








NARRATIVE
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MONTHLY MEETING OF NEW-YORK,
AND THEIR
SUBSEQUENT CONFIRMATION
BY THE
QUARTERLY AND YEARLY MEETINGS,
IN THE CASE OF
ISAAC T. HOPPER.

“ Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.”...JOB xvii. 8.

“ Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels and the worst of fallen men.”
WILLIAM PENN.

NEW-YORK:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.
M DCCC XLIII.



1857

NARRATIVE, &c.

THE arraignment and subsequent disownment of Charles Marriott, James S. Gibbons, and myself, by the Monthly Meeting of New-York, having given rise to much misrepresentation, and having also created considerable speculation and excitement in different parts of the country, I have thought it right to give a brief history of my case, and some facts connected with it. Upon much reflection, I have believed such a course is due to myself, and to the Society of Friends, with which I have been connected, and which I have sincerely loved from an early period of my life.

On the morning of the 29th of third month, 1841, I was called upon by Amos Willets, who requested me to meet the overseers of the Monthly Meeting of New-York on the evening of the same day, at Hester-street Meeting-house. My son-in-law James S. Gibbons, had received a similar request from another overseer. Charles Marriott was absent from the city. We met accordingly, and instead of finding the overseers of Hester-street Preparative Meeting merely, we were surprised to find assembled those of the other two Preparative Meetings, viz. Rose-street and Brooklyn. There were pre-

sent on this occasion, Amos Willets, Thomas Carpenter, and Stephen Valentine, of Hester-street; George T. Trimble, Robert Hicks, and Nathaniel S. Merritt, of Rose-street; and Richard Field and John Leggett, of Brooklyn. The interview lasted not quite an hour and a half.

The cause of our being thus arraigned was an article which had appeared in the "National Anti-Slavery Standard," of the 25th of the same month. The interview was wholly devoted to the ascertainment of the character and extent of our connection with that paper. They neither reasoned nor remonstrated with us—they did not advise us, nor did they give us any opinion in relation to the matter for which they had arraigned us. They agreed to take our cases to the Preparative Meeting before they separated, and the next morning, in less than fifteen hours after this interview, one half of which was probably spent in sleep, we were informed of their determination.

On the 1st day of fourth month, my case was accordingly taken to the Meeting. I was present. After a portion of the regular business had been attended to, Amos Willets remarked, that, as Isaac T. Hopper's case was to be introduced to the Meeting, he thought he had better withdraw. I remarked in reply that, until the case was introduced, I had the right to remain, and I should remain. Amos then observed, that such a course was unusual. I replied, in substance, that my course was not to be

governed by what others might have done, and that I should avail myself of the privilege granted by the Discipline. The clerk for the day then read as follows :—

“Isaac T. Hopper is charged with being concerned in the support and publication of a paper which has a tendency to excite discord and disunity among us.” After a short pause I rose, and, as nearly as I can remember, remarked as follows.

“I am growing to be an old man. Seventy winters have already passed over my head, and it is not likely that I shall see many more. I love the Society of Friends, and its principles, and its testimonies ; and particularly the doctrine of the Inward Light, which I have endeavoured to make the rule of my life, and which I can now say is the confidence and support of my declining years.

“I have been a diligent attender of our meetings for many years—I have felt a deep and abiding interest in the Society, and have honestly laboured for its welfare according to my ability. On the present occasion I can say—and I feel thankful that it is so—that I have no unkind feelings towards any one. I am also thankful that I can say with reverence, and in some degree of humility, I believe in the doctrine of Scripture: ‘If our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things ; but if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God.’ Having this confidence I fear no evil.”

I was now about to leave the meeting, when a friend said he wished to say a few words before I left. I observed to him that if he had any thing to say to me he had better do it privately, but if it was for the meeting, I did not wish to hear it. I then left the house. I was afterwards informed that he proposed that the meeting should return the case to the overseers, and appoint a committee to unite with them in re-considering the subject. This suggestion created considerable discussion, and occupied the meeting for about an hour and a half, and seemed likely to prevail, when Amos Willets and Thomas Carpenter, two of the overseers, said they should decline having any thing more to do with the case ; upon which it was ordered to be forwarded to the Monthly Meeting.

It is proper that I should here pause in my account of the proceedings of the Monthly Meeting, and refer to some facts and circumstances which have had a tendency to bring the Society in this city into its present difficulties.

The American Anti-Slavery Society was formed in the latter end of the year 1833. Many respectable persons joined it, and its influence was soon felt in the community, and in order to counteract their efforts, a meeting of the citizens was called by the following advertisement, which was published in the Journal of Commerce, on the 26th of eighth month, 1835 :—

PUBLIC MEETING.—The undersigned, citizens of New-York, having witnessed with regret the conduct of some imported travelling incendiaries, assisted in their attempts to create sectional jealousies by a few misguided native fanatics; and being anxious to prove that these individuals constitute but a very small portion of this community—to convince our Southern brethren that we are ever sincerely desirous to cultivate the most friendly and honourable intercourse with them—to disclaim and deprecate, in the most unqualified terms, any interference with their constitutional rights on the slave question, and to assure them that this city is decidedly hostile to the movements of the Abolition faction,—do hereby invite a public meeting of the citizens to be held at the City Hall, on Tuesday next, the 27th inst., at 4 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of adopting such resolutions on this subject as may be thought proper and expedient.

This call, than which it is difficult to conceive of any thing more inflammatory, was signed by many, among whom were several members of the Society of Friends, some of whom seemed to be much alarmed lest their business should suffer by their being identified with abolitionists. They seemed to have no scruples in joining with others in opposing the measures of the friends of human liberty, but they considered it very objectionable to mix with others in pleading for the oppressed. I have never

heard that those persons who signed the call were ever censured for the part they took in this matter.

This fear was not very remarkable when it is remembered, that many Friends were largely engaged in dealing in the produce of slave labour, and "by this craft have their wealth;" and some actually had business establishments in the South. It was not long before cautions were given in our meetings, particularly those for disciplinary purposes, against joining any associations, the members whereof were not of our religious communion. The Society was evidently losing ground in relation to its testimony against slavery. This being the case, some members felt it to be their duty to hold up this testimony more conspicuously and efficiently than it had been of latter time, and the subject was several times introduced to the attention of Friends in the Meeting for Sufferings, and the Yearly Meeting. An effort to bring the subject before these meetings was frequently attended with much excitement, and without any thing being done to advance the testimony.

Seeing that Friends as a body would not move forward in this concern, and being unwilling to interrupt the harmony of the Society, a few Friends met in this city, and formed an Anti-Slavery Society, which they called "The New-York Association of Friends, for the relief of those held in slavery, and the improvement of the free people of colour." This Association was confined solely to members of the Society. It moved on harmoniously within

itself, and while it afforded an opportunity for Friends to unite in its objects and purposes without mixing with those not members of the Society of Friends, it could give no just cause of offence to any. But we soon had evidence that could not be misunderstood, that it was no less offensive to many members of the Society, than the American Anti-Slavery Society. We were deprived of the privilege of holding our meetings in the Meeting-houses; and one Friend, in the station of a minister said, he would as soon go to the theatre as to attend any of the meetings of our Association. At another time, he said, that he would as lief a political meeting should be held in the Meeting-house, as that this Association should be permitted to meet in it.

The Anti-Slavery Societies were frequently alluded to in our public meetings in very harsh and offensive terms. Believing that many had joined these Societies from pure intentions, and that they acted from motives the most conscientious, I often felt it to be my duty to express my disapprobation of such attacks, as they appeared to me to be a gross infringement upon the civil and religious rights of a large body of excellent individuals; hence I soon found myself placed among the proscribed.

It soon became very evident that a determination existed in the minds of some members of the Society of Friends to discountenance, and, if possible,

to crush every effort to carry forward the testimony against slavery. An Anti-Abolition party soon exhibited itself arrayed for battle, and various kinds of contrivances were put in operation to accomplish their purposes. Measures were taken, not only to prevent individuals from bearing their testimony against the traffic in human flesh and blood, but no stone was suffered to remain unturned to dissuade those who had been faithful to their convictions of right and duty, to turn from their course and join the ranks of proscription and persecution.

These efforts were not without a degree of success. The character of the ministry soon gave evidence of a change of opinion and feeling in regard to the important testimony against slavery. One Friend residing in the neighbourhood of the city of New-York, who, though possessed of the gifts and qualifications of a minister in quite a moderate degree, yet had made herself useful and acceptable according to her measure, for several years advocated the cause of the oppressed in her public discourses; and would frequently advert to the example of Elias Hicks to give force and sanction to her sentiments. This individual attended a meeting for ministers and elders in the city of Philadelphia, a few years since, in which she bore her testimony against slavery in a most unqualified manner, and entreated her hearers with much apparent sincerity to embark with renewed energy in the righteous cause. She had considerable intercourse with those who were

zealously engaged in the Anti-Slavery cause, and earnestly pressed a distinguished Anti-Slavery lecturer, not a member of the Society of Friends, to visit her at her house, and encouraged him to persevere in his labours. This individual suddenly changed her opinions and conduct, and became, so far as her abilities and influence would admit, a most ardent opposer of the principles and cause which she had so zealously laboured to support. Instead of confining herself to the sphere which truth and nature had designed for her, the character of her once plain simple communications changed to what seemed to be laboured imitations of sermons which were likely to be popular, and which were fraught with virulent attacks upon the Anti-Slavery cause, and those engaged in it. The character of the ministry was thus ignobly disgraced and brought into contempt. This friend, it is presumed, claimed divine authority as her rule of action in these two contrariant courses of conduct. As she could not be right in both, there is no better way to decide the matter than to look at their respective fruits and their effects on the character and spirit of the individual.

The zeal against the cause of Emancipation grew warmer and warmer, and those who felt an interest and whose duty led them to use their endeavours to advance it, were denounced in our meetings for worship in epithets and anathemas the most vile and sarcastic, and which could alone proceed from

a bitter spirit, and could be sanctioned only by a depraved and vulgar taste. A minister of the New-York Monthly Meeting, whose course has rendered him somewhat conspicuous in the late agitation which has taken place in the Society, was in the frequent habit of indulging himself in this way. In his communications, he would frequently denounce the friends of human liberty as "servants of the devil," "vile emissaries of Satan," "howling wolves, too famished to bite," "contemptible reptiles," "household vermin," "too lazy to work, ashamed to beg, and *some of them* afraid to steal;" "that if they could, they would raise up out of their graves the dead bodies of the inhabitants of old Babylon and Sodom and Gomorrah, and receive them with open arms as worthy coadjutors in their works of popular righteousness." In addition to these disgraceful denunciations, which no well-regulated mind could hear in a religious meeting without disgust, there was much other indecent matter of a similar character. Views and sentiments were frequently uttered by the same individual highly injurious and immoral in their tendency, and of course wholly irrational and unscriptural, and at variance with the fundamental principles and opinions advocated by the Society of Friends from their first rise. This sort of preaching received the most unmingled approbation of a large number of the most active and influential members of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and was sanctioned

by them as the fruit of immediate divine inspiration. For, at this time, when this minister would ask for a minute to visit distant meetings, it was furnished to him, certifying that he was a minister in unity—the Meeting thus endorsing all the extravagant abuse and vituperation and fallacy alluded to. I am aware that with many persons who are situated beyond the limits of the agitation which has lately befallen our portion of the Society of Friends, it will be difficult to credit the statement, that such preaching would be tolerated by people making a religious profession; but the facts are too notorious to be denied. The friends of human liberty were not the only objects of this kind of intolerance, persecution and virulent abuse. Temperance Societies, and those professing the principles of non-resistance, were frequently included within the circle of defamation and detraction, and were alike the objects of ridicule, slander and misrepresentation. Statements were frequently made respecting these persons and their associations, which were as far from the truth as the spirit and disposition which dictated them were beneath the legitimate functions of a pure, enlightened, useful and dignified gospel ministry. Our religious meetings, instead of being seasons of quiet and useful meditation, affording means of spiritual refreshment, became arenas for exciting and violent communications, in which the most unprovoked insult, wholesale denunciation, abuse, irony, sarcasm, bitterness and misrepresentation

seemed to vie with each other for the pre-eminence. These meetings were attended by some, from long habit ; by others, because of a species of infatuation and man-worship admiration for the declaimer ; by others, whose consciences received quiet and rest from the palliations which were offered to sin and iniquity ; and by many whose curiosity was excited to witness for themselves, the extent to which these fallacies and abominations could be carried in a meeting of professing Friends.

This kind of preaching was continued for several years. It rarely happened that a meeting was suffered to pass over without the utterance of some of these opprobrious allusions ; many of which were frequently so pointed and personal, that it was readily understood to whom they were intended to apply. And it may easily be conceived how such a course of conduct was calculated to affect the usefulness of the Society and the harmony of its members.

So far as relates to myself, I may say, without meaning to assume undue credit, that I have learned so many lessons in the school of persecution and affliction, that I could patiently have borne these most unrighteous and unprovoked inflictions, though no one who felt an interest in the welfare of the Society of Friends, could be a witness of such disorder without fear and deep sorrow. It was evident that unless this current of evil could be repressed, much that was good in the Society would be lost in the whirlpool, which bitterness, untempered zeal,

wild and preposterous accusations, on the one hand, and supineness and disaffection on the other, would surely occasion. Here were large and unoffending bodies of individuals, time after time, made the objects of censure and false representation, in meetings which were open to all, and attended by a large number of persons. In the very nature of things, it could hardly be expected that no effort would be made by those who had thus been injured, to relieve themselves from the effects of the slander and injury heaped upon them. The Society of Friends are the last people who should expect from others a tame acquiescence under false accusations, not only in regard to principles, but facts and motives. If they will quietly permit their meetings to be thus prostituted, they are among the last who should look for an escape from correction and rebuke. Where *their* motives or principles have been the objects of misrepresentation or misconception on the part of others, where *they* have been vilified either by the pen or the tongue, or where the *pulpit* has been made subservient to the unhallowed design of falsehood and proscription, they have ever since their first organization been bold in the use of the tongue and the press, and have spared no effort to rescue themselves and their good name from the fangs of the reviler.

In consequence of some of the misrepresentations alluded to, a correspondence took place between O. Johnson and George F. White, the minister to

whom allusion has been made. This correspondence was long, and was published by the former in pamphlet form ; and as the excitement had by this time progressed to other portions of the Society, there was a most extensive demand for it. This circumstance alarmed and greatly excited the adherents of George F. White, as it placed matters in a position not at all creditable to the defamer. It elicited from Friends in different parts of the country severe animadversion. Two documents were issued from Ohio, severely censuring the spirit and conduct manifested by George F. White. One of these was signed by about fifty individuals.

The Monthly Meeting of Peru, in this State, issued the following Minute, addressed to the Monthly Meeting of New-York.

“ To New-York Monthly Meeting of Friends.

“DEAR FRIENDS.—This Meeting was dipped into a feeling and painful exercise by the introduction of a subject that appears to be fast spreading before the public, through the medium of various periodicals, as having transpired among you, and published to the world in a pamphlet, recently put out by Oliver Johnson, of the city of New-York, purporting to be a correspondence between himself and George F. White, a member of your Meeting, by which our Friend is presented to the public in a position, (considering his standing and well-known influence among us,) calculated to bring reproach

upon Society, unless speedily refuted if false, or disapproved if true.

