

American Anti-Slavery Society.

Address of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the Abolitionists of the United States.

In laying the following statement before our brethren, we obey an instruction of the Society we represent, and the dictates of our own judgment. There are moments in human history, which are embryo ages. Of such a moment we have to speak, in relation to the future fortunes of the anti-slavery enterprise in this country. It is fit, then, that the fust communication be had, and the maturest councils adopted at this stage of our affairs.

The occasion embraced by a considerable minority, of retiring from our ranks at the late Annual Meeting, and forming a separate National Anti-Slavery Society, was the appointment of a woman, a member of the Society, and a delegate to that meeting, on the Business Committee. No objection was made to the votes of women, nor to their performance of other duties and their exercise of other rights of membership. They might create a committee, instruct it, sanction or reject its report, recommend, amend or propose and adopt a substitute; in a word, they might, by the admission of the minority, be the masters, but in no case the servants of the Society; for it is a principle of parliamentary law, that a committee is a mere agent of the House. And if the Society should choose to resolve itself into a committee of the whole, for the sake of convenience and freedom of debate, women, according to this view, should be turned out of their seats and go home, or retire, as strangers, to the gallery, until the Committee should rise, and then they would reclaim their seats, and sit in judgment on the doings of the men. But it would be tedious, if not trifling, to run this notion into all its legitimate absurdities.

Against the above-mentioned appointment, the disaffected made a firm stand; and being defeated by a decisive majority, they withdrew and entered into 'new organization.'

Surely this is narrow ground for a National Association to found itself upon. Had they objected to the recognition of women as members, or to their exercising any of the rights, or performing any duty appertaining to membership, they would have been less inconsistent, though not less incorrect. So far, however, from opposing their voting, the separatists repeatedly pressed them in open meeting so to do, provided they would vote on their side. Thus they practically contradicted all that they had said about the impropriety of women's acting 'in mixed meetings,' its repugnance to the Constitution and to the precept of the apostle Paul.

But as this was the immediate ground of summoning the Convention to form the 'American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' it is proper to state all the reasons assigned to sustain it. They were:

- 1. That the appointment of a woman on a committee was contrary to the Constitution of the Society, inasmuch as the word 'person' in that instrument, signified men only; that this was the usual way of construing it in such connection, and that it had been uniformly so understood in this Society.
2. That it was throwing a firebrand into the Society.
3. That it was contrary to the usages of the civilized world.
4. That it was unscriptural.

To these objections it was replied— 1. The 4th article of the Constitution has determined the qualifications for membership in the words following, to wit:

'Any person who consents to the principles of the Constitution, who contributes to the funds of the Society, and is not a slaveholder, may be a member of the Society, and shall be entitled to vote at its meetings.'

Under this article women have become members. It was now proposed to divest them of the rights and privileges they had acquired by consenting to the principles of the Constitution, and contributing to the funds of the Society. And this upon the bare assertion, that the term 'person,' as here used, meant men and excluded women. Not an instance of such limitation of the term, on an actual claim of a woman to enjoy the rights of a member in a society to which she belonged, was adduced. Reference was only made to what benevolent societies have done, or rather have not done, when no such case was before them. As soon as the question arose in our Society, it was decided against those who now appealed to precedent.

