

(Private)

Anti-Slavery Office  
Phil<sup>a</sup> Nov 25  
1860.

162

My dear Garrison

in reply, dear Garrison, will much oblige you

I am looking forward with some anxiety to the Convention called by J. P. Estlin & others, to meet in your city next week. Most of the papers to the Call are strange to me, and all of them, as I hear from their own statement to be "very men". The avowed object of the meeting is laudable, and there may be nothing in its proceedings to distinguish it <sup>essentially</sup> from ordinary Anti-Slavery conventions; but as one or more of the papers are known to hold views that are peculiar as to the means of abolishing Slavery, it is not improbable that others sufficient to give character to the meeting and may be of the same opinions.

Now while I hold to the fullest freedom of speech and the

largest liberty of individual action,  
I should regret to see our special  
friends or our peculiar movement  
unnecessarily mixed up with  
measures of doubtful purpose.

I hail <sup>them</sup> with delight all access:  
was to the ranks of freedom &  
I glory in the zeal & strength of  
"young men", but I am a little  
little jealous of neophytes. Good  
intentions are very well as far  
as they go, but they are not a  
sufficient qualification for leadership  
in an enterprise like ours  
— especially at a conjuncture like  
the present.

Let public advocates "insure  
him" if they think that's the best  
way, but let them do it at their  
own charge and in the strength  
of their own reputation — not  
leaning even indirectly on another  
party — Republican or Federalist —  
while doing so.

Intervention will come from some  
way, God knows, without any  
stimulation, from impatient  
people at a distance. The slave  
holders seem bent on grading  
this business to the bloody  
work. The idea is appalling to  
me; but if there be any to whom  
the thought is pleasant, I  
would say "bide your time;  
we'll soon be gratified to  
the full." When it does come  
- or come I think it must -  
I should like it to be latent  
to all that it was the slave  
holders not the abolitionists  
that brought it on.

Some on the border are shown  
on the old platform of the Am.  
Society, that is broad  
deep, comprehensive and all  
sufficient in our judgment for  
the work before us. Standing  
on this platform we have main-  
tained a hand to hand fight  
with the enemy for 27 years;

and we are willing to ~~maintain~~  
endure the conflict to the bitter  
- or the glorious end, whichever  
it may be. The doctrine of this  
platform are such as we can  
live by or die by. "Other foundations  
can no man lay than that is laid."  
If other people insist upon  
building on your foundation - do  
you insist - that their foundation:  
will be such as will bear  
the fire. For to this ordeal it is  
probable, especially here in the  
border, our works will be subjected.

- We have to answer for your  
doings - and for your doings we  
are willing to answer; but don't  
set them in our man's way, mix  
ed up with other people's doings.  
"What do you mean" said a gentleman to  
me yesterday "by inviting Forester  
Packer to your Abolition Convention?  
You are fools to give such a man  
such a capital opportunity of  
frustrating you." "It was not we  
that did it -" was my reply. "It is  
not our way to invite such men  
in such terms to our assemblies."

Perhaps there is no call for their  
words of precaution. If so no harm will  
be done, as this spirit whenever you  
speak. But as I have felt to I have  
written, a word

in reply, dear Samm, will much oblige in the  
the  
em  
be  
be  
of  
me  
dis  
fla  
me  
how  
the  
is  
sup  
me  
of  
ful