“Which exercise, after a full and free expression of sentiment had been feelingly engaged in, resulted in a conclusion to transmit to you the foregoing address.

“With the salutation of love, we remain your Friends.

“Signed in and on behalf of Peru Monthly Meeting of Friends, in the State of New-York, the 29th of 4th mo. 1841.

“WILLETS KEESE, *Clerk.*”

When this document was read in the Meeting to which it was addressed, such was the hostility felt towards those who did not approve of the course pursued by the object of their adulation, that an elder proposed that it should be “thrown *under* the table.”

The “Correspondence” having had a very wide circulation, it became necessary, in the opinion of some of the members of New-York Monthly Meeting, to do something to save George F. White and his friends from the reproach which their conduct had brought upon them. To affect this purpose as far as it was possible, a letter was prepared in the city of New-York, which was signed by Robert Hicks, and addressed to a Friend in Ohio. This letter denies the correctness of the printed “Correspondence,” and says, in reference to it, that

there are many alterations, omissions and additions, but it did not specify what they were, nor has it ever been shown since. These assertions were incorrect, and there is no foundation for the statement. For a total disregard of truth, this letter, perhaps, stands unequalled by anything emanating from any individuals professing to be respectable. It was circulated through the country pretty extensively for about five months before we were able to procure a copy of it. As soon as a copy was obtained, it was published in the National Anti-Slavery Standard, and its many misstatements and perversions exposed and refuted. In this letter, it is insinuated that, although Oliver Johnson is ostensibly so, yet James S. Gibbons and myself are the real authors of the "Correspondence;" and it is further said, that it is not doubted that the former is a mere tool employed by the latter, to do that which, as members of the Society, they dare not do themselves. These charges and insinuations, thus clandestinely circulated, were as void of truth as they were cowardly and malicious; and, until they were refuted, had some effect in exciting prejudice against us, and particularly myself. *For this letter, see Appendix A.*

Somemonths after the "Correspondence" between Oliver Johnson and George F. White was published, the former attended Rose-street Meeting, of which he thus speaks in an editorial article in the Standard, of 3d mo. 25th, 1841.

“On Wednesday of last week, we attended Rose-street meeting. In his (G. F. White’s) sermon on that day, after stating the general principle, that men are humbled and subdued by suffering, and referring to the judgments of God upon Pharaoh as a case in point, he gave an illustration, which we will repeat as nearly as we can recollect, in his own words :—‘ Just as a slave, recently, who had suffered the effects of his criminal conduct, and been thus led to calm reflection, chose to go back into slavery with his master, and to endure all the evils of that condition, notwithstanding his former experience of them, rather than stay with those hypocritical workers of popular righteousness who had interfered in his behalf. For my own part, I commend his choice. I had a thousand times rather be a slave, and spend my days with slave-holders, than to dwell in companionship with abolitionists.’

“This was an allusion, which every one present understood, to the case of Thomas Hughes, formerly the slave of John P. Darg, whose history is given in our columns to-day, by Isaac T. Hopper, as No. xvi. of his ‘Tales of Oppression.’ It was also understood and intended as a thrust at Isaac T. Hopper, who went to Sing Sing to act the part of the good Samaritan, by informing Tom that he was free, and offering him protection.

“But it was not true that Tom Hughes went back to the South *as a slave*. For this reason, we deemed it our duty, at the close of the sermon, to

rise and say—‘Tom Hughes, formerly the slave of John P. Darg, on his release from prison recently, returned with his master to the South, NOT AS A SLAVE, preferring slavery to freedom, but as a FREE MAN, under a promise of being permitted to enjoy his liberty and to live with his wife. I state this to prevent misapprehension.’”

The article from which the foregoing extracts are made, was headed, “Rare specimen of a Quaker preacher,” and was the ostensible cause of the proceedings against James S. Gibbons, Charles Marriott and myself. See *Appendix B*.

My case (and also that of James S. Gibbons) was introduced into the Monthly Meeting on the 7th of 4th mo. 1841. William C. White, Richard Cromwell, Dobel Baker, and John J. Merritt, were appointed a Committee to treat with us severally. This Committee met me at my house on the 13th. My wife was present at the interview. I admitted that I was concerned in the publication and support of the National Anti-Slavery Standard; but I contended that it was not of the character imputed to it in the charge against me: and this I considered the proper issue.

I informed them that I was a member of the Executive Committee, who had the supervision of the paper alluded to, but that supervision extended no further than to procure the funds and select an editor. That in making a selection, we were careful to chose a person of good moral character, of

adequate acquirements, and who was in principle an Abolitionist ; but that we never undertook to instruct or control him as to what he should write, and that his essays were never submitted to the inspection of the Committee. One of the Committee then exhibited a copy of the Standard, containing the article upon which the charge was founded. I informed them that I had not read it until I had been called upon by one of the overseers ; that soon after it appeared, I had read part of it, and upon finding its character, I put the paper in my pocket, took it home to my wife, and requested her to read it, and put it away where the family would not see it. I asked the Committee if there was any thing in the article that was not true ? One of them replied, there was. I desired him to point out the part that was not true, for he was the first person whom I had heard make such an allegation. He said it was libelous ; that George F. White did not exhibit ferocity in his manner, as stated in the piece. I replied, that was a matter of opinion about which people might differ.

I stated to them, that whatever disunity existed among us, was justly to be attributed to the preaching of George F. White. That in his public discourses, he applied epithets to Abolitionists and others, that would not be tolerated in a political meeting, and that it was unreasonable to suppose the false charges he was in the habit of making would pass without answer or rebuke. Three of

the Committee expressed their full unity with the speaker, and that they considered that he was divinely inspired when he uttered the epithets and denunciations complained of. Towards the close of this interview, two of the Committee had left, when one of those who remained remarked, that all who supported the Standard ought to be disowned. I replied, that if that suggestion were carried out, they would have to disown several hundred members of the Society of Friends, among whom were a large number of ministers and elders of high standing. He said he would disown them all, though there should not be five left. It is due to the individual to state, that subsequently he qualified his assertion as to those whom he would have disowned. I stated to the Committee, that while I had no objections to the facts that actually occurred in the Society of Friends being published in the Standard, I had objections to their being accompanied by any invidious remarks.

On the 21st of the 5th mo. two of the Committee called on me, and inquired if I wanted to see them again? I replied, that I had no business with them, and of course no desire to see them; but if they wished to see me, I had no objection to their calling on me.

After some desultory conversation on the subject of their visit, I remarked, that I was much more tried with some of the views and sentiments of George F. White, as advocated in his public dis-

courses, than I was with the epithets and denunciations which he so frequently applied to Abolitionists. That the latter were of but light impression, and might pass off without harming any body ; but the former were calculated, so far as they were received, to do immense mischief. The balance of the interview was consumed chiefly by one of the Committee in expressing his most unqualified approbation of George F. White's sentiments and ministry. He said that he believed him to be divinely authorized to make the statements which he sometimes made in his preaching. And after further conversation upon much that was irrelevant to the case, he stated that he thanked his Heavenly Father that he had lived to the day and date that George F. White preached. When this individual was expressing himself so strongly as to the preacher being divinely authorized to make certain statements respecting the Abolitionists and non-resistants, which, I observed, had been proved to be untrue, the other remarked that he could not go quite so far as that.

In the fifth month, the Committee made a written report in my case. From what I could learn, I believed it was not strictly correct in all its parts, and I requested the clerk to ask the Monthly Meeting, on my behalf, for a copy of it. He accordingly made the application, but it was refused. Amos Willets, Thomas Carpenter, and one or two others objecting to it. The gross injustice of this denial

is so palpable as to render any comment unnecessary.

I may here pause in my account of the proceedings of the Monthly Meeting, after saying that upon being informed that I was disowned, I notified the Meeting that I should appeal; when Richard Field, George T. Trimble, Thomas Carpenter, Richard Cromwell, Samuel Willets, and John J. Merritt, were appointed to attend the Quarterly Meeting with the minutes and proceedings of the Monthly Meeting in my case. This Committee I shall call Respondents.*

The case came before Westbury Quarterly Meeting in the tenth month, 1841. A short time before that meeting was held, I was informed that Friends in the city of New-York had determined that no member of the "Association of Friends for the relief of those held in Slavery," &c. should be permitted to serve on the Committee in my case. I discovered that the New-York Friends intended to carry their own views into the Quarterly Meeting, and spare no exertion to gain their point.

Before I was called into the Quarterly Meeting, such a proposition was made, but was overruled by the meeting. During the appointment of the Committee, one Friend asked to be excused from serving

* In proceedings upon appeals in the Society of Friends in England, the term *Respondents* is used in this way. As it is a convenient term, I shall adopt it here.

on it, on the ground of his being a member of the Association which had been alluded to. I then inquired whether the meeting had concluded to reject such? After a short pause, Samuel Willets, the clerk, rose and said: "As the organ of this meeting, I think the meeting had better proceed with the business." I was at a loss to determine how, as the *organ* of the meeting, he could announce its decision before any individual in it had expressed an opinion upon the subject. The following Friends were then appointed:—Samuel Mott, of Cowneck; William Willets, Isaac Rushmore, Jacob Valentine, and Joseph L. Townsend, of Westbury Monthly Meeting; John Willis, Willet Robins, Selah Hubbs, Samuel J. Underhill, and Williams Willets, of Jericho Monthly Meeting; Samuel Pearsall, Gilbert Lawrence, Samuel Bowne, Silas Hicks, and James Byrd, of Flushing Monthly Meeting; and Thomas A. Green, of Nantucket Monthly Meeting, there being no other Friend from that meeting present.

The Committee, with the exception of one member, met on the same afternoon at the Meeting-house in Flushing. After the Respondents and myself had been fully heard, we left the Committee to deliberate upon the case. They remained together a considerable time, and adjourned to meet again in the city of New-York, on the afternoon of the day preceding the next Quarterly Meeting.

It will be seen by a statement which I made to the Yearly Meeting Committee, and which was not

denied, that the overseers never laboured with James S. Gibbons or myself, previously to our cases being taken to the preparative meeting, other than merely to question us as to the facts relating to our connection with the Standard, &c. This being the case, they were very fearful that the Committee of the Quarterly Meeting would think the regular complaint was of itself insufficient to justify their proceedings against us. Under this view of the case, the overseers privately manufactured a document which was read to several of the Committee of the Quarterly Meeting while the cases were pending ; and a copy of it was sent to one of their number on Long Island, where all of them, except one, resided. This document they called an " EXPLANATION " of our cases. It will be my duty to speak of it freely hereafter, when I explain its character. I should be glad were I able to insert it here ; but it was most carefully, and with palpable and characteristic injustice kept from me, though it was the work of the overseers, and declared to be official.

When the Quarterly Meeting met, the Committee in my case made a report, confirming the decision of the Monthly Meeting, which was signed by Samuel Mott, Joseph L. Townsend, John Willis, Willet Robins, Selah Hubbs, Samuel J. Underhill, Gilbert Lawrence, Samuel Bowne, and Silas Hicks. The name of Williams Willets was also attached to the report. This was not done by himself, as he was sick at the time, and did not attend the last meeting

of the Committee ; yet his name was affixed as though he had signed it with his own hand.

I am more than willing to leave those individuals who signed the report to their own reflections. They know best how far they acted in accordance with their own convictions of right and justice. That some of them would be glad of an opportunity to undo what they have done, I have the best of all reasons for believing. It will be proper to allude to this subject hereafter.

While my case was under discussion in the Quarterly Meeting, the members of New-York Monthly Meeting claimed the right, and actually exercised it, to take an active part in the proceedings. Such conduct, I believe, was never before countenanced, nor even tolerated in the Society of Friends. The injustice and absurdity of it must be plain to the most superficial observer.

At the succeeding Quarterly Meeting, information was given that I intended to appeal ; when the following persons were appointed, on its behalf, to attend the Yearly Meeting as Respondents, viz. :

Nathaniel S. Merritt, Robert Seaman, John Leggett, Richard Field, John C. Merritt, and Samuel J. Underhill.

When the case came on at the next Yearly Meeting in 5th month, 1842, the following friends were appointed a Committee to hear the respective parties, viz. Solomon Underhill, Samuel Bowne, Samuel Halsted, David R. Carpenter, of Purchase Quarterly

Meeting ; Jacob Willets, Daniel E. Jereau, Alexander J. Coffin, Josiah H. Quimby, of Nine Partners Quarterly Meeting ; George G. Macy, Henry M. Robinson, Thomas C. Stringham, Henry J. Powell, of Stanford Quarterly Meeting ; Jacob Merritt, Job Wilbur, Stephen Dillingham, Aaron Rogers, of Easton Quarterly Meeting ; Thomas Rogers, Arden Barker, Joseph Rogers, Samuel Keese, of Ferrisburgh Quarterly Meeting ; Abraham Leggett, Joseph Gurney, Abraham Merritt, Job Wright, of Saratoga Quarterly Meeting ; John Powell, Abner Moore, Abraham Van Vleck, Jacob Gurney, of Duaneburgh Quarterly Meeting ; James Cromwell, John Townsend Hallock, Hezekiah Ferguson, George Fritz, of Cornwell Quarterly Meeting ; Morris Webster, Richard Brotherton, John Corlies, James C. Moore, of Shrewsbury and Rahway Quarterly Meeting.

When the case came before the meeting, I asked permission for James S. Gibbons to be present with me, as his case would be called up soon after mine. It was proper that he should be there to answer to it, and state whether he intended to prosecute his appeal or not ; and I had motives for wishing his presence. The request was simply made without any reasons being given on my part. Immediately a member of *Westbury* Quarterly Meeting objected to and opposed the request. Upon this, I remarked, that any interference from the members of the quarter from whence the appeal came, was out of order, and

I hoped the business would be left where it properly belonged, and that the case would be conducted with a dignity becoming the occasion. The request was then granted.

The Committee, the Respondents, and myself had several meetings—I think six in all, of about two hours each. One of the Respondents, John C. Merritt, attended the first, and perhaps the second sitting, when he returned home, as he disapproved of the whole proceedings on the part of the prosecution. At the first sitting of the Committee, I was called upon to make my objections to the proceedings of the subordinate Meetings. I did so, by reading a document which I had prepared for the purpose. I made a few additional remarks, when the Respondents entered upon their reply. They then read parts of several essays from the Standard. I requested that they should read the whole of each essay which they deemed proper to refer to, as the tenor of it could not be appreciated or understood by reading parts only, and one part would qualify another. This they refused, and the Yearly Meeting Committee sustained them in this course. I think about nine hours were occupied by the Respondents, and perhaps about two by myself. I soon discovered that the minds of many of the Committee were fixed, so that nothing that could be said would change them. It appeared to me that several of them were particularly so, which they clearly manifested by a degree of activity unbecoming those

who were intended to be impartial judges. The Respondents consumed much time in reading from the Anti-Slavery Standard, and the document which had been prepared and clandestinely circulated by the overseers of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and in making such statements as they thought would influence the Committee. In doing so, there was much bitterness of spirit manifested by some of the Respondents, and the truth was not strictly adhered to in stating facts.