The member who took the lead in making this objection afterwards called the Convention for forming the new society, and acted as President of it. In answer to him, it was observed that he had admitted, but he had been very active and ingenious in devising ways of rescuing runaway slaves from the pursuit of their masters. The Constitution of the United States provides that a 'person held to labor or service in one State, escaping into another, shall be delivered up on the claim of the party to whom such service or labor is due.' Now, did it ever occur to him to resist the surrender of a female fugitive from slavery on the ground that 'person' did not mean women? To this, that gentleman or his conditors did not attempt to reply. It may be further remarked, though it may seem unnecessary in a matter so self-evident, that any pretension in derogation of general right must be so clearly ascertained and established as to leave no doubt on the subject. Thus, in excluding colored men from serving in the militia and mail departments, the laws of the United States declare that none but 'free white male citizens,' or 'free white persons,' shall be employed or enrolled. Congress were well aware that if they did not use the term 'white male citizens,' negroes, mulattoes, slaves, and women would be enrolled in the militia; and if they did not use the term 'free white persons,' negroes, &c., would be employed in carrying the mails. It had been stated at the previous Annual Meeting that, under the Constitution of New Jersey, provided in 1776, securing the right of suffrage to all inhabitants of full age and possessed of a certain amount of property, women were held to possess that right, and did exercise it whenever they claimed so to do. To these and other like arguments no reply was made; and none can be made. It was well observed by the venerable Seth Sprague, of Massachusetts, that to exclude women under this provision, was as absurd as it would be to exclude bachelors, and to say that none but married men were intended by the Constitution to act in the Society. In a word, the pretence that negroes are not men, the most constant and virulent of all the pro-slavery slang, has never received more countenance than it would have done if this narrow and unnatural attempt to disfranchise and degrade a portion of its members, had been sanctioned by the Society.

Such is the 'head and front of our offending.' In relation to what is called 'the woman's rights question,' the American Anti-Slavery Society has, and has had, nothing to do. It maintains the rights of neither men nor women, except as defined and settled in its own Constitution.

So sensible were the separatists that the term 'person' had, and could have no less extent than we have attributed to it, that they have taken it for granted that women will become members of their new society in whose constitution the term is used in the same way, and in order to exclude them from exercising any of the rights of members, they have disqualified all members, as such, from participating in meetings for the transaction of business, and have limited the right of speaking and acting, 'to the officers, and such other men as may be sent as delegates; a provision more repugnant to the principles of abolitionism, can scarcely be imagined. There is sufficient arbitrariness in the principle of this arrangement to justify any usurpation, even that master one over the liberty, the person and property of the slave.

In another article the new society benignantly invites women to form societies, and provides for their representation by delegates. One would naturally suppose that this means such delegates as they may choose, and of course delegates who are members of their own body, but another clause provides that this representation shall be subject to the limitation in the 8th article, which confines the exercise of the rights of membership 'to the officers, and such other men as may be sent as delegates.' Thus we learn indirectly by comparing the two articles and making an inference from both, that women's societies, if any should be formed under this kind and liberal provision, must choose males, of course strangers to their society, for their representatives in this christian sanhedrin. Hence arises a new solecism, that the attorney is clothed with power, which the constituents do not possess and never can possess, and cannot, therefore, according to any known principle, impart. To such unhappy and preposterous devices may one false step ultimately lead.

On the general question of women's rights, which the separatists perversely persist in confounding with the question of their constitutional powers and duties as members of this society, we would observe

that there is not, so far as we are informed, one in a hundred of this, or any Anti-Slavery body in the country, who is not either indifferent or positively opposed to the views said to be entertained by individuals in and out of the Anti-Slavery societies. We declare unhesitatingly that all representations to the contrary of this are untrue, and, tending as they do, to excite against this and kindred societies increased popular odium and new persecution, they must in all candor and moderation be pronounced calumnious. It is our duty to the cause and to our constituents to nail this counterfeit, which has been so extensively circulated. As Abolitionists we meddle not with the theories of men or women, friends or foes on this subject, and we have no right to be so any more than we have to regulate the relation betwixt husband and wife, or parent and child. Those opinions, whatsoever they may be, are just as inviolable to this society as the peculiar religious views of its members. He who believes women to be in every respect equal to men and entitled to a perfect equality of rights and privileges, and he who believes her to be in every respect inferior, is entitled to stand without fear and without reproach upon the American Anti-Slavery platform. And may Heaven avert the day when we shall push from it any true friend of our great and catholic enterprise, an enterprise beset with so many difficulties and discouragements, as to demand all the aid which can be derived from every human being, who has a heart to feel for human woe.

2. To the second reason of the separatists it was answered that slavery was agreeable to the usages of the civilized world, and from this fact slaveholders derive a favorite and stereotyped argument against all the principles and operations of Abolitionists.

