting the same, and to the members thereof individually.

“ DEAR FRIENDS:—

“ In the fear of the Lord, and under a solemn sense of the obligation resting upon us, to stand for the defense of the Truth, at the same time being sensible of our own weakness and insufficiency as men and creatures, but in humble reliance on the unfailing arm of the Shepherd of Israel, we believe it right at this time to address you, although you have heretofore refused to give our communications a hearing in your Yearly Meeting. Our object is not now to solicit the customary correspondence between Yearly Meetings, for this your previous course, both in the capacity of a Yearly Meeting and Meeting for Sufferings forbids us to expect; and indeed, unless

we could see in the action of those meetings, relative to the unhappy difficulty among Friends in this country, arising from the opposition of the 'body,' to the A. S. action of some of its members, more regard for consistency and truth, than for the forms of order—more concern for the promotion of the great cause of justice and mercy, than for the preservation of the external bonds of union, such a correspondence is, perhaps, as undesirable to us as it is to you. Still, as your Yearly Meeting has thought fit to issue an Address to us—though still refusing to recognize us as brethren—advising us to discontinue our meetings for worship, and to attend those of the 'body,' and has sent over a deputation to present the Address, and to urge a compliance with the advice; we believe ourselves called upon, even by a regard for common courtesy, and a decent respect for civility, as well as justice to ourselves, to the Truth which we advocate, and for the information of all concerned, to make a brief reply to the Address, in a respectful manner, and with feelings of due regard, declining to comply with the Advice. And while we believe ourselves thus bound to submit to your consideration some of the reasons which impel us to this course, we think we have a just claim to a patient and impartial hearing before that body from which the Advice issued.

“ We do not desire now to rehearse the particulars of the difficulty which resulted in the establishment of our Yearly Meeting. The most important facts have been presented to your Yearly Meeting, which it has refused to hear, choosing to make up a judgment in our case merely from the statements of our opposers, and from the simple fact, that we had set up separate and independent meetings. Thus, by refusing to inquire into, or even hear our reasons for the measure, and at the same time virtually passing sentence of condemnation upon us, by refusing to correspond with us, and advising us to discontinue our meetings; your Yearly Meeting has practically recognized (however you may discard it in theory), the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, or else

that equally absurd and dangerous position, that, no matter how corrupt and oppressive the Church may become, those members who desire to have it otherwise, are bound to submit to the corrupt and anti-christian measures of the dominant party, to preserve the external forms of order and the appearance of harmony. We believe there is no possibility of escape from this dilemma, for a departure from the usual order in the establishment of meetings, instead of the merits of the controversy, is made the grounds of the judgment of your Yearly Meeting.

“ This doctrine of implicit, unconditional, and unqualified submission to the powers that be, in religious Society, which is so prevalent among Friends, both in this country and in England, is a most conclusive evidence of a lamentable defection from first principles. All ecclesiastical history testifies to the fact, that in proportion to the corruptions of the Church, have been its claims to infallibility, and to a blind submission to the decrees of its dignitaries.

“ To assume that the references which your Yearly Meeting have made to passages of Scripture, to enforce the duty of submission to one another, are applicable in the present case, is to take for granted the very thing in controversy, that is, that the requirements of Indiana Yearly Meeting were in accordance with truth, and which London Yearly Meeting has refused to investigate. That it is our duty to submit ourselves one to another in love, in the truth, and in the fear of God, we freely admit; but not in error and in the fear of man; for the fear of man bringeth a snare.

“ The exhortation, to submit ourselves one to another in love, no more requires a surrender of our own consciences into the keeping of the rulers of the church, than the requirement to be subject to the powers that be, puts us under an obligation to surrender them to the wicked rulers of the State. It is all a perversion, and so far as the doctrine in question has obtained a hold among those with whom we were formerly associated, we feel

bound to say to our London Friends, that they are mistaken in supposing, that on fundamental doctrine there is no essential difference between us. We regard the doctrine of individual responsibility and accountability to be one of vital importance, and that the difference between us and those who contend for implicit obedience to the mandates of the Church, however contrary they may be to our conscientious convictions of duty, is essential; and we can have no fellowship with the sentiment repeatedly put forth by members of the London deputation, that no conceivable circumstances can justify a separation from the 'body.'