I then endeavoured to show that the proceedings of the Monthly Meeting were not warranted by the discipline, nor supported by the facts of the case. It was easy to perceive that many of the Committee were deeply imbued with prejudice, and I did not believe that much would be gained by my going very fully or at large into the merits of the case. I therefore satisfied myself with a simple statement of it, and the views I entertained of the discipline upon which the proceedings were founded, with little or no comment, further than appeared necessary to illustrate the positions which I assumed. Indeed the state of my health at the time admitted of nothing more ; and I felt little disposition to contend with the spirit and disposition exhibited by my opponents on the occasion.

After the hearing of the Respondents and myself was over, the Committee, I was informed, occupied about four hours in discussing the case as presented to them by the parties. A report was then made

to the Yearly Meeting, of which I am told the following is a copy.

“The Committee on Isaac T. Hopper’s appeal report, that after patient deliberation thereon, we find that eighteen of our number are in favour of confirming the judgment of the Quarterly Meeting, fifteen for reversing it, and three declined giving judgment in the case.”

Upon this report there was considerable discussion; after which, the Meeting decided that the decision of the subordinate Meetings should be confirmed.

The Committee, I was informed, stood thus:— For confirming the decision, Joseph Rogers, John Powell, Abraham Leggett, Joseph Gurney, James Cromwell, Morris Webster, James C. Moore, Solomon Underhill, Samuel Halsted, David R. Carpenter, Jacob Willets, Daniel E. Jereau, Alexander J. Coffin, Josiah H. Quimby, Jacob Merritt, Stephen Dillingham, Aaron Rogers, and Thomas C. Stringham.

For reversal, Thomas Rogers, Arden Barker, Samuel Keese, Abner Moore, Abraham Van Vleck, Abraham Merritt, Job Wright, John Townsend Hallock, Hezekiah Ferguson, Richard Brotherton, Samuel Bowne, Job Wilbur, George G. Macy, Henry M. Robinson, and Henry J. Powell.

Those who declined giving judgment in the case, were Jacob Gurney, George Fritz, and John Corlies.

THE EXPLANATION, of which I have spoken as having emanated from the overseers, I think stands unparalleled in point of unfairness and deception. It was incorrect in its statements, and invidious in its whole bearing. Whatever there was in it that had the least origin in truth, was enveloped in a colouring as false as the design was malevolent and vicious. Probably most of my readers are familiar with the case of the slave, Tom Hughes, or, as it has sometimes been called, the "Darg case." My accusers endeavoured to make it appear in this document that the connection of James S. Gibbons and myself with that case, was of a grossly reproachful and immoral character. I shall withhold further comment until I place the reader in possession of a condensed statement of the facts of that case which has been greatly perverted and misrepresented.

Thomas Hughes was a slave of John P. Darg, whose residence was said to be at Helena, in Arkansas. Said Darg was the adopted son of John Darg of this city. Tom had been sold several times before he came into the possession of Darg. Becoming weary of his bondage, he determined to be free. During the year 1838, his master contemplated a visit to his reputed father in New-York, and was desirous that his slave should accompany him. He inquired of him if he would not like to be free? He made this inquiry that he might form an opinion whether it would be safe to bring Tom with him. Tom was, in some respects, a shrewd fellow, and

immediately understood his master's object in asking the question. He answered—No; and said he did not wish to be free. He would rather be a slave and live with him.

Darg now concluded it would be safe to bring him to New-York. Darg, his wife, and Tom, accordingly arrived in this city the latter part of the 8th month, 1838. Immediately upon their arrival, Tom began to consider how he could get his freedom. In the course of two or three days he met with Henry Clark, a colored man, who was a waiter at a public garden in Broadway, a few doors below my office. Tom made his case known to Henry, and asked him if there was any way to get free. Henry inquired of him if he had any money? He replied that he had none of his own, but that he had the care of his master's. Clark proposed to him to take his master's money and give it to him, and he would return it on condition that he should be manumitted. The plan appearing feasible, the same evening Tom abstracted his master's money and gave it to Henry Clark. Clark changed Tom's clothes, and about 12 o'clock brought him to my house. The bell was rung, when James S. Gibbons, who was then a member of my family, opened the window, and inquired what was wanted? The answer was, 'Young Mr. Hopper.' My sons then had their place of business nearly opposite to where Clark was a waiter, and by that means he came to a knowledge of them. My son John was called,

who opened the front door, when Clark and Hughes entered.

I heard the conversation, got up, and was told a colored man wanted accommodations for the night. Such a request was not unusual. Tom was accordingly furnished with lodging. I rose early the next morning, and upon inquiry, was informed that the stranger was a fugitive slave. I was aware that my house would not be a safe asylum for him, and left directions with my family that he should leave as soon as he got his breakfast. He accordingly did so, and went to Abraham Shoemaker's, who lived near me. The next day I saw an advertisement in a paper called "The Sun," offering a reward of one thousand dollars for the apprehension and return of a mulatto man, who, it was said, had stolen seven or eight thousand dollars from a house in Varick-street, or a proportionate amount for any part of the money.

In consequence of this advertisement, I made inquiry where Tom could be found, and called to see him. I told him of the advertisement, and inquired whether it was true. He replied, it was not, and said, it was very common for slave-holders to advertise their runaway slaves as thieves. I believed him, concluding it was a stratagem adopted by Darg to recapture him.

About this time, Barney Corse called upon me, and when I asked him what he thought of the advertisement in "The Sun," respecting a robbery in

Varick-street, he replied, that he had not thought any thing about it, and asked if there was any thing peculiar in it. I then observed that I did not believe a robbery had been committed; upon which he called in company with Horace Dresser, a respectable lawyer, and D. Ruggles, upon the editor of that paper, who told Corse he was satisfied that the robbery had been committed, and added, "The man who has lost his money will manumit the slave in addition to the reward, if he can recover it; and if you will call upon him he will tell you so." Barney then called upon Darg, who fully confirmed what the editor had said. Corse stated to Darg his conscientious scruples respecting slavery, and said, that he could have no agency in returning a fugitive slave to his master, but was willing to render what aid he could in recovering the lost money.

The information that Corse received from Darg and others, and which he communicated to me, led me to the conclusion, that the money had really been taken; and I felt desirous that it should be restored to its rightful owner. Just after this interview with Barney Corse, I was informed that Tom had said he had given to some person one hundred and fifty dollars, and had received but twelve dollars in exchange for it. I immediately took measures to find who that person was, and ascertained it to be Henry Clark, before mentioned. James S. Gibbons, stopped incidentally at my office, and at my request saw Henry Clark, and asked him to call on me,

which he did. Clark was told that if his previous character was good, and he would tell where the money was, and use his exertions to assist in getting it, he should not be exposed. He then admitted that Tom had placed in his hands a sum of money, but how much, he could not exactly say.

J. S. Gibbons accompanied him to his place of residence, and obtained from him a roll of bank-notes, which, with another sum subsequently obtained at the garden, where it had been concealed, amounted to five thousand eight hundred dollars. He then told us, that a man, by the name of Bob Jackson, had received one thousand twenty-five dollars. I requested J. S. Gibbons to accompany Henry in search of Jackson, and they soon returned bringing him with them. Upon giving him the like assurance we had given Henry, that he should not be exposed, he acknowledged having received the one thousand twenty-five dollars, as mentioned by Clark, but said, he had placed it in the hands of a friend of his, who resided in Albany, to keep for him, and that his friend had taken it home.

I prevailed upon B. Corse to accompany Jackson to Albany to get this money, in which he was successful, and paid it to Darg the same evening that he returned.

The particulars of this part of the business were, in a former publication, related by James S. Gibbons, as follows:—"I suggested to I. T. Hopper, that it would hardly be safe to trust him alone, and

that some one ought to accompany him to prevent further villany. Barney Corse was engaged by Isaac T. Hopper for that purpose. He wished to see Darg first, and have an explicit understanding of the conditions on which he would go. At his request, I accompanied him to Darg's lodgings, and an agreement was then made, providing for the manumission of the coloured man, the payment of his (Corse's) expenses, and the exoneration from criminal prosecution, of any person or persons concerned in the robbery, *if it should be necessary to secure the money*. This agreement was subsequently reduced to writing and signed by Darg. On the next morning, Corse went to Albany with Bob Jackson.

“On the same evening on which the five thousand eight hundred dollars was recovered, I. T. Hopper gave it into my possession for safe-keeping, and I stated to him my intention to place it in the bank, and to inform some well-known individual thereof, in order to protect my own character from any charge of improper motives in retaining it. Accordingly, the next morning, I informed Reuben Withers, the cashier of the Bank of the State of New-York, that the said money had been entrusted to me for safe-keeping, and that it would be returned to the proper owner, so soon as the measures then in progress for the recovery of the balance should terminate ; an unseasonable disclosure, it was feared, might defeat those measures.

“On the 2d of the 9th month, Barney Corse returned from Albany, having succeeded in obtaining from Bob Jackson one thousand and twenty-five dollars. He communicated to the Recorder of the city, who was a fellow-passenger on the boat, the nature of his business ; exhibited to him the money, and the agreement with Darg, and received from him counsel and advice relative to the best mode of carrying out his purpose. In regard to this interview, the Recorder stated in evidence, when the case was under legal investigation, that Corse’s manner was frank, and that he manifested no disposition improperly to shield a criminal from justice. He admonished Barney that the paper which he had was not a manumission, but only an *agreement to manumit*, and that he should take care to have a manumission properly drawn and executed. In the cross-examination, he was asked, if he had advised Barney to get the manumission *executed* ? to which he answered, *yes*. The counsel for the prosecution then asked him, if, before giving him that advice, he had read the clause of the agreement which promised an exoneration from criminal prosecution ? to which he answered, ‘*yes, I distinctly remember reading that clause.*’

“On the same evening that he returned from Albany, Corse requested me to accompany him to witness the return of the one thousand twenty-five dollars. Darg declined receiving it, though Corse offered it to him several times. This was in con-

formity with the advice of police officer Peck, whose object was to catch Corse *with the money on his person*, and then make it appear that he had felonious possession of it. Darg's father received it.

“After our return from Darg's, I. T. Hopper requested me to hand over to Corse the five thousand eight hundred dollars which had been entrusted to my keeping. On comparing the notes with memoranda given by Darg, there appeared to be a deficiency of ten or fourteen hundred dollars; in consequence of which, it was determined to confront the parties implicated in the transaction, to discover, if possible, how this had been disposed of. On the evening of the 3d, Tom Hughes, Henry Clark, and Bob Jackson, were brought together at Isaac T. Hopper's house, and Tom declared that he had given a part of the money to another person, not present, and who was *in company* with Clark at the time. Clark was finally induced to expose the name of this individual, and agreed to meet any of our number after 10 o'clock that night, to go in quest of him. The object of the interview being attained, the parties separated. I agreed to meet Corse in the neighborhood of Darg's, at 9 o'clock, to witness the return of the recovered money. We met at the appointed hour, and Corse began counting the money, in presence of Darg and several other members of the family. While in the act, and before he had delivered it into Darg's hands, Merritt and Peck, *well known* to the citizens of

New-York as having been connected with the police department, rushed into the room, snatched up the money and papers, and arrested Barney Corse for compounding a felony. They were followed immediately by two or more other men, one of whom, as it afterwards appeared, was Ambrose L. Jordan, a lawyer, and counsel for John P. Darg. Corse expressed his astonishment at such an outrageous attack, and said he was willing to go before any magistrate that might be named. Merritt replied, he had made arrangements with Lowndes, who was then at Niblo's garden, but would be at home soon. Either he or Peck asked how much money had been recovered in all? Corse replied, 'Nearly seven thousand dollars.' Merritt, Corse, and myself, proceeded in company to Lowndes' dwelling, in Liberty-street. Immediately on leaving Darg's house, Corse told Merritt, that he had the remainder of the money that had been recovered, in his pocket, and that he intended to give it to Darg; but under the altered circumstances of the case, he would give it to Justice Lowndes. Merritt stated on oath, that Corse said nothing about having any more money in his possession, until he threatened to search him, and that he then surrendered it. I feel bound in justice to Barney Corse, to pronounce this untrue; and I speak *positively*, because I did not leave him for an instant, up to the time when he gave the money to Darg in Lowndes' house. Not a word about search was uttered, until after Corse informed

Merritt, more than once, that he had the money in his possession, and would give it to Justice Lowndes, as soon as he would see him. Merritt wished to become possessed of the money, that he might himself return it to Darg, and thus be entitled to the reward ; and Corse suspecting his object, was not inclined to favour it.

“ These are the material facts of the case of which I was cognizant ; they form but a small part of its entire history. The outrageous assault of the police, the clamour of a profligate press, and the anxiety of the District Attorney to propitiate the popular sentiment, by convicting an Abolitionist, have given to it a degree of notoriety to which its bare importance does not entitle it. Nevertheless, this may have its uses. I am much mistaken if the exposition now offered will not prove the necessity of a rigid scrutiny into the conduct of our police officers. Corruption pervades every department of our *police system* ; its first victims may be among the humblest of our citizens, and those who are most odious in the public eye ; but if aggression on these be suffered to go unpunished, the community generally must soon become exposed to inroads of reckless marauders, whose official character may serve only to shield them from the just sentence of the law.

“ The parties who undertook to ferret out the stolen money for the sole purpose of returning it to its owner, have been charged with imprudence. It is difficult to conceive how they could have acted

with more prudence. The whole amount of money recovered, was six thousand nine hundred and eight dollars ; five thousand eight hundred dollars of this was entrusted to my keeping, and I immediately informed Reuben Withers of the fact, for the express purpose of protecting my own character from a possible imputation of dishonest motives. B. Corse procured one thousand twenty-five dollars at Albany, of which he informed the Recorder of the city. Was not this prudent ?

“ What man in the community would not feel safe in his integrity after confiding his purpose to the guardian of one of the first financial institutions of the city, or to its first judicial officer ? But because that confidence was not reposed in some petty police officer in preference to those gentlemen, Merritt and Peck, aided by a speculator in slaves, and Ambrose L. Jordan, a lawyer, determined on an ambuscade which should involve the parties in the liability of a criminal conviction ! And Jordan, fearful that his adjuncts in the scheme might fail in some essential point, proceeded to the house of Darg, and superintended its execution in person.”

As soon as it was ascertained that Tom had stolen his master's money, and measures had been taken to secure its recovery, he was left to pursue his own way. Those who were willing to afford him protection as a suspected fugitive slave, could not conscientiously harbor him after they discovered he was a felon ; and he seeing himself thus

abandoned among strangers, by those whom he considered as his friends, after a few days, voluntarily returned to his master.

It appears from Darg's account, that Tom had been a trusty and faithful servant, had fully gained his confidence, carried the keys of his trunk, and was frequently sent to it to get money when it was wanted.

I would not, under any circumstances, countenance the act of Tom in abstracting Darg's money; but my sense of his guilt is not a little modified by the reflection, that all the tendencies of Slavery are calculated to blunt the moral sensibilities, and to destroy that power of discrimination between right and wrong, for which even educated slave-holders themselves are so little remarkable. And, when I consider also, the evil influence of Darg's example upon Tom, (according to whose statements he is one of the most reckless of gamblers,) I am still less surprised at his perpetration of the act; his conduct truly verifies the adage, "Evil communications corrupt good manners."