3. To the third reason it was answered, that if women had powers and duties under our constitution, and they came here claiming to exercise those powers and perform those duties, those who attempted to wrest from them their constitutional privileges, not those who defended them, were chargeable with throwing a firebrand into the society. Let them cease their assaults upon the rights of their associates and upon the constitution, and there would be no lower fire-brands or heart-burnings amongst us.

4. The scriptural objection was not insisted on by the separatists, nor alluded to by any of the leaders of the party at the late annual meeting. But inasmuch as great use has been made of it, and may be hereafter on other occasions, we deem it proper not to pass it by without notice.

The religious obligations of the members of this society are matters within the exclusive cognizance of their own consciences. It is enough for the society that it was not constituted to adjudicate upon the soundness of Christian creeds, or to compel conformity of faith among its members on disputed points of theology.

The texts relied on by the separatists when they attempt to make any thing of this theme are the following: 'Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak;' 'And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.' In another epistle St. Paul enjoins more generally that women shall not 'teach.' The apostle was impressed by education and custom with the importance of the Jewish method of managing women, methods still in practice among Asiatic tribes. He frequently descends to minute details on this subject, which it is presumed that the most heresy-hunting disposition would not enforce upon members of an Anti-Slavery Society, nor of their own families. Thus he directs women not to wear ornaments of 'gold or pearl,' nor to pray or prophesy without having their heads either veiled or shorn. The discrepancy of the implication here that women did pray and prophesy in public, with the argument with which we are dealing, is too obvious to require comment. Could they prophesy without speaking? Besides, prophet in scripture often means merely a speaker. 'And Moses said, O Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant: and the Lord said, Is not Aaron, the Levite, thy brother? I know that he can speak well.' 'He shall be thy spokesman.' 'Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet.' 'Aaron, thy brother, shall speak unto Pharaoh that he send the children of Israel out of the land.'

In the early history of the Puritans in Massachusetts, we have a notable instance of the rulers and elders undertaking to compel women to observe certain of the oriental regulations respecting apparel. They disciplined women for coming to church unveiled. They said the apostle had prohibited that practice; and among the arguments to show the reasonableness and necessity of the rule, they said thoughts from religious subjects. But the rulers and elders, with that famous compeller of conformity, Governor Endicot at their head, failed in their crusade for the veils.

Several religious sects in this country allow and encourage women to speak in their public meetings, and a majority of Sunday school and other teachers throughout are women. But really we feel that such objections are too trifling to occupy the attention of Abolitionists. It is enough for us that the jealous and despotic restraints of Jewish and Turkish females are not incorporated into our constitution, and the Anti-Slavery societies have repeatedly, and with wonderful gravity, considering the ridiculous nature of the proposition, refused to engraft them by a forced construction.

We have now noticed the only reasons offered by the separatists in the late annual meeting in justification of their course. But in their address 'to the Friends of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States and the world,' they state another ground which they declare to be the 'chief' matter of difference, though by circumstances it was made less on the occasion above mentioned.

They set out with saying that the same persons, belonging to the anti-slavery ranks, (meaning the entire American Anti-Slavery Society,) who are contending for women's rights—the civil and political equality of women with men, deny the obligation of forming, supporting or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the duty of political action.

Assuming that they have already fixed upon the American Anti-Slavery Society, and some of its most useful and active auxiliaries, the charge of being 'women's rights' societies; and intimating, moreover, that this description of our Society is quoted from our own language, they proceed to charge us with refusing to affirm the duty of 'political action,' and thus departing from the constitution, which they say 'recognises the lawfulness of human government,' and establishes 'as a fundamental principle that political action is both expedient and proper.'