“But independently of the foregoing considerations, there are other circumstances which dictate to us the propriety of declining a compliance with the advice. We would briefly state that in pursuing the course which brought upon us the displeasure of our fellow-members, and placed us under the necessity of occupying our present position, we were greatly encouraged by the example of our English brethren, and by the advice of your Yearly Meeting, in 1830, to unite with our fellow-countrymen in the promotion of this and other benevolent enterprises. This advice we were very ready to comply with; not because of your word, but because we heard and felt for ourselves that it was in accordance with the dictates of Truth. And now, we can not see the propriety of giving up our own views of required duty, in consequence of your *recent* advice; neither can we see the justice of your course in virtually censuring us for imitating your example, and following your advice, while you cling to and effectually justify those who have rejected that advice, and presented a most formidable opposition to the advancement of the Anti-Slavery enterprise. No religious society, in this country, we confidently believe, has exerted a greater influence adverse to its advancement than the Society of Friends. Its former Anti-Slavery character, and the fact of its being clear of slaveholding, gave it the power of exerting a greater influence for or against the cause, than any other society of equal

numbers; and that influence, as is well known, has been exerted, either by manifesting an apathy of feeling toward it, or by active opposition to it and to those who are laboring therein. But we forbear to enlarge upon this topic; and dismiss it with the observation, that the conduct of London Yearly Meeting and of its deputation is calculated to uphold the Friends in this country in their opposition to the labors of the Abolitionists, in adhering to a Pro-Slavery political party, and in voting for slaveholders. We cannot consent to act in accordance with the advice contained in the Address and urged by the committee, because it would be a surrender of our just rights; and it would be to deprive ourselves of the inestimable privileges which we now enjoy of religious fellowship with one another in the bonds of gospel unity.

“We cannot comply with the advice, because it would be a virtual acknowledgment that our Anti-Slavery principles and views were all wrong, and must lead to an abandonment of them; which would, as we conceive, work infinite damage to the blessed cause, by operating as a discouragement to our fellow-laborers.

“And, finally, we cannot comply with the advice, because we believe it would bring disgrace upon the Christian name, by giving an additional evidence that the ‘American Churches are the bulwarks of American Slavery.’

“We wish to say, before we conclude, that we fully believe there are many members of London Yearly Meeting, who deeply sympathize with us, who have no unity with the attempt to destroy our religious society, and who did not fully understand the course of labor prescribed for the committee by the Yearly Meeting, as they themselves explain it. This opinion is confirmed by the frequent expression by some of our truly sympathizing Friends of a hope that a proper reconciliation would be effected by the labors of the deputation. This hope they could not have entertained had they understood that no other attempt was to be made than to annihilate our religious society, and to justify the proceedings of our opposers.

“To those of your Friends, who have some just conceptions of the true state of the case, we beg leave to say, the responsibility that rests upon you is great, and we pray that you may be enabled faithfully to discharge your duty in the sight of God.

“Unless we shall become convinced that Slavery is not that great evil which we have long believed it to be, we should consider ourselves traitors to the cause of Truth, which we believe ourselves called to advocate, were we to accede to the advice of your Yearly Meeting and its committee. And should the labors of that committee prove effectual in the accomplishment of their designs, we have no doubt but the damage done to the Anti-Slavery cause would be incalculable. But, thanks be to Him, who controls the elements, we believe their course has had a powerful tendency to strengthen the minds of Anti-Slavery Friends generally, in the confidence of the rectitude of our position.

“And now, in coming to a conclusion, permit us to state, that with our present convictions of duty, we can not look towards a re-union with those whom we have left, upon any other terms than a total recantation of all their proscriptive measures, and an unconditional restoration to all the rights and privileges which we formerly enjoyed in the Society, with unrestrained liberty to pursue our Anti-Slavery labors according to the dictates of our own consciences; being responsible to the Church only for violations of the Discipline. We shall rejoice to hail such a proposition, made in good faith, and upon a thorough conviction of its propriety, by our Friends of Indiana Yearly Meeting.

“Signed by direction and on behalf of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, held Second month 28th, 1846.

“BENJAMIN STANTON, *Clerk.*”