After suffering some time in confinement, Merritt and Peck, uncle and nephew, and both police officers, told him, as appears by a statement made by Tom, that if he would swear he was advised by us, Ruggles, Corse, Gibbons and myself to rob his master, &c., he should not be prosecuted, but used as a witness. This was a trial upon his honesty too great to be resisted, and I have been informed,

he agreed to do so ; and the District Attorney informed me, that application was made to him to enter a *nolle prosequi* in his case ; but he declined doing so.

What higher bribe could be offered to any man, than a manumission from slavery, (for a *slave* cannot be a witness in such a case,) and an exemption from prosecution for felony ? It cannot be supposed that an individual, who had all his life been a slave, and, if his own account be true, and there is no reason to doubt it, had lived a long time with gamblers, would have hesitated, under such inducements, to say any thing that might be required of him. During the first six weeks after Tom returned to Darg, he was taken out of prison at the pleasure of the police officers. Peck furnished him with food, and had him at his house, which afforded him an opportunity to tamper with, and prepare him for any measures he might wish to pursue ; and there is no doubt but he made *good* use of the opportunity thus put into his power. As Tom could not be released to testify as a witness, they then endeavored to get him discharged from prison, and take him to the South ; but in this they were again disappointed, for he refused to go, saying, he would take his own life first. This so enraged Peck, that he attempted to strike him in his cell, but was prevented by the keeper of the prison.

Tom Hughes returned to Darg on the 6th of the 9th month, 1838, and B. Corse had entered recog-

nizance to appear at the Court of Sessions three days before. The grand jury were then in session, and remained so nearly two weeks, but it does not appear that the complaint was laid before them; neither was it submitted to the grand jury of the next session, until the day they usually get through their business and are dismissed. The reader will be at a loss to understand why the business should have been so long protracted; more especially as Darg was a great distance from home, and was very anxious to return. But the secret will be unravelled when he is informed that overtures had been made to B. Corse, to pay the balance of the lost money, and the prosecution against him and others should be abandoned; and his connexions being wealthy, they no doubt flattered themselves with the hope that this would be done. There was also another reason why the business should be delayed. I had found it necessary, in order to prevent Darg from suddenly leaving the city, to commence an action for the amount of the reward, and I was threatened with prosecution, though not then indicted; but it was frequently intimated to me, that if my suit was withdrawn, no further proceeding would be had in the case: and some time was required to effect this object. At length, after the grand jury had been in session about twelve days, and Darg and his party found their overtures were rejected, the complaint was laid before them, and on the 16th of 10th month, 1838, a bill of indictment was found

against Thomas Hughes for grand larceny, and against Barney Corse, James S. Gibbons, Henry Clark, David Ruggles and Isaac T. Hopper, for that we "did feloniously receive, harbour, aid and maintain, with intent and in order that the said Thomas Hughes might avoid and escape from arrest, trial, conviction and punishment."

On Tom's trial, it finally appeared, that he had no other object in taking his master's money, than to secure his own freedom ; and, under this view, the court passed the mildest sentence upon him that the law would allow, viz. two years imprisonment at hard labor.*

* Some weeks before Tom Hughes' sentence expired, Darg took his wife to see him at Sing Sing, and told him that if, when his time was out, he would go with him to the South, he would manumit her ; and that he should not attempt to make a slave of him. The day before Tom's sentence expired, I went to Sing Sing, and informed him that I had come to make him acquainted with the position in which he stood—that he was a free man, and might stay at the North, or go to the South as he pleased.

Darg and his friend Peck went to Sing Sing in the stage with me. Soon after my interview with Tom, Darg saw him ; he also had a conversation with him the next morning immediately before he was set at liberty. As soon as he was discharged, I again informed Tom that he was a free man, and that I had come there to protect him. In consequence of the plausible overtures made by Darg, Tom concluded to go with him. He accordingly accompanied him as far as Baltimore, when he discovered that Darg had sold his wife, and intended to make a slave of him. Upon making this discovery, he embraced the first opportunity that offered and left him, and now resides at the North.

The police officers were stimulated in their exertions by the hope of receiving the reward ; and to accomplish their object, resorted to every stratagem their ingenuity could invent, without regard to truth or justice. I was informed that but six grand jurors, out of eighty that were directed to be summoned, appeared at court ; and it is believed that very few, if any, of the absentees were notified. The officers were ordered to summon others ; and it may be supposed that they would select such persons as would answer their own purpose. Many of them were men of low character : such as rum-sellers, tavern-keepers, &c. One thing is certain, they found a bill of indictment against several respectable persons without a particle of evidence.

James S. Gibbons never attended the court at all ; and neither he nor myself was ever called upon to answer to the indictments, though I often solicited the court in person to bring our cases to trial ; and finally they were dismissed as being wholly groundless. Neither of us employed an attorney in the case.

It will be proper to state the motives that influenced me in bringing a suit for the reward. The pro-slavery papers *had* greatly misrepresented the case, and I thought it possible an indictment might be trumped up against us ; and I was perfectly satisfied from the first, that Darg would never have the temerity to face either James S. Gibbons or myself before a judicial tribunal ; and I was appre-

hensive he would leave the city, and the cases never receive a full and open investigation which I wished to invite. I was determined to detain him until that object was accomplished. After an investigation had had taken place, and the indictment against James S. Gibbons and myself had been dismissed as wholly groundless, I discontinued the suit against Darg upon his paying costs. I ought to mention, that soon after the suit was commenced, I announced in the public papers my intention not to apply any part of the amount I might receive to my own use, though I hardly thought the case would proceed so far as to be tried.

Last summer, when I was at Farmington, a person in the station of a minister, a member of Genesse Yearly Meeting, and who had been to Philadelphia professedly on a religious visit, and spent a short time in this city on his way home, stated in a large company that some individuals in the city of New-York had paid eight hundred dollars for me in this case, to save the reputation of the Society. A friend who was present gave me this information, and I immediately, in company with two or three others, called upon the individual above alluded to. He admitted that he had made the statement, but declined naming the person, though urged to do so, from whom he had received the information; but said it was a friend of high standing in the city of New-York; that he would write to him, and that the friend would call upon me.

No such friend has called. The statement was utterly false. Neither James S. Gibbons nor myself, nor any other person for us, ever paid one cent in the whole concern. This person made several other statements equally malicious and untrue.

I have now placed the reader in possession of a faithful though condensed history of the facts connected with the "Darg case," which has given rise to so much falsehood; and for my connection with which, I have received an almost unmeasured amount of persecution from a number of individuals, who have been so far carried away by their worldly, selfish interests and pro-slavery prejudices, as to vilify and injure me, for that which, in their own hearts and consciences, they can not condemn. I have many times reviewed every thing done by me in connection with the case, and in the retrospect, can most truly say, that there was nothing in my course that I would desire to change or undo. When I was with the Respondents and the Committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting, I was refused a copy of the slanderous EXPLANATION, nor was I permitted to take notes from it, that I might prepare a refutation of its falsehoods. One reason alleged for denying my request was, that if I should get it into my possession, "*we shall see it in print in less than a month.*" During the sittings of the Committee, I called on the late Recorder of the city, (who has since been made Mayor)—he presided at the trial of Barney Corse, during which every thing connected

with the matter was fully developed—and informed him that an attempt had been made to cast reflections upon my character, in consequence of the part I had taken in the “Darg case,” and requested from him a certificate as to the position I occupied with reference to it. He seemed indignant, and was anxious to do any thing to serve me in the matter, and offered to go anywhere and give testimony in person as to my integrity. I thanked him, and informed him that his simple certificate would satisfy me. He was to me almost a stranger, as I had never had any acquaintance with him, except what arose from meeting him in court, as the Presiding Judge during the pendency of this case; and I could not but mark the strong contrast between the kind, frank, and generous course exhibited by him, and that pursued by those upon whose kindness and protection I had far greater claims. I was at once furnished with the following certificate, written by the Mayor himself, and which, it will be seen, was fully concurred in by the prosecuting Attorney.

Mayor's Office, May 26th, 1842.

I hereby certify, that I was Recorder of the city of New-York during the trial of the case in relation to Thomas Hughes, the slave of John P. Darg; and also, that in the said trial and investigation, I saw nothing in the least militating against the character of Mr. Isaac T. Hopper, or that could be considered reproachful. All that he exhibited was

a desire to procure the money for the master, and the manumission of the slave.

ROBERT H. MORRIS,
Mayer of the city of New-York.

I fully concur in the above.

J. R. WHITING,
District Attorney, New-York.

May 26. 1842.

During the whole pendency of the case which I have just narrated, I had never one moment's anxiety as to the result. I knew very well that I had done nothing wrong according to my own judgment, and I availed myself of every means within my reach to have the whole circumstances thoroughly investigated. I also knew that I had been actuated by no other motive than to serve the cause of humanity. I employed no counsel at any stage of the proceeding. I felt in need of no legal assistance. I had the offer of whatever professional aid might be necessary in maintaining my defence, but I was convinced that nothing would be required beyond what I could myself accomplish. I had strong reasons for believing that the indictments could have been quashed, owing to technical informality ; but I was unwilling, so far as I was concerned, to do any thing that would prevent an investigation of the case upon its merits. I was well aware that in all that I had done, I had the full approbation of many highly intelligent and excellent individuals ;

and that my course was sanctioned and approved by some eminent jurists, who had taken the trouble to make themselves acquainted with the case. The trial of J. S. Gibbons and myself was delayed by the prosecution for many months, during which time I attended court, mostly once a month, for the purpose of demanding a hearing of the case. The court, at last, seeing that there was nothing to sustain the charge, were unwilling to grant further delay to a flimsy prosecution, and ordered a *nolle prosequi* to be entered, and the matter was dismissed.

The whole facts of this case, as I have detailed them, had been published to the world, and my persecutors were doubtless perfectly familiar with them ; yet they were willing and anxious to torture and pervert what I considered one of the best acts of my life into an engine, that would, could they carry out their purpose, crush me to pieces, and blast my moral and religious character for ever.

The reader will be astonished when I mention, that one of the Respondents of the Quarterly Meeting entered into a recognizance for my appearance at the time the trial should come on. He did so apparently with great cheerfulness. He was an overseer too, and yet he never expressed to me a single word of disapprobation or dissatisfaction of the course I had taken. The individual who entered into a recognizance for the appearance of James S. Gibbons, was one of the Respondents of the Monthly Meeting, and had never made any objec-

tion, or even expressed to the parties concerned any unwillingness to continue his responsibility.

The overseers knew perfectly well that I courted the closest investigation of the case from Darg and the whole company of prosecutors. They also knew that the action against Darg was commenced with the view of obtaining an examination of the whole case. I announced this in the public papers at the time, and stated, that if the reward was recovered, not one cent should be appropriated to my own use, but that it should be made over to some benevolent society. Several of the overseers further knew that overtures had been repeatedly made to me to discontinue the action for the reward, and the prosecution should be immediately abandoned and dismissed. In the face of all these facts, this "EXPLANATION" contained the following paragraph from the Book of Discipline, as being applicable to the connection of James S. Gibbons and myself with the case.

"If any member of our Society should be guilty of gross or notorious crimes, or such other disorderly and indecent practices as occasion public scandal, he should be speedily labored with by the Monthly Meeting; and if he cannot be brought to a proper sense of his misconduct, he should be disowned."

My opponents discovered, that in alleging such grossly immoral conduct on my part, they would show their own inconsistency and neglect in not

having long ago taken the case to the Meeting, desired to relieve themselves from the dilemma. To do this, they had the effrontery to say, that they then would have taken my case forward ; but as I was indicted as an accessory to a larceny after the fact, they forebore out of tenderness to me and my family, lest it should prejudice the public mind, and be injurious to me on my trial. This assertion was false, and grossly inconsistent on the face of it. The " Darg case " was pending for several months, and then dismissed without being brought to trial. It certainly would not have been out of season for the overseers to have taken up my case then ; but so far from that, not a single member of our meeting ever signified to me that he thought I had acted improperly, or in any way deserved censure in relation to that affair. It would be difficult for malignity to create a more mischievous, false and scandalous story than was propagated by the overseers and their coadjutors, for the purpose of destroying my reputation and carrying out their own sinister purposes. In the whole management of my case from beginning to end, there was a finesse and low cunning exhibited by my opponents I could not descend to meet.

The " EXPLANATION " contained other false and scandalous imputations, equally untrue, with the attempt to distort and misrepresent my connection with the " Darg case." But I fear that I have already erred in going too much into the detail of

what can afford but little interest to my readers. I think there can be required no stronger proof that my persecutors were conscious of the turpitude of this covert attempt to injure me by the production of this document, than their unwillingness and positive refusal to give me a copy of it. They were ashamed to expose their own conduct to the light of day.

With reference to this "EXPLANATION," I may further state, that there was no attempt on the part of the Respondents of New-York Monthly Meeting to read it to the Committee appointed by the Quarterly Meeting to hear my case in my presence; indeed it appears that they did not intend we, J. S. Gibbons and myself, should ever know there was such a document in existence; for when the Quarterly Meeting Committee was informed that it had come to our knowledge, one of them observed, "we have leaky vessels among us." The Committee of the Quarterly Meeting in James S. Gibbon's case, however, was called together at Cow Neck to hear it read, when Samuel Leggett, Henry Mott, and John C. Merritt, with an exemplary magnanimity and fairness, objected to its being read, unless the accused was present. It was then proposed to meet in New-York, at six o'clock on the evening of the day previous to the next Quarterly Meeting, that he might have an opportunity of hearing it. But it was said that the document was long, and they finally agreed to meet two hours earlier, as it would afford more time to hear

it. The Committee, the Respondents, and James S. Gibbons, met at the time adjourned to ; *but the "EXPLANATION" was not produced.* Here is the fact ; comment on such a proceeding is unnecessary.

So far, however, as regarded the purposes of the traducers, it was entirely unnecessary that the document should have been produced, as the design of the authors had been already accomplished by its clandestine circulation. It was secretly circulated in different parts of the country embraced by the limits of the Quarterly Meeting, and read in the presence of a company, all of which were not members of the Society of Friends. It must be recollected too, that the actors in this design were individuals occupying the station of overseers, professing to carry out the letter and the spirit of the discipline, and to act under the influence of religious concern. I am sure that such gross injustice is without parallel in the annals of the Society of Friends. And I do not believe there is in existence a religious Society that would knowingly countenance a proceeding so entirely divested of Christian kindness, and so marked at every step by falsehood and finesse. Since the introduction of my case into the Monthly Meeting, infinite pains and labor have been taken by my adversaries to give a false coloring to the whole matter, by which the minds of numbers have been prejudiced and poisoned. The facts which I have so far communicated, can furnish the reader with but a faint idea of the many unchristian devices

used by my enemies and pursuers to achieve their scandalous design. Their conduct is without one single palliating feature. In vain can they seek for a plea sufficient in the judgment of impartial and disinterested minds, to justify them in their course, or acquit them of gross and wanton injustice,—of slander in its most aggravated form.

When the Yearly Meeting Committee, the Respondents and myself were together, in alluding to the conduct of the abettors in my disownment, I endeavored to inculcate the view that the Discipline was originally designed for the mutual benefit of all the members of the Society ; and when administered by exemplary, righteous men, in accordance with the spirit indicated in the following extracts from its pages, will continue to be, as it ever has been, eminently useful in promoting the happiness and welfare of individuals, and the prosperity of the Society at large. But when its administration falls into the hands of designing, crafty, worldly-minded men, who would use it as an instrument to carry out purposes stimulated by animosity and revenge—then indeed has the time arrived when it had better be committed to the flames, than thus to furnish an engine of oppression and injustice.