We need not here enter into a dispute as to the meaning of the constitution on these points, for there is no practical difference of such importance between this Society and the separatists in relation thereto. Neither this nor any body of abolitionists, of which we have any knowledge, discourages or disapproves political action. Individuals differ in opinion as to the best mode of political action, as whether, for example, it be expedient to turn our societies in electioneering clubs, and our meetings into caucuses; but that any anti-slavery society opposes political action in general, or has not, on the contrary, undertaken and pursued it in some form with unsparing zeal, untiring vigor, and beneficial results, is a false and wicked misrepresentation. The assertion, however, is as consistent with veracity, as the one that we are a 'woman's rights society.' All that we have refrained from doing has been and is, to compel by public admonition and censures, unanimity in the choice of the manner and instruments of political action.

We know no abolitionist who objects to petitioning, and in that way they recognize civil government, even as the separatists demand. The charge, sifted of circumlocution and false coloring, amounts simply to this,—that we refuse to dictate to abolitionists on the subject of politics, as we have on the interpretation of scripture. Such attempts could not fail to disgust our free spirited associates, sow discord as they have, and ultimately break our fraternal phalanx in pieces.

It is a striking commentary on the sincerity of the charge against us, on the score of political action, that the separatists, in forming their new organization, have not adopted any test of politico-abolition orthodoxy. They disclaim, 'as a society,' the machinery of party political arrangements, and 'leave that for the action of individual citizens.' Here, then, for aught that our optics can discern, we are perfectly agreed. This is precisely what we have always said in the most explicit terms.

In fact, we have been informed, although the debates in their Convention have not been published, nor the original draft of the Constitution, nor the amendments proposed and adopted or rejected, where-

\* 1 Cor. 14. + 1 Cor. 14, 35. § See the speech of the Rev. Mr. Ludlow, at the late annual meeting of the Connecticut Anti-Slavery Society. † 1 Tim. ii. 12.

by we should have some clue to the real state of opinion among them on the pretended difference betwixt us; yet we may state, as matter of public report, during the sittings of the Convention, that a political test was attempted, and gave rise in their own body to dissensions so alarming, that it was deemed prudent to give it the go-by, laying it on the table, where it still lies. Their Constitution, however, does enjoin, as a duty, the exercise of political power in behalf of the slave, and goes on to enumerate specific modes of exercising it. And what are these? Take their own words: 'That the legislative action of governments should be invoked to abolish slavery and the slave trade: for the enfranchisement of the free people of color; and to restrain the lawless from violating the rights of others.' Now, what does all this amount to? Simply to this that new organizations ought to petition. All this amplification means no more.

It is a principle of interpretation in all legal instruments, constitutions and compacts, that by an enumeration of particulars under a general principle, the application of that principle is limited to the enumerated particulars. The duty of petition is therefore the whole duty of political action, which the new Society has enjoined!

And was it for this cause, 'chiefly'; was it to enjoin a duty which every anti-slavery society, and every anti-slavery man and woman in the country, so far as we know and believe, have performed, year in and year out, for the last five years, that they have rent our abolition fraternity in twain? Was it for this that they sought to destroy it?

We do not find in the Address, the Constitution or resolutions of our disaffected brethren, a syllable on the duty of voting for friends of the slave at the polls. Is this, then, the result of the war, open and in disguise, which has been waged for two years upon particular abolitionists and societies, because the former had conscientious doubts about the propriety of voting at all, and the latter refused to mathematize them for their doubts? And with what grace or decency can the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Society continue to assail the American Anti-Slavery Society and its auxiliaries, for refusing to affirm the duty of political action, when they have, on this point, openly abandoned every thing distinctive in practice between us and themselves?

We might, perhaps, content ourselves with having exposed this abandonment, on the part of the separatists, of the great ground of their defection in that act, wherein, if sincere, they would have brought it forward with peculiar alacrity and emphasis; and failing to establish it, would have refused to pursue the formation of a new Society, and have returned to the old. To show, however, the injustice and folly of past assumptions on this subject, and to prevent a recurrence of the error, we will state what we believe to be the true intent and meaning of the clauses of the Constitution of our Society, which speak of 'influencing Congress in a constitutional way,' and of 'doing all that is lawfully in our power, to bring about the abolition of slavery.' These expressions occur in the preamble and second article, and we think a misconstruction of them has been the means of lending countenance and support to the old assumptions of the separatists on the subject of political action.