I then quoted from the Book of Discipline as follows : The reader will observe, that I have italicised such parts as have been violated or neglected by those concerned in my disownment.

“ It is desired that *overseers may treat with them*

[*offenders*] *in the spirit of meekness and restoring love, patiently endeavoring to instruct and advise them* ; but should their labor prove ineffectual, the preparative meeting should in due season be informed of the cases." The overseers "ought to exercise a tender and vigilant care over their fellow members." "Although those who transgress should manifest a spirit of opposition, *yet we ought patiently and meekly to instruct and advise them.*" "In the administration of the Discipline, *it is our duty to treat with offenders in tenderness and love, agreeably to apostolic advice.* 'Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, *ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted.*' And, according to Gospel order, 'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, *go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.* If he shall hear thee, then thou hast gained thy brother ; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more,' " &c.

I then repeated such facts (which were not denied) as went to show that the course prescribed by the Discipline had been wholly disregarded in my case.

The rule of Discipline under which the overseers profess to have acted, will be found in the Book, page 86, and is as follows :—

"Should any of our members print or publish any writing against the advice of the Meeting for Sufferings, or which tends to excite disunity and

discord amongst us, they should be treated with ; and if they cannot be convinced of the impropriety of their conduct, and condemn the same to the satisfaction of the Monthly Meeting, they should be disowned.”

I stated that I considered this clause as intended to apply to the publication of *Books* only, and not to ephemeral matter, such as may be published in a newspaper. The rule is placed under the head of “*Books*,” and could not with reason or propriety be brought to bear upon our case ; but even granting that my construction was not correct, the hasty proceedings of the overseers were contrary to all previous practice, and to the intent and spirit of the Discipline. It was alleged that they considered themselves bound to take the cases forward when they did, and were not at liberty to exercise their own discretion in the matter, because the Discipline says, “*Should any of our members print or publish any writing, * * * which tends to excite disunity or discord amongst us, they should be treated with ; and if they cannot be convinced of the impropriety of their conduct, and condemn the same to the satisfaction of the Monthly Meeting, they should be disowned.*”

I mentioned that my confidence in the sincerity of such an assertion was very limited, inasmuch as Charles Marriott was given to understand, that if he would not submit to a reappointment on the Executive Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society,

his case should not be taken forward at all ; and it was postponed for one month on that account ; but he having been subsequently reappointed on that Committee, his case was taken forward.

I further contended that the charge was not well-founded. My opponents had taken for granted the very fact that they had failed to prove, and which, I presume, could not be proved. The paper alluded to, I conceive, has no such tendency as was imputed to it. It was not calculated to excite disunity and discord in the Society, as a very large number of the most respectable friends, who were much more familiar with its columns than my adversaries, and of course much better qualified to judge, could testify.

In addition to the foregoing views of the case, I presented others to the consideration of the Committee, some of which I have incidentally thrown out in the preceding part of this narrative. I will now, with as little repetition as possible, state the reasons which have governed me in coming to the conclusion, that the decision of the Yearly Meeting in my case was erroneous.

In the first place, I consider that the rule of Discipline under which my case was taken forward, was wholly misapplied ; believing that it was intended to apply to *Books*, and not to such articles as may appear in a newspaper. This, however, may be considered as a matter of opinion, in which I may be mistaken. And supposing me to be wrong in this view, I considered,

That it was not proved in any way that the National Anti-Slavery Standard was calculated to excite disunity and discord in the Society. On the contrary, it is a paper, the character of which for purity of morals, excellence of taste, and intellectual superiority, is certainly not exceeded, and perhaps hardly equalled by any periodical extant. This is attested by the fact, that it is supported by a large subscription list, composed of the names of many of the most exemplary and enlightened men and women in the country, among whom are a great number of the members of the Society of Friends of both divisions, embracing numerous ministers, elders, overseers, and others occupying prominent positions in the Society. And the fact must also be remembered that, as one of the Executive Committee, I had no control over the editorial columns of the paper, having no right at any time to inspect or interfere with matter which the regular editor had prepared for it. It was a thing for which I could not be held responsible, and over which I could exercise no authority.

Again, I assume that there was error on the part of the overseers in their omission to treat with us according to Gospel order, which is so clearly recognised and enforced by the Discipline. And further, that the Preparative Meeting erred in rejecting the proposition which was made to return the case to the overseers for reconsideration, and to give such friends as felt interested an opportunity

to confer with me on the subject: this proposition being generally united with by the Meeting, but some of the overseers refusing to have any thing further to do with the matter, though they had not treated with me on the subject of the complaint according to Discipline.

I allege that there was further error in the members of the Monthly Meeting of New-York being permitted to take an active part in the proceedings of the Quarterly Meeting, on the appeal from their own decision.

There was also error in the conduct of my opponents, in preparing a slanderous document filled with matter wholly out of the record of the Monthly Meeting, which was sent by one of the overseers to a member of the Committee appointed by the Quarterly Meeting to hear the appeal, and otherwise circulated for the purpose of injuring my cause and character, without giving me an opportunity of knowing anything of its contents. This document was thus used while my appeal was pending, which went to show that my accusers thought they had not made out their case, and that they should fail, without the introduction of false and extraneous matter.

And I further suggest, that as a *majority* of the Committee of the Yearly Meeting did not decide in favor of confirming the decision of the subordinate meetings, it was contrary to all precedent with which I am acquainted, for the Yearly Meeting to

sanction the confirmation ; as according to the principles upon which appeals are conducted in the Society of Friends, the body of the meeting are presumed to be ignorant of the facts, merits or demerits of the case. I ought to add, that the same disorder was manifested in the Yearly Meeting that was practised in Westbury Quarterly Meeting ; the members of that meeting claimed the right, and actually took part in deciding the case, notwithstanding they had previously passed upon it.

I think there was a case in the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia a few years since, in which a report was made by a Committee on an appeal, signed by a majority of those present, confirming the disownment by the inferior Meetings. The Yearly Meeting, on finding that some of the Committee were absent at the time of signing the report, and that it was not signed by more than half of the whole number of the Committee, without any hesitation agreed to reverse the decision, and the Appellant was reinstated a member of the Society. And I presume such would be the course adopted by any Yearly Meeting where every effort had not been made by means of out-door intrigue and malicious misrepresentation to prejudice the minds of the members of the body against the Appellant.

It may here be a suitable place to remark, that the Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends in London, in order to guard against abuses which may be practised against the rights of the Appellant,

and to give every fair opportunity to the accused, require, in order to confirm a disownment by an inferior Meeting, that the report shall be signed by at least two-thirds of the Committee appointed to hear the appeal.

When every thing connected with the case is fully understood, the reader will not feel so much at a loss to understand why the Quarterly and Yearly Meeting's Committees confirmed the decision of the Monthly Meeting, and why it should have been sanctioned by the Yearly Meeting itself, when a majority of its Committee did not report in favor of such a measure.

From the time of my disownment until the Quarterly Meeting which decided my appeal, took place, some of the Members of the Monthly Meeting of New-York made frequent and repeated threats that they would withdraw from the Society if I should be reinstated. Every possible means that could be devised were put in operation to prevent a reversal of the decision. In addition to the slanderous "EXPLANATION" of which I have spoken, and which was sent by one of the overseers of New-York Monthly Meeting to a member of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee on Long Island, where all the Members of the Committee resided, except one who lived in New-Bedford: the subject was made a matter of almost constant and exciting conversation, accompanied with the most invidious aspersions of my character. Strenuous efforts were

made to promulgate the idea, that the subject of Abolition had nothing to do with the disownment of James S. Gibbons and myself. This cannot be believed by any one conversant with the prominent features of the case. In addition to the proofs exhibited in the official proceedings, it was frequently asserted that every Abolitionist belonging to New-York Monthly Meeting, should be disowned. As far back as the autumn of 1840, two very respectable Friends, strangers, who had been spending a few days in the city, called on me, and during their short stay, one of them inquired of me if I was aware that friends of the Monthly Meeting to which I belonged intended that I should be disowned? I replied, that I was not acquainted with the fact, and asked upon what ground the disownment was to take place. He said, "For thy Abolition; but they will not be able to do it for that, so they are going to get hold of something else." I was well aware of the hostility of many Friends in this city to the cause of Emancipation; but as I am not in the habit of paying attention to floating rumors, I gave but little attention to the suggestion, not then thinking that it was so soon to be realized. I have not the least doubt that some excellent individuals of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee really believed, that in case the decision of the Monthly Meeting was reversed, there would have been a disruption in the Quarterly Meeting. In speaking of the subject, one member of the Committee remarked that, *of the*

two evils he chose the least. Although many, and some among my adversaries seemed to think that the decision would be reversed by the Quarter, yet I never thought such would be the case. I was too well aware of the character and extent of the means that would be put into active and efficient operation to effect a different result. And I have the best assurance that some of that Committee who signed the report in favor of confirmation, have seen the case in its true aspect, and most sincerely regret the decision which they were induced to be instrumental in producing.

The subject was kept alive in the manner adverted to until the Yearly Meeting. Through correspondence and other means, every effort to prejudice my case was continued. These efforts were not confined within the range of New-York Yearly Meeting. It was determined that every part of the country that was accessible, should be trained and prepared in such way as would exert all possible influence against my case by the time the Yearly Meeting should come round. In illustration of this assertion, I will mention an instance, which must inevitably reflect shame and disgrace on those concerned in the measure. An ambassador from Flushing, on Long Island, who was one of the Quarterly Meeting's Committee, and who signed the report confirming my disownment, attended the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia, having in his keeping a copy of the proceedings of the Monthly Meet-

ing of New-York against me, which was read in companies when opportunity was presented, accompanied with such remarks as his resources enabled him to make in support of the decision. I venture to say, that such conduct during the pendency of an appeal, is without parallel in the Society of Friends. *I was refused* by the Monthly Meeting a copy of the Committee's Report in my case; and yet a copy of that Report and the other parts of the record, in the hand-writing of the clerk of the Meeting, were thus permitted to go abroad to effect *ex-parte* designs. I presume it was the official copy used by the Respondents of the Monthly Meeting in my appeal.

After my case was given to the Committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting to hear it, the Respondents of the Quarterly Meeting pursued such a course, as to extend the investigation through the greater part of the week, thus furnishing an opportunity for the action of those local influences which were so sedulously kept in operation to affect my case in the subordinate Meetings. During the week of the Yearly Meeting, the subject was much talked about at the houses of friends in the city, in the presence of large companies. To say that the measures adopted to injure my case were a species of tale-bearing and detraction in virulent form, would be but an inadequate definition of the conduct pursued.

During the week of the Yearly Meeting, at a

Friend's house, where a considerable number of persons were assembled, some gross misrepresentations were made respecting my character, which would have shocked the sense of propriety of a stranger belonging to another Yearly Meeting who was present, only that his feelings had become somewhat inured to the impropriety, as he had, through the week, frequently witnessed such gross misconduct, and was convinced that it was one of the means employed by my adversaries to accomplish their design. Upon his showing his disapprobation of such conduct, he soon discovered that he was a "*marked man.*"

It certainly is not at all astonishing that my enemies should have succeeded in effecting their purpose. Such a wicked, malicious, and wanton scheme to carry out the determination of a faction—such an extensive plan, and the perseverance in it, to slander, and if possible crush, individual character, were never equalled, I believe, in any proceedings since the first rise of the Society of Friends.*

Knowing all this, it was not difficult to foresee what would be the probable result of my appeal. Still, I felt it to be my duty to carry it to the

* Thereader will please to bear in mind, that from the time of my first interview with the overseers on third month, 29th, 1841, to the time of the disownment, not a hint was given, either by them or the Committee of the Monthly Meeting appointed in the case, of any other complaint or charge than that already specified.

Yearly Meeting, and place the responsibility where it belonged.

James S. Gibbons, however, was unwilling to continue a controversy with those who had conducted the prosecution with so little regard for candour and correct principle. When he was publicly inquired of by the clerk of the Yearly Meeting whether he intended to prosecute his appeal, he remarked in substance as follows :—

“ I cannot answer that question either satisfactorily to myself or intelligibly to the Meeting, without some words of explanation. When the decision of the Monthly Meeting that disowned me was announced, my own judgment dictated that I should quietly acquiesce therein, because I was well assured that the contest would be of a personal character—that there was no *principle* in the prosecution. Having no taste for such controversy, and placing no value on the rights for which I should contend, if at all, and having not the approval of conscience, I should have retired, but for the advice of my friends, to whom I condescended so far as to appeal to the Quarterly Meeting. I have now had an opportunity to test my former judgment by the light of experience, and it has been confirmed. The contest has been wholly of a personal character stimulated by prejudice. If I felt it to be a conscientious duty to proceed, no considerations personal to myself should deter me. But I do not. I cannot conscientiously maintain a public religious

connection with a body, which like the Monthly Meeting of New-York, has trampled upon the rights of conscience, and despised the claims of humanity. It is inconsistent with the faithful discharge of my duties to my fellow-man to remain in such a connection. Especially has that Monthly Meeting repudiated the great testimony of Gospel freedom which called the Society of Friends into existence. Therefore I retire from it, and would request this body to think seriously on the condition of a Meeting which can act thus in repudiation of its own professed principles, and give a purely personal character to cases of appeal from its decision."

My adversaries seem to think that because my disownment has been confirmed by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, they are relieved from all responsibility in the matter, and that it is entirely unnecessary to give themselves any further trouble in defending their course of conduct; or, in other words, that they may safely rest and take shelter under the "*reputation of Society.*" No one would more heartily rejoice than myself, in the persuasion, that that term carried with it the weight and significancy which attached to it in former years. The time was when the decision of a Monthly, Quarterly, or Yearly Meeting, was entitled to great respect. To say nothing of the weakness which has most lamentably characterized these bodies for the last twenty-five years, and which has given rise to persecution, disorganization and disaffection; the his-

tory of the case now presented to the reader, must convince every dispassionate observer of events, that the character of the official acts of the different meetings of the Society, has lost much of its dignity and claim to respect, in consequence of the unfaithfulness, worldly-mindedness and misconduct of many of its members, who have assumed a position to which neither their religious experience, nor their attainments in moral excellence entitle them. Much has occurred of latter times to show that many of the proceedings in the Society are marked by as much out-door contrivance and worldly policy as are displayed in many of the movements in political government, and are as totally void of sound religious principle. The "*reputation of Society,*" degraded and injured as it has been by such conduct as that of my persecutors, can furnish but a flimsy veil for such obviously evil doings as this narrative exhibits. Such a course as has been pursued by my adversaries, particularly in relation to the EXPLANATION which has been alluded to, was a most unparalleled conspiracy, not only against private character, but also, so far as its influence extends, against the peace, reputation, and harmony of the Society at large. Well might we exclaim in the pointed and expressive language of Job, "Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite."

Whatever may be the opinion of my readers

respecting my case, I think the fact must be very obvious, that the state of our Society is much to be deplored. Although the scheme of persecution which has been carried into effect against me, has doubtless been the work of a few individuals who were bitterly inimical to the cause of Emancipation, and were determined at all hazards to effect their plan of extirpation, yet it is greatly to be regretted that the prejudice against the cause of suffering humanity should have extended itself somewhat beyond the limits of New-York Monthly Meeting, into regions where a more consistent course of conduct would be expected. In one meeting not far from the city of New-York, some young men left the house in a rude and disorderly manner, merely because a respectable colored man in company with one of their most estimable members, took a seat on a bench near the preacher's gallery. And a friend of excellent character and standing, at whose house some colored children were boarding, was requested by several prominent members to take them up stairs when he took them to Meeting, a part of the Meeting-house which was then, and had been for a long time entirely unoccupied; when the congregation did not cover one half of the floor below. These innocent children, clean, tidy and respectable as they were, could not be permitted to occupy even the back bench on the lower floor of the Meeting-house without giving offence. We have even heard it asserted in the Yearly Meeting

that, when we ask the dealers in human flesh to manumit their slaves, we ought to pay them for their property, for that they, the slave holders think they have as good a right to their slaves as they have to their horses and oxen. When such views are tolerated, not to say sanctioned, and when members are engaged extensively in business connections with slave-holders, or trade largely in the produce of slave-labor, we cannot marvel that those friends who have followed their conscientious convictions of duty in bearing a testimony against the evil of slavery, should be made the victims of a most unrelenting persecution. I am well aware that there are many country friends who are not engaged in this corrupt traffic; but in consequence of their frequent and familiar intercourse with the city, too many have permitted their sensibility to its great wrong, to become in some measure blunted, and have remained disaffected in relation to the crying sin of oppression.

It would have been supposed, that after my persecutors had accomplished their scheme, so far as to succeed in having the decision of New-York Monthly Meeting confirmed by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, their efforts to slander my character would have ceased. But far otherwise is the fact. During a visit which I lately made in some of the counties of Pennsylvania, I discovered that the tongue of the traducer had been busy there. Some individuals residing in and near the city of

New-York, who had left their homes professedly as messengers of Gospel love, so far forgot the legitimate objects of their mission, as to spend too much of their time in endeavouring to convey very erroneous ideas in relation to my case and the circumstances connected with it. Such reprehensible conduct is productive of but little satisfaction, and generally recoils with redoubled force upon the heads of the defamers. In the language of the proverb, I would kindly remind such as are disposed thus to labor in the prolific vineyard of detraction, that "he that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."

Had the movements in my case been commenced and continued under a really honest concern for the support and maintenance of the Discipline and testimonies of the Society, I should have quietly rested under the result, however much I might have differed with my friends as to the propriety and correctness of their proceeding. But the whole conduct of my adversaries, in connection with my case, and in other matters, impels me to a different belief. Their extreme sensibility as to members mixing with those not of the Society, seems to receive its whole stimulus from their determined hostility to the cause of Emancipation. It is true that although friends of New-York Monthly Meeting mix very little in social, moral, or religious intercourse with other Christian denominations, yet

in any thing pertaining to "the craft of wealth," the shackles of sectarian exclusiveness fall to the ground, and he by whom they were carried knows nothing but the most free action. Is there a Bankrupt Act to be repealed, so that the creditor may have a tighter grasp upon the body and goods of his debtor? Our public journals show who are prompt and active in effecting the measure. Look at the records of our Banking, Insurance, and Railroad Companies, and see who are leading and active directors. The regular trips of the Long Island rail-road cars were not long since suspended, that they might be employed in conveying persons to the race-ground. And they were so employed. The price of passage was reduced to a very low rate, to induce a greater number to attend the races, and many thousands of the most dissolute and licentious were thus furnished with increased facilities of conveyance to that scene of cruelty, dissipation, immorality and riot. Sorrowful and surprising as it may appear, several members of the Society of Friends, prominent characters too, are now, or were at the time, members of the Board of Directors of this Company. *The being concerned in the support of such immorality may not have a tendency to excite disunity and discord in the Society of Friends*; but if it is not productive of a ten-fold worse abomination, I am totally incapable of forming any judgment upon matters in themselves self-evident.

No one can more sincerely regret than I do, the degenerate condition of any portion of the Society of Friends; and these facts are alluded to merely with the view of sustaining the position, that my disownment was effected to gratify the vindictive feelings of some bitter individuals whose hostility to the cause of Emancipation far exceeded their zeal for the welfare of the Society, the maintenance of its Discipline, or the support of its Testimonies. Irrespective of my own persecutions and trials, I deeply regret that the state of Society in this Yearly Meeting should have been weak enough to permit such a gross imposition to be practised upon it, as the proceedings of my adversaries, who were determined to carry out their own wills and purposes at any hazard, and at every sacrifice. William Penn most aptly says, "Have a care of novelties and airy changeable people, the conceited, censorious, and puffed up, who at last have always shown themselves to be clouds without rain, and wells without water, that will rather disturb and break the peace and fellowship of the church, where they dwell, than not have their wills and ways take place."

It has also been a cause of much sorrow, to see the ministry among us so diverted from a practical character into that which has been the means of creating "*discord and disunity in the Society.*" Had it been directed against usury, extortion, detraction, defamation and falsehood, instead of opposing the cause of excellence and truth, its fruits might have

been much more abundant in good. But the course which has been taken in attacking the friends of Humanity and Right, has given great cause of dissatisfaction throughout the country, as has been seen by the many "*Disclaimers*" which have been issued by the different bodies of Friends in this and other Yearly Meetings. The condition of the other portion of the Society of Friends in Indiana, which has resulted in disorganization, should serve as a warning to Friends in other places.

In preparing this narrative, I have omitted many facts which have a bearing on the proceedings of my adversaries, and which would go to show the true character of the controversy, and would place my persecutors in a position that could not be misconceived or misunderstood, but which I have purposely withheld, and most sincerely hope circumstances may never render necessary for me to publish.

It is due to truth that I should say that there are many honest-hearted friends who see and deplore the state of things among us, without being able to discover or apply a remedy. Some of the members of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, who are in no way connected with the Anti-Slavery movement, condemn the proceedings in my case; and there are besides, many within the limits of the Yearly Meeting, who sincerely regret the course taken against Charles Marriott, James S. Gibbons, and myself.

What is the position now presented by the Society of Friends? A few years ago they were foremost in the cause of Emancipation, but having cleared their own skirts of the evils of slavery, too many of them have settled down at ease, as though there was nothing more for them to do. Some feel a kind of sectarian pride, and seem to consider it a disparagement to mingle with persons not connected with their own religious denomination, in works of philanthropy, while they have no scruples in joining hands with such, in all schemes of pecuniary emolument. Some again, are disposed to do nothing, and settle down self-condemned for their own unfaithfulness, while they witness the faithfulness of others.

Another class of the Society feel themselves bound to hold up the testimony against slavery, and to labor in the cause of Emancipation, though it must be through much contumely and reproach. And what adds greatly to the trial of those who desire to be honestly performing the measure of service allotted to them, is, the opposition of those to whom they have a right to look for help, countenance and support, in this righteous cause. Why will our brethren continue their opposition? "Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."

In the best feelings of which my heart is susceptible, I would warn my friends against persecuting tender consciences. It is hateful in the sight of

God and good men. Cease your opposition to those who conscientiously believe themselves called upon to "Open their mouths for the dumb in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction," and who have none to help them. As you love the prosperity of truth, as you desire the peace of your own minds, above all, as you desire the love and favor of God, pause before you take another step in this unholy warfare.

I must now draw to a close. I have written plainly, and only with a view to set forth the truth. I can truly say that I harbor no unkind or hostile feelings towards those who have distinguished themselves as my persecutors, and have arrayed themselves in battle against me. It is true that I have been placed among the perils of false brethren, and have been hunted as a beast of prey; yet I am more than willing to leave my pursuers to the just witness in their own souls, who will never deceive them, nor leave them at ease in their sins; but will render judgment and justice according to their works. Neither dissimulation nor hypocrisy will cover their iniquity before that tribunal where justice is awarded, and where they and I shall appear.

Several months have elapsed since the decision which I have reviewed, was made. During which time, I have given the whole subject much patient and calm reflection in all its bearings. I have honestly examined my own heart and motives, and have never for a moment wavered in my opinion as to the acts

which have been the ostensible ground of the proceedings against me. I have felt, and now feel, nothing but the most unmingled satisfaction and peace of mind in taking a retrospect of the course which I have pursued. I have meditated in the cool of the day, and I would hope, free from improper excitement. I have reached that point in my earthly pilgrimage, at which the force of the passions becomes much abated, and wherein my aspirations to the Giver of all good become stronger and stronger, that I may be preserved in the path which will confer upon me true peace. My already multiplied years give me significant intimation that it cannot be long before I shall cease to be affected by earthly vicissitudes; for, at farthest, "When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I shall not return." In view of this, my disfranchisement as a member of New-York Monthly Meeting can be of but little consequence as regards myself personally.

It cannot be expected, in the present condition of that Meeting, and my views in relation to it, that I could be benefited by being connected with it, or that I could render any service to its members. And although my enemies have succeeded in obtaining a confirmation of their proceedings by this Yearly Meeting, I cannot feel that I am separated in spirit or feeling from the great body of the Society of Friends. In my extended intercourse with Friends in different parts of the States of New-

York, and Pennsylvania, and other places, I have had copious and irresistible testimony to the contrary. I feel and know that the bond of fellowship is not broken. And as regards the mere external connection or right of membership, I have had assurances which cannot be mistaken, that it is at my service at any time when I may think proper to request it. How or when I may accept of this kindness, is matter for future consideration. While I have sorely felt the wrongs inflicted upon me by my adversaries, I have received many unexpected evidences of sympathy, kindness and regard, for which I feel deeply grateful. They have strengthened my resolution not to be deterred from following the course of duty, while they have served as a rebuke to the wrong-doing of my enemies and persecutors.

One thing, however, I am free to confess. Conduct such as has been pursued in my case, has very naturally had a tendency to create disaffection on the part of many Friends, particularly in the minds of the young, and has caused them to err in attributing to the Society as a body, that which has been the unhallowed work of a faction of misguided individuals. This I sincerely deplore. Although I have had meted out to me "false burdens and causes of banishment," yet one consideration has given me greater anxiety and concern than any thing else connected with my disownment. I greatly feared that the unchristian conduct towards

me would have a tendency to unsettle the minds of my children and grandchildren, and weaken their attachment to the Society of Friends, which I have so long and studiously endeavored to cultivate and confirm ; but which the doings of my adversaries has been so pre-eminently calculated to diminish. Towards guarding against this evil, I feel that I have faithfully done my part.

I cannot close, without embracing the present opportunity to declare my unqualified attachment to the Society of Friends. My admiration for its great leading principles, my faith in its simple, but elevating doctrines, my love for its inward and external testimonies, my confidence in the efficacy and usefulness of its discipline, when administered with pure hearts and clean hands, remain wholly unabated and unshaken. I have ever looked upon them as calculated to accomplish much for humanity. In taking a retrospect of my past life, in looking at its vicissitudes—which have been various in kind, and almost without limit in number—my most cherished recollections, my sweetest associations, unnumbered incidents that have heightened my joy, and have lessened the bitterness and poignancy of many a cup of sorrow, have bound me in close affection to that religious communion which was the choice of my early days, and the principles of which shall be the strength, support, and gladness of my latter years. I have spent much time in its service, as the records of all its disciplinary meet-

ings amply attest. In its brighter days I have rejoiced in its prosperity; in its more depressed condition, when clouds have lowered, and storms have threatened, I have never for a moment turned my back, but have gladly hazarded every thing personal to myself, in its defence. And now, although excluded from its Meetings for Discipline at home, yet I have never felt at liberty to alter my habits of diligently attending those for worship. My inclination, my sense of duty, my views of proper example, all forbid my making any change in this respect. Whatever good I have attained in the Society, or in following my convictions of duty, has not been the work of my adversaries, nor can I conscientiously permit them to take it away. My sincere desire is to know what is right for me to do, and then to raise my eyes to the Hills from whence cometh all our help, for grace and strength to enable me to perform it, regardless of fear, favor, or affection on the one hand, or persecution and bitter reviling on the other.

I most ardently desire that my friends and brethren who have been called to labor for the redemption of those who are held in captivity, may not be alarmed or intimidated at what has befallen others who have felt it their duty to engage in the work of humanity. Steadily pursue the path that may be opened before you, and permit nothing to turn you aside from it. The Society of Friends have it in their power to do much, without in the least departing from their

principles or testimonies. In what better, nobler, or holier work can they engage? Some efforts have been made in times past which have been blessed, and I cannot persuade myself that this people will turn a deaf ear to the cry of oppression. And however much we may feel discouraged at the course taken by those of whom better things should have been expected, let us hope for the dawning of a brighter day. Let every one do his part in the great reform for which we hope, and not turn away from the field of labor. "Let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."

In the language of a modern writer, I would say, "With every endeavor to introduce a more active spirit of virtue amongst us, I deeply sympathize. I hold that all the physical and intellectual powers we possess should be dedicated to the furtherance of good, and the very possession of them is an obligation upon us to exercise them—that our understandings are amongst the noblest gifts of our Divine Father, and that we are bound to employ them at all hours and at all times, in his service. It is a false, and has been a most pernicious notion, that because "the carnal mind is enmity against God"—i. e. the carnal state of the mind—therefore our minds in their natural capacities, are unfit to serve him. The maxim of "not running in our own will to do good," has done infinite harm. If we run with a desire to do good, we shall run well;

for the very desire of good springs from the source of good. My opinion, therefore, is, that "to be instant in season and out of season," is the law and the obligation of the Christian; and our daily experience shows that obedience to that law is largely blessed. I say, therefore, that I deeply sympathize with all endeavors to introduce a greater tendency to virtuous action in our Society. I would have none leave it—I would have none lopped off who hold with us the few real essentials of Christian association; but would have us all stand together in the spirit of an enlarged love, for the cause of religion and of man."

ISAAC T. HOPPER.

New-York, 5th mo. 1843.

A P P E N D I X.

A

[See page 16.]

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.—DEVELOPMENTS.

To the Editor of the Standard :

“Strike ! but conceal the hand !” was the favorite maxim of one who formed the vain and impious resolution to exterminate Christianity, and to “crush” its Divine Founder. The spirit which dictated this maxim, however, was not peculiar to its author ; nor are there wanting those, even at the present day, who, if less daring than the Infidel philosopher, and less capable of doing injury to society, are nevertheless governed, in their warfare upon truth, by the same assassin-like policy. An example is now before me, which I am reluctantly constrained to notice.

It is known to most of the readers of the Standard, that during the last winter, I published a pamphlet, entitled, “Correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White, a Minister of the Society of Friends ; with an Appendix ;” the object of which was to refute certain charges brought by G. F. White, in his public ministrations, against abolitionists and others. As this pamphlet has been extensively circulated, I need only say here, that it furnished the most ample evidence, from his own pen and lips, and from other sources, that, under a profession of Divine inspiration, he had made statements, which, on investigation, were proved to be untrue ; and that, in other respects, his deportment to say the least, had been very extraordinary.

Hitherto, there has been no open attempt, either on the

part of G. F. White or his supporters, to impeach the truth or fairness of the statements contained in the pamphlet; although if his conduct had been capable of vindication, the excitement created by the publication, and the effects it has produced in the Society, would seem to have rendered the motives for a defence peculiarly strong. When nothing available *can* be said, it is surely the part of wisdom to be silent.