Laws are of two kinds, those which command, and those which prohibit something. The clauses above recited clearly belong to the latter class. Their meaning is not that we should do everything which is lawful or constitutional, but that we should do nothing unlawful or unconstitutional. They are simply restraining causes which enjoin nothing, but prohibit something.

At the time the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed, there was much jealousy and misrepresentation in the country in respect to the character and designs of the new Abolition Associations. In order to remove honest doubts, and all pretences of the ill-disposed, it was deemed expedient to insert in the Constitution several pledges, that in no case would we do ourselves, or encourage others to do aught against the constitutions and laws of the land. Hence the adoption of the provisions in question not to impose any positive duty upon the Society or its members, but simply to assure the country that we would undertake or approve nothing contrary to our duty as citizens and subjects of the laws.

If the meaning be that we are to do every thing that is constitutional and lawful, then to say nothing of the physical impossibility, for it would require the hands of Briareus,) the question so often put tauntingly and foolishly by our enemies, may be justly pressed home upon our disaffected friends; 'why do you not go to the South?' It is both consistent and expedient, for the sake of our brethren, to deliver anti-slavery lectures and distribute our tracts. If it be said that this is forbidden by the State laws, we answer that it is not forbidden in all the slave States, nor is it forbidden in respect to the masters and whites in any of them. It is only with the slaves that it is unlawful to communicate.

It is constitutional and lawful to live on the coarsest fare, to be clad in the coarsest raiment, to sleep but four out of twenty-four hours, as thousands of slaves are compelled to do, to journey on foot, beg our food, and bestow all our income and our economies, in enlightening the masters and releasing the slaves. Above all, it is lawful to abstain from slave labor produce. But will any man maintain that our constitution enjoins these as imperative duties, merely because we have pledged ourselves in that instrument, that all the means we shall use shall be lawful? The constitution and laws permit us to seek martyrdom at any moment in the cause, and we should like to know how a disaffected brother who holds to this absurd construction of our constitution could reply to the question, 'why don't you go and be lynched?' He would say, perhaps, that we are bound by laws higher than human to preserve our lives and employ them in this and every good work until the providence of God shall call us from our labor. Then we answer that this is surrendering the whole question, for those of our brethren who refuse to give or receive votes at political elections, do so expressly on the ground that these acts would contravene the laws of God. It is no part of our duty to pronounce judgment upon the truth or sincerity of such professions. 'Let every one be persuaded in his own mind.' 'To his own master he standeth or falleth.'

We repeat, therefore, that the provisions in question are restraining and negative, not positive and enjoining, and we must presume that the separatists either had no settled ideas about them, or that they regarded them in the same light. Otherwise they would not, in forming their new constitution, have limited themselves to declaring only one mode of political action a duty. They allege, as the general ground of their dissatisfaction with this society, that it does not in practice carry out the principles of its constitution. Now why have they not carried out those principles, as they have interpreted them and attempted to obtrude their interpretation upon others? Is one mode of political action, the subscribing of a petition, all the political action which the constitution and laws permit? In establishing and enjoining this one mode, we think they are chargeable with gross inconsistency, for if it be a duty of abolitionists to exercise in all cases the inferior right of petition, much more is it their duty to exercise the higher and more effective right of the elective franchise. The explanation of this incongruity we suppose to be this: The 'new organization' felt that after making it a subject of grave and clamorous accusation against this society, that it refused to affirm the duty of political action, (the italics are theirs) they could not decently omit it wholly themselves, but they found even in their own body such a variety of sentiment and such an inconvenient spirit of freedom and of inquiry, that it was impossible to extend such a declaration beyond one and the lowest form or political action, because on that all happen at this time to be practically agreed; and therefore were not disposed to make it a matter of theoretical dispute, where so much matter of dispute was already on their hands.