But while there has been no open and manly attempt to reply to the pamphlet, the *tongue* and the *pen* have been employed, *in private*, to diminish, as far as possible, the influence it is calculated to exert, by assailing the character and motives of the author. Although I had been frequently advised of the false reports which the supporters of G. F. White had put in circulation, they did not reach me in a shape sufficiently tangible to call for a defence, until I received from a friend a copy of a letter, purporting to have been written by ROBERT HICKS, of this city, to Samuel Griffith, of Mount Pleasant, Ohio. This letter having been extensively circulated, *in private*, in various parts of the country,* where it was impossible for those who saw it to know what I might say in reply, has excited prejudices not only unfavorable to myself, but injurious to the Anti-Slavery cause. I have been assured by Friends, in whose judgment I have great confidence, that I ought, by all means, in justice to the cause of truth no less than to myself, to publish this letter, with a suitable reply to its numerous misstatements. I therefore send it to you with some reluctance, for insertion in the Standard.† My reply is subjoined in the form of notes.

* I am told that a relative of the writer took a copy to the Genesee Yearly Meeting, where it was read in various circles, in vindication of G. F. White, and to destroy confidence in me!

† A copy was sent to Robert Hicks, in proof, in order to afford him an opportunity to point out any errors of the copyist. As the proof was not returned, I take it for granted that he admits it to be a correct copy.

LETTER OF ROBERT HICKS TO SAMUEL GRIFFITH.

NEW-YORK, 3d. mo. 26, 1841.

Esteemed Friend, Samuel Griffith.

In reading the correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White, &c., I perceive thy name is brought into notice by Oliver Johnson, and in such a way as possibly to subject thee to censure in the minds of some, who judge of the case as it is presented by him, without being acquainted with the source from which it emanated. I address thee under a belief that thou wouldst be willing to learn something of the estimation in which he is held by Friends in this city.(1)

It may be proper to premise that there are in our monthly meeting a few individuals, (numbering, perhaps, five or six male adults,) of whom Isaac T. Hopper, and James S. Gibbons, his son-in-law, are the most active, who have been laboring with great zeal to draw our Society into modern abolitionism, but have failed. They consider George F. White to be one of their principal obstacles, and against him are directed their greatest efforts. They have, until recently, professed warm friendship for him, and high esteem for his ministry; while one of them has at the same time been defaming him by misrepresentations privately circulated.(2)

Oliver Johnson is ostensibly the sole author of the pamphlet; but it is not doubted by Friends here, that he is a tool of these parties, employed by them to do that which they, as members of society dare not do themselves; and he appears to be a pliant instrument for their purposes. (3) A short time prior to the correspondence, he was first noticed as a stranger, apparently between 30 and 40 years of age, attending our meeting in Rose street; not known by us, with perhaps one or two exceptions—not even his name. When George F. White received his first letter, he had no knowledge of him, and first supposed him to be an honest inquirer; but he soon discovered that the object was to entrap him. (4) Of this correspondence, being now public, I have little to say. (With regard to its correctness, George F. White says he cannot say, as he never read it, (5) though one of the pamphlets was sent him.) In reading the two last letters, I became suspicious that there was something wrong, and requested George to let me have the originals of Oliver Johnson's letters, together with the copies of his own in reply. On examining and com-

paring them with the pamphlet, I find many alterations, omissions, and additions.*(6) It would probably have been better, had George requested a personal interview, as he then could have judged of the motives of the inquirer and acted accordingly. Where both parties are known, it will do George no harm; but it is not improbable that in some places it may lead to a prejudice in the minds of Friends against him. It is here considered, that he followed the advice of a wise man formerly, "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."(7)

The last letters, as published in the correspondence, are a review of the previous ones, and were designedly not sent to George until sent in a pamphlet form. They, with the appendix, abound in misrepresentations and falsehood.(8)

On the non-resistance case, I need make no comments, as thou art better acquainted with it than I am. I will now pass to that of the Anti-Slavery case. In the communication alluded to by Oliver Johnson, [*i. e.* the sermon at Rose street,] George F. White did not charge the whole body of abolitionists with maintaining the opinion that the only hope of the slave was not in God, &c., but in the Anti-Slavery Society. He stated that an anti-slavery society had passed such a resolution; (9) and he pronounced such a sentiment flat blasphemy. And can it be denied that it is so? Can it be questioned that such a sentiment is an indignity to God? I think it cannot; but bear in mind, that although George calls this sentiment blasphemous, he calls no man a blasphemer. I have long sat under his ministry, and have travelled with him from home, and have never heard him do so. He says he never did it; neither did he ever call any man a sinner.(10) He holds that a man may write or speak blasphemy, and not be a blasphemer in the sight of his Maker; as, on the other hand, a man may swear that the Lord liveth, and therein swear falsely. Almost immediately on George's closing, Oliver Johnson arose and said—I believe that the Spirit of God(11) requires me to say, that what you have heard in relation to the Anti-Slavery Society, is untrue, &c.

* I have been informed that Robert Hicks shows a paper purporting to be a true copy of the correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White; as far as that paper differs from the pamphlet, it is incorrect. The original letters are in my possession, and I will show them to any person wishing to examine them. I. T. H.

After Oliver Johnson took his seat, George again arose and stated, that he had vouchers to prove the truth of what he had asserted, and if any one would call at his house or store, he would show them, &c. Did this invitation include O. Johnson? I think not, certainly; it was to those who had heard him charged with falsehood, to come and judge for themselves, whether he or O. Johnson had told the untruth. (12) One important part of the interview at George's house is entirely omitted in O. Johnson's account of it. Believing that they would make such a report of it as to suit their design, before they left his house, George told J. S. Gibbons, that he was about to ask him one or two questions, which he desired him promptly to answer, to wit: whether he had seen anything in his manner, or heard anything in his language, during the interview, which he thought was unbecoming a minister of our religious society?—if he had witnessed anything in his manner, or in his language, that evinced bad temper? (13) James was embarrassed, and George pressed him for an answer. He repeated the question again. The only reply was, "Thee will not receive my friend"—"I can understand thee"—"I know how to take thee." Although George repeatedly requested Oliver Johnson to withdraw from his premises, (14) he remained with James S. Gibbons in the house for nearly an hour. (15.)

The proof of George's assertion in relation to the anti-slavery resolution is to be found in the report of the proceedings of a meeting of the Junior Anti-Slavery Society, held at Temperance Hall, 1st mo. (Jan.) 3d, 1840, published in the Pennsylvania Freeman of 1st mo. 9th, 1840. As the paper may not be within thy reach, I will transcribe the full account, viz:

"James G. Birney delivered a powerful address, showing the sin of slavery under all circumstances. The following preamble and resolutions, offered by J. L. Hallowell, were advocated by Gerrit Smith, in an impressive speech.

"Whereas, it is the belief of the members of this Society, that the plan proposed by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and its auxiliaries, is the only one by which American slavery can be abolished; therefore,

"Resolved, That, in the language of our esteemed friend from New-York, we believe that the peaceful and bloodless termination of American slavery is not to be expected without a more entire consecration of property, and a more self-sacrificing spirit, than now characterizes American abolitionists.

"Resolved, That, *as we believe the only hope of the slave is in the*

anti-slavery society, the abolitionists of the present day must contribute more liberally of their funds, if they expect to accomplish their most glorious object,—the liberation from their chains of three millions of their fellow-countrymen.

“The resolutions were unanimously adopted. Pledges were received to the amount of \$100, and \$45 86 additional collected.

“THOMAS S. CAVENDER, *Secretary.*”

I know not whether or no Oliver Johnson's assertion is true, “that this society is composed principally of minors, and members, too, of the Society of Friends.” The truth or falsehood of this assertion has no bearing on the truth of George's statement. But thou wilt notice, that there were present, and participated in the proceedings of the meeting, two of their most prominent men in the whole Union, James G. Birney and Gerrit Smith. The former delivered a powerful address, and the very resolution in question was advocated by Gerrit Smith, in an impressive speech, and passed unanimously. On examining the resolution, thou wilt find that George might have called attention to another part, to wit: “their most *glorious* object” of the anti-slavery society was to be accomplished by a more liberal contribution of funds; a clear distinction between their glory and the glory of the Creator.(16)

The attack made by O. Johnson, upon George F. White, was a premeditated one. (17) Isaac T. Hopper was cognizant of this fact; (18) and on the morning when it was made, several members of his family were at the meeting, (19) (not the one to which they belong, and which they usually attend,) (20) apparently with the view of witnessing the outrage. Isaac professes to disapprove of the disturbance of the meeting, and to be exceedingly grieved at the publication of the correspondence, and entirely denies having had anything to do with it; but O. Johnson says that Isaac furnished him with the cases he has cited (21) to prove that early Friends *unlawfully* disturbed the meetings of other denominations; and thou canst bear witness that he has endorsed Oliver Johnson's character,(22) (as a respectable, worthy man,) for the very purpose of assisting him in obtaining materials that are used in his publication. O. Johnson's home is at Isaac T. Hopper's house, and they occupy the same office. The information, that Isaac received a salary for his services, was given by himself—the amount stated, six hundred dollars.

In letter No. 12, Johnson seems to demur to the charge of hypocrisy and cant, on the ground that the proof brought by George is not sufficient to sustain it; but those who are acquainted with the following circumstance, will not deem that George was very wide of the mark in making the charge; as I think it will be difficult to find stronger proof of hypocrisy and canting. A short time since, a worthy Friend, who is far advanced in years, very infirm in body, and still more infirm in mind, had a good deal to say in one of our public meetings, at which were many strangers, in is such a way as to be exceedingly trying to all who have a concern for the good ordering of our meetings. During the course of his remarks, O. Johnson was repeatedly observed to exhibit lightness of behaviour, &c. In a person feeling in no degree the importance of the occasion on which we were convened, and having no concern for the good order of our meetings, this conduct was not to be wondered at, as the discourse was calculated to lead to such a result. But the unpleasant feature of the case is this: At the close of the meeting, as the aged Friend was passing from the house, a person introduced him to O. Johnson, at the same time saying something that was not fully understood; but it was believed to be, that O. Johnson was a warm friend of the slave, &c. The aged Friend shook him heartily by the hand, saying, that in that thing he had full unity with him. Here was a chance to make capital, too good to be lost; and how was it improved? Why, O. Johnson replied,—Mr. ——, I am glad to be introduced to you; it gives me much pleasure; and I feel best satisfied to say, that your communications, *both this morning*, and on former occasions, have been very edifying to my feelings, and comforting to my spirit, &c. Now I have not the slightest objection to O. Johnson's being edified and comforted by such a communication; but his conduct during its delivery did not comport with such a state of mind.

Regarding his accusation of the founders of our Society disturbing the worship of other denominations, he might, with equal justice, accuse William Penn and William Mead of a breach of the peace, in addressing a jury, at the Old Bailey, in 1670, under the tyrannical government of Charles 2d, and urging upon them to maintain their rights, and the rights of all Englishmen, under their great charter or constitution. Friends acted under the same necessity, in supporting their legal and religious rights, when they entered

the churches of which they were members, and at which they were required by law to attend, and there spoke to the people after the regular service. (24) There may be one or two exceptions, in which Friends interrupted the service, which was only a breach of the church regulations; and in all the commitments and imprisonments in that day, I have found none for the breach of any law against disturbing persons assembled for divine worship; (25) but very many for refusing to take an oath for holding unlawful assemblies, or conventicles, and speaking therein, and for non-attendance at the church, and for not paying the fine for non-attendance. I know of no instance on record of their attending at the church for any purpose, after they became a Society. (26) How different was the conduct of O. Johnson, in coming into the meeting of a Society in which he had no right, (27) and slandering that Society, in the presence of its members others, (28) in justification of his own outrage in asserting that one of its ministers had declared that which was untrue. (29)

P. S. Since the foregoing was written, I perceive that the last "Anti-Slavery Standard," published in this city, (on 5th-day last,) contains a violent attack upon our Society. (30) This paper is the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and is under the management of the Executive Committee of said Society, the Committee consisting of some eight or ten persons: James S. Gibbons, (Chairman,) Charles Marriott, (Secretary,) Isaac T. Hopper, (Treasurer,) of their Society,—the three being members of our Monthly Meeting; and they, with one exception of a person not a member of our Society, are the only residents of the Executive Committee in the city. (31) The parties admit that they are the Acting Executive Committee; the others occasionally attend when in town; and they support and direct the publication of the paper. By this thou wilt perceive that the paper is supported and directed by members of Society, they being three out of four of the acting part of the committee.

These persons, after having made efforts to introduce their agents and lecturers among Friends in this vicinity, and having utterly failed, have now commenced an attack upon us; and it is to be feared that Friends living at a distance, not being acquainted with circumstances that transpire here, have written letters, perhaps confidentially, which are liable to be made use of to their injury, and the injury of their services in Society.

I send thee a copy of the paper. I presume no (public) notice will be taken of this attack, or of the correspondence—I mean by way of reply to it. (32)

P. S. *2d 4th mo*—The cases of Isaac T. Hopper and James S. Gibbons were this day reported to the preparative meeting, and referred to the monthly meeting, charged with being concerned in the support of a paper having a tendency to create disunity and discord amongst us.

Thee is at liberty to make any use of this letter, if it will be of any advantage to thee. (33)

NOTES IN REPLY TO THE FOREGOING LETTER.

(1.) Was it ingenuous to attempt to impair confidence in the truthfulness of what I had said in the pamphlet, by statements respecting the “estimation” in which I was held by those whose circumstances rendered them peculiarly liable to imbibe prejudices against me? Certainly it would have been very remarkable, if the warm supporters of G. F. White had not been offended with me for publicly contradicting, in a manner however unexceptionable, statements made by him under a profession of Divine inspiration. *They* would not be likely, under such circumstances, surely, to hold *me* in *better* “estimation” than were the early Friends by those whose doctrines and practices they so pointedly condemned. Suppose, that, instead of replying directly to the Statements of Robert Hicks, I were to attempt to impair confidence in his character, by reporting the “estimation” in which he is held by those who are bitterly prejudiced against him: would not every candid person say, that such a course was unfair, and that it furnished presumptive evidence that I was in the wrong? So it appears to me. I submit whether the rule will not work both ways.

(2.) The writer of this letter is an overseer of the New-York Monthly Meeting. If he can substantiate what he here asserts, why has he not dealt with the individual alluded to as the discipline requires? Why is such a charge “privately

circulated" within the limits of three or four yearly meetings?

(3.) Perhaps all this is "not doubted" by those "Friends here," who believe George F. White to be divinely inspired; but others, I apprehend, will not estimate very highly the candor of one who can accuse such men as Isaac T. Hopper, Charles Marriott, and James S. Gibbons, of employing "a tool," to do that which they "dare not do themselves." So far as the imputation relates to myself, I simply deny that it has any foundation in truth.

(4.) Those who have read the correspondence must, I am sure, acknowledge that on my part it was at least characterized by manly frankness, and the absence of design to "entrap" any one. Of that, however, others must judge.

(5.) Those who listened to his denunciations of "hireling writers," on the next Sabbath after the appearance of the pamphlet, and heard him declare (with a *vehemence* and *agitation* of manner peculiarly his own, and in singular contrast with the *usual* indications of peace of mind,) that he enjoyed a "REST" which could not be disturbed by "reptiles" and "household vermin," will be likely to suspect, that if he had not read it himself, he had at least *heard* it read by some one else.