It has been seen that the separatists hesitate not to stigmatize this society as a 'woman's rights' and 'non-resistant' society, to charge us with new 'sectarian views' because we believe women to be 'persons,' with 'sanctioning principles evidently foreign to any thing set forth in our constitution,' 'glorifying men of like passions with ourselves,' 'disappointing the confidence reposed in our 'integrity,' and much of the like. Yet they pray that 'it may not be imagined that their society has any desire to wage war upon any other association. Far from it. It has been (they continue) a source of grief to the true friends of the slave, and of exultation to the enemies of human rights, to see a denunciatory spirit towards brethren engaged in the sublime cause of emancipation.' Yet they call this whole society 'woman's rights,' and 'no-government men,' and 'non-resistant,' contrary to the repeated disclaimers of a belief, or even knowledge of the theories designated by those phrases; and having so denominated us, they charge the whole class with inflicting 'wounds with the tongue and pen as really as they would do with any other

weapons.' This, we suppose, is no war—this is kindness and conciliation! The very worst of all wars, is war in disguise, war which comes with the smile of peace. But we cherish no hostility towards our disaffected brethren.

There is something ingenious in the affected imputation upon our 'integrity.' To set up certain opinions and requirements of their own as a standard of truth and duty, and then to impeach the integrity of all those who do not come up to it. The Arabs, no doubt, think a man must be a great villain who will not suffer himself to be quietly stripped of his shirt and shoes. The military

caused it to be declared to President Jefferson or France the Emperor expected it from the candor and dignity of the government of the union that all commerce should cease with the Haytiens, that race of African slaves, the reproach and refuse of nature! The American government, with a slaveholder at its head, and, as usual, a pro-slavery party in power, hastened to respond to the Emperor's position, 'candor and dignity,' and passed 'an act suspending all commercial intercourse' with those parts of Hayti in possession of the heroic 'refuse of nature.' We suppose that we might with equal credit to ourselves prove to the separatists our 'integrity.'

The charge against this Society, which the separatists appear to deem next in importance to non-governmentism and womanism, relates to the manner and circumstances of the assembly of the late annual meeting. In their chargin at the result of that all that contributed to it. We wonder that they have not found fault with the sunshine and the wind. Three several times in their short manifesto they bring forward the accusation that the majority of this society at the late meeting was 'a packed delegation,' and they repeatedly assert that it was only in a packed meeting that their own views did not find favor and support. Packed is a term derived from the gaming table, and it implies secret shuffling and fraudulent management to obtain unjust advantage. This is an accusation which we think the separatists will yet regret. How were the facts?

The friends of abolitionism in its original largeness and purity, were called upon openly for weeks and months to come to the rescue of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the integrity of which was periled by the untoward proceedings of sectarians and politicians holding its helm. At this call a vast and girded themselves about, filled with indomitable zeal and some indignation. Was this fraudulent, was this corrupt; or was it the true and bright metal of American abolitionism? Had there been less life, had not the principles of their great cause quickened and pervaded their whole moral being, they would have remained at home earning and saving, instead of spending money. A steambath was chartered by members of the Massachusetts society, and there was indeed a good deal of packing on board of that craft. But we look upon her as we do upon the Mayflower. One motive of this measure was to secure accommodations to colored brothers and sisters, who are still subject to dangerous exposure and mortifying indignities on board of ordinary passenger boats.

Such was 'the packing' of which the majority at the late annual meeting stand indicted, and which the separatists state for the third time in the following words.

'The same persons belonging to the Anti-Slavery ranks, who are contending, for what they call women's rights, the civil and political equality of women with men, deny the obligation of forming, supporting, or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the duty of political action; and they continued to bring to the late annual meeting a sufficient number of men and women to compose a majority of all the members present, to sustain their views and measures. Of the whole number present this year four hundred and sixty-four were from the single State of Massachusetts. Styling themselves, 'non-resistant,' and professing to be opposed to all physical force either of offence or defence, but not disclaiming in their practice the use of the tongue and pen as weapons—weapons that often inflict wounds as really as any other weapons could do—with which to assail those who are for maintaining the primitive objects of the society, they seem determined to carry forward their favorite theories and practices at all events, even if the great moral enterprise in which they and we originally embarked should retrograde, and be justly offensive to those who might otherwise join the anti-slavery ranks and help on the cause of impartial liberty to a glorious consummation.'

That four hundred and sixty-four should have come from Massachusetts, from which have sprung most of the reforms and improvements of this nation, and a good share of those of the age, we regard as one of the best omens to the cause, as the best living testimony to the soundness of our principles. 'But four hundred and sixty-four' was the entire attendance from that State, and so many of them as constituted a majority or nearly so on the test question came as friends of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, or New Organization, so called, and of the late Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The number of these has been variously estimated at one hundred and upwards. It was certainly not less than that number. And yet the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society are so reckless of accuracy, as to represent the entire attendance of four hundred and sixty-four as the result of the great 'contriving and packing' system of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society and a majority of this Society. But this was not enough; they seem to have been led on by an unaccountable inclination to distil a little antidote along with poison; for they say, 'styling themselves non-resistant,' &c. what, the whole, new organizationists and all? But waving this point, who does not see the evident falsity of asserting that the whole of the friends and supporters of the Massachusetts and American Anti-Slavery Societies from that State 'style themselves non-resistant?' Whatever they or we may be every body knows that neither have avowed the name or principles of non-resistant.

There can be no excuse for such disingenuousness as this. There could be no motive for it, but to excite new odium and new persecutions against those they still call brothers.

And does the respected President of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society suppose that converts are to be made, the disaffected strengthened and the people taken by such tales? But they serve to show the fallacious and head-strong spirit which prevailed in the formation of that Society, and this the disaffected will find is about all the bearing it will have on us or them.

But we must not dismiss the subject of packing yet. We certainly have no objection to summoning the friends of a cause in any and every fair way to its support. We find no fault with circulars, however earnest, provided they tell the truth. But a circular has been put into our hands by a person in New Jersey, to whom it was addressed, which we do think objectionable. This document after repeating the stale and oft refuted calumnies against our Massachusetts brethren, called upon all persons who should receive it, to come to the rescue of the late Executive Committee; and distinctly proposed that if such person were not already a member of the American Anti-Slavery Society, that he should make himself so at the meeting for the very purpose of controlling its proceedings, and for no other. We are authorized in making this conclusion by the fact that in stating in this connexion the conditions of membership, the document declared that consenting to the principles of the Constitution was the only condition, leaving out that of 'contributing to the funds of the Society,' and thus showing a consciousness of a design to bring into the meeting members, persons who did not feel interest enough in the cause to contribute a shilling to it. How many such recruits there were to whom the interests of our sacred cause were for a day subordinated, it is impossible now to determine. Doubtless some of the votes given were by persons thus introduced by stealth; but the yeas and nays were not taken, and if they had been there was no book of accounts, or records at the meeting, to enable us to ascertain whether individuals voting, were legitimate members or not. Thus we see that while old, faithful and self-sacrificing members were to be deprived of their votes and other rights as members, individuals were surreptitiously employed to usurp those rights for the very purpose of wresting them from those to whom they have constitutionally belonged from the foundation of the Society!

This circular was issued by the New-York City Society.

'One of the opposition had the hardihood to charge the majority with 'packing' in open session of the Society, whereupon the editor of the Emancipator, and for some years previous, the Recording Secretary of the American Society,' remarked to a friend, 'I don't think there's any room for us to talk about that.' Another gentleman on the same side, however,

\* Joshua Leavitt.

requested a friend of this Society to observe, that  
he said nothing about packing.'

We can inform the disaffected of the true secret  
of packing a meeting. It is to be right, and to  
maintain the right with honest zeal and single-  
mindedness. Then human hearts are touched, then  
answers deep to deep; and then

'From cliff to cliff leap the live thunders.'

[To be concluded next week.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.