(6.) Immediately on receiving a copy of this letter, I addressed to the ostensible author the following note:—

NEW-YORK, July 31, 1841.

ROBERT HICKS:

I have in my possession a copy of a letter written by you, and addressed to Samuel Griffith, of Jefferson county, Ohio, under date of "3d mo. 26th, 1841;" in which, alluding to the published correspondence between George F. White and myself, you say:

¶ "In reading the two last letters, I became suspicious that there was something wrong, and requested George to let me have the originals of Oliver Johnson's letters, together with the copies of his own in reply. On examining and comparing them with the pamphlet, I find many alterations, omissions, and addition."

As your letter has been circulated privately, to a considerable extent, and is calculated to make an impression, where its statements are believed, that I have printed George F. White's let-

ters, as well as my own, incorrectly, I am desirous of placing the matter in its true light before all whom it concerns. For this reason, I request you to *specify, particularly*, all the "alterations, omissions, and additions," to which you allude. If you will give me such a specification, I hereby pledge myself to publish it as extensively as I did the correspondence, and to furnish you, gratuitously, with 100 copies, if you desire them.

I wish also make to you the following proposition, which, if it suits you better than to comply with the foregoing request, you can accept. If you will call at the Anti Slavery Office, 143 Nassau-street, with any friend, or number of friends, whom you may choose to have with you, and bring the originals of my letters to George F. White, I will produce the originals of his to me; and the whole may be freely examined in the presence of both your friends and mine. Any "alterations, omissions, and additions," which may be discovered on such an examination, I will publish as before stated, and furnish you with 100 copies of the same, if you desire them. If you prefer some other place to the Anti-Slavery office, I will meet you with one or two friends at any place in the city, and at almost any time which you may choose.

I deem it proper, in conclusion, to apprise you, that I shall feel at liberty to publish your letter to Samuel Griffith, with such comments as it appears to me to require.

Respectfully,

Your friend,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

Could I have made a fairer proposition, or furnished more conclusive evidence that the charge against me was unfounded? But did the author accept the proposition, and embrace the opportunity thus afforded to establish, if possible, by the only fair means, an accusation, which, if true, must necessarily destroy the confidence of the public in my honesty? Or did he retract the charge? He did neither. Like the man in the gospel, conscious that he had not the garment of truth for a covering, "*he was speechless!*"

Here I might dismiss this calumny as unworthy of further notice; but, in order to put it for ever to rest, and to satisfy even suspicion itself, I offer the following

CERTIFICATE.

The undersigned, members of the Society of Friends, as an act of simple justice, hereby certify, that Oliver Johnson has this

day placed in our hands certain manuscript letters, which we have satisfactory reasons for believing, and which, we do not doubt, are the original letters of George F. White, published in a pamphlet, entitled, "Correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White, a minister of the Society of Friends;" and that, on a careful and rigid comparison, we find the same printed in the said pamphlet with scrupulous accuracy and fidelity, without "omissions, additions, or alterations," except in the following trifling and unimportant particulars, viz. :

1. In the pamphlet, p. 15, (line 13 from bottom,) the word "have" is erroneously printed for *had*; so as to read, "I *have* long looked upon," &c. instead of, "I *had* long looked upon," &c.

2. The phrase, "thy informant," on p. 16 of the pamphlet, line 18 from bottom, reads in the original, "thy thy informant."

3. In three instances, in the last letter of G. F. W., in order to correct a *mistake*, (which is fully explained by a note in the pamphlet itself,) the word "implements" is substituted for its synonym, "materials."

4. The *name* of the person, who gave the information which led to the correspondence, is written in the original, but omitted in the pamphlet for the reason stated in a note on p. 10.

5. In four or five instances, Oliver Johnson has corrected the orthography of G. F. W.

6. In several cases, Oliver Johnson has made proper corrections in punctuation, and in the use of capital letters.

Not one of these mistakes, or corrections, affects, in the least degree, the meaning of the writer, as expressed in the original letters.

We have been induced to give this certificate, not only as an act of justice to Oliver Johnson, but from a belief that those who have honestly imbibed impressions unfavourable to him, will be glad to have them corrected.

JOHN KETCHAM,
HENRY WILLIS,
JOSEPH POST,
MARY W. POST.

Jericho, L. I., 8th mo. 9, 1841.

The signers of this certificate are members of the Monthly Meetings of Jericho and Westbury, and all well known to Robert Hicks, as persons whose character for veracity is unimpeachable. I might have obtained the signatures of a score of Friends, of equally high standing, if I had deemed it necessary.

It has been suggested, that my accuser may attempt to

substantiate his charge, by declaring, that the insertion of a comma or a semicolon, where it was manifestly required by the common rules of punctuation, is an "addition;" that leaving out either of these marks, for a similar reason, is an "omission;" and that the substitution of a — for the name of the informant, and a correction of false orthography, are "alterations," &c. &c. A resort to such a subterfuge, however, would be tantamount to a confession of gross hypocrisy and an intention to deceive; for what reader of his letter would suppose that he alluded in his charge to the common corrections of punctuation and orthography, which the printer is expected to make in nearly every manuscript that is put into his hands? The letters of George F. White were treated by me as I would treat those of a personal friend. They were as well prepared for the press as manuscripts generally are; and if I had refused to make the corrections which are demanded in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, of a similar character, I should have been charged with an invidious effort to make him appear illiterate. If any one should still suspect that I have done him injustice, or doubt the fidelity of the examination made by the signers of the certificate, the letters are open to inspection.

It may be asked, whether the "omissions, additions, and alterations," do not pertain chiefly to my own letters? Respecting this, I only need say, that, with the exception of a single word, I am confident the printed letters will be found to correspond exactly with the originals, as they do with the copies which I retained. The word to which I allude is, "unworthy," which, if I had followed the original, I should have inserted before "member," on p. 6, line 20 from top. I omitted it, that I might not appear to proclaim my own humility.

I waive all comments upon the motives of my accuser, as well as upon the insidious nature of the charge itself. It is enough for me that I have shown the latter to be groundless.

(7.) There is another rule, given by one "greater than Solomon," by which the conduct of both G. F. W. and myself must be tested—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

(8.) In answer to this *general* charge, I can only say, that it is untrue. So far as the writer has ventured to *specify* what he is pleased to term "misrepresentations and falsehood," my reply will be found in subsequent notes.

(9.) This statement may deceive those who live at a distance, but it will have no other effect here, than to impair confidence in him who makes it. It is perfectly notorious, and, so far as I know, has never before been denied, either by friend or foe, that on the occasion referred to, George F. White attributed the "blasphemy" to "abolitionists," without qualification, and without allusion to any Society, or resolution of a Society. It was in this light that I replied to the charge, denying its truth; and remarking, at the same time, "that it was not unlikely, that out of 1500 or 2000 Anti-Slavery Societies, scattered in every part of the free States, one or more might have used unguarded language on this point." G. F. W. did not pretend that I had misunderstood or misconstrued his remarks, but immediately reiterated the charge; and in the interview, at his own house, with James S. Gibbons, he contended that the resolution of the Philadelphia Society fairly implicated the whole body of abolitionists. So far from complaining that I had misunderstood him, in supposing that he referred to abolitionists generally, he even ridiculed the argument by which J. S. G. endeavoured to convince him that the Philadelphia Society was alone responsible for its resolutions. On this point I confidently appeal to hundreds, in Philadelphia and elsewhere, who have often heard him make the same charge in the most unqualified terms. Indeed, he rarely, if ever, uses qualifying terms, but almost invariably speaks in the superlative degree. Of course, if he had only said that *an Anti-*

Slavery Society had adopted a "blasphemous" resolution, I should have been relieved from the unpleasant duty of a public reply. A private request to be furnished with the *names* of the Society would, in that case, have been sufficient.

(10.) In this the writer is probably correct. George F. White rarely, if ever, uses so mild a term as "sinner." "Hypocrites," "vile hypocrites," "hypocritical hirelings," "hypocritical workers of popular* righteousness," "emissaries of Satan," "servants of the Devil," "wolves," "reptiles," "household vermin,"—these, and such as these, are the epithets he is wont to apply to members of his own religious society, and to others equally worthy of esteem and confidence. And yet, he calls no man a sinner! As if it were possible for men to be "hypocrites," and not at the same time "sinners!" As if "hypocrisy" were not the most aggravated of all sins!

(11.) I did not use this expression; but simply said, that I rose "from a sense of duty."

(12.) The object of denying that the general invitation to "any body" included me, is to furnish an apology for the treatment which I received at the house of G. F. W. The distinction may pass for what it is worth; but suppose I was *not* invited; is that a justification for turning me out of doors? Is that such treatment as the gospel would sanction, even when awarded to an enemy? "If ye salute [extend the rites of hospitality to] your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans the same?" Let those who think I acted improperly in going to the house of G. F. White, for the purpose of asking him, in a respectful manner, to let me see the "vouchers" which he said he was willing

* "*Popular!*" This is certainly a very singular adjective to be used in such a connection. Would it not be more consistent with truth to say, that those who thus denounce abolitionists are "workers of popular unrighteousness?" Many offences have been charged to the abolitionists, but G. F. White is the only one, I believe, who has accused them of being engaged in a *popular* work.

to show to "any body," and who are ready to excuse or palliate his conduct in ordering me out of the house, read the following, from Besse's *Sufferings of the Quakers*, vol. i., p. 583 :

"About this time (1658) it happened, that Elizabeth Tucker, a zealous woman of Ilminster, went to the house of James Strong, Priest of that place, and exhorted him, in the name of the Lord, to give over deceiving the people, where he was set up and owned as a minister, and no longer to make a prey upon the innocent by his covetous practices. *The priest, angry at reproof, thrust her out, and shut the door after her, before she had fully expressed her mind.*"

True, the priest above mentioned used physical force to eject the woman from the house ; and in this respect his conduct was different from that of George F. White. But, then, it must be considered, on the other hand, that the priest did not profess to be a Quaker, and that the woman visited him not by invitation, nor in defence of her own character ; while her language was peculiarly calculated to provoke him.

(13.) Did not the asking such questions betray a consciousness of having acted improperly ? Is it natural for a man, when feelings of kindness are uppermost in his heart, and the "voice within" conveys no reproof, to inquire what others think of his conduct ?

(14.) This is incorrect. No such request was made during the conversation with J. S. G.

(15.) During this time, James stood with his hat in his hand, ready to depart. He regarded himself as excluded from an honorable reception by the treatment awarded to me. Under such circumstances, can I be blamed for not withdrawing alone ?

(16.) I hardly know how to express, without seeming harshness, the disgust I feel, and which I am sure must be excited in every enlightened mind, by this effort to characterize as blasphemous the resolutions of the Philadelphia Junior Society, which, understood according to their obvious intent and meaning, are perfectly consistent with the highest

sense of dependence upon God. Think of a minister of the Society of Friends, at this period of the Christian era, in a country where one-sixth of the people are slaves, whose sighs and groans are borne to his ears on every breeze, turning coldly away from the tale of their agonizing sorrows, justifying his cold-hearted indifference to their wrongs, by the impious declaration that God can send them relief in his own good time! and then fastening an evil eye upon the benevolent action of others, and torturing their very "*mercy into crime!*" Shade of Fox, and Penn, and Woolman, and Hicks! Was such *your* testimony against oppression? Did ye suffer the giant iniquities of your generation to go unrebuked, and turn a deaf ear to the cries of suffering humanity, that ye might hurl your denunciations at those whose names were "cast out as evil" for their fidelity to God and truth? Did ye listen to the generous outpourings of sympathy for the down-trodden, from hearts consecrated, in the face of reproach and persecution, to the work of their deliverance, as the Scribes and Pharisees listened to Jesus, that ye might find whereof to accuse them? Was such your spirit—such the example which constitutes the inheritance of those who, while they garnish your sepulchres, defame and persecute the messengers whom God has raised up to proclaim to this generation the truths which fell with such burning eloquence and power from your lips?

(17.) This is not true. There was nothing of arrangement, preparation, or concert with others, in relation to the matter. Not until his denunciations reached a point at which it seemed strange that the very stones did not cry out, nor until I felt that I could not innocently refrain, did I open my mouth; and then I said as little as would satisfy my conscience, and much less than might have been deemed justifiable on the principle of self-defence.

(18.) This is untrue; but I will leave Isaac T. Hopper to speak for himself.

(19.) This is also untrue. Only one member of his family was present, and he affirms that he did not even know that I was going to be there—much less that I would speak.

(20.) The only member of Isaac T. Hopper's family present on that occasion was in the frequent habit of attending that meeting. James S. Gibbons and his wife were also there, but without my knowledge. They, too, frequently attended the Rose-street meeting, as they do still.

(21.) That is to say, he was guilty of lending me, at my own request, the Journal of George Fox! A grave offence, certainly, and worthy of being whispered through Ohio and Western New-York, as a proof that he was at the bottom of the whole affair, and was only using me as his "tool!"

(22.) As I was a stranger to Samuel Griffith, I. T. H., *at my request*, added to my letter of inquiry a note, designed to introduce me to him. Was there any thing wrong in this?

(23.) This story, so confidently related, for the purpose of branding me with insincerity and hypocrisy, is marked by the grossest misrepresentation. The aged Friend alluded to is WILLETT HICKS, an approved minister of the Society, who, when his health allows him to be present, sits at the head of the preachers' gallery in the Rose-street meeting. Nothing could be more unjust than the statement that his communications, at the time alluded to, were calculated to produce disorder. To me, they seemed to partake, in a high degree, of that tenderness of spirit, and that childlike trust in God, which can alone be felt and exhibited by a man of deep religious experience. If there was a quaintness in some of his expressions, calculated to produce a smile, there was much more to move the soul to tears. I confess I was highly delighted with his spirit, and solemnly impressed by what he said. He evidently spoke from the depths of his own experience; and there was in his communications a fervent charity, and a warmth of benevolence, which charmed me the

more because they were in such delightful contrast with the sweeping denunciations and scornful invective, which had characterized most of the preaching to which I had listened in that place. George F. White was absent ; and many who had been drawn there by a desire to hear abolitionists abused and vilified, were doubtless disappointed, and not a little chagrined, to hear a good old man declare that he loved every body, "blacks as well as whites," and that no man who was a Christian could either slander his neighbour or hold human beings in bondage. Preaching like this did not suit the admirers of G. F. White ! It was too much like that of the prophet Nathan, and came home too closely to their own consciences. The assertion that I was "observed to exhibit lightness of behaviour," is no more true, than that "the discourse was calculated to lead to such a result." I was *pleased*, and my countenance may have exhibited the pleasure I felt. Friends, I know, on such occasions, are more strict than others ; and if I suffered the emotions of the mind to be more visibly expressed by the countenance, than is usual with them, my apology is, that I have not been educated in their Society, but in one which regards it as no breach of decorum when individuals are seen even to smile at the expression of a sentiment that is peculiarly quaint or pleasing. I am confident, that on the occasion alluded to, I did not do this ; but whether I did or not, it is the height of injustice to represent me as having spoken insincerely in what I said at the time I was introduced to Willett Hicks. I told him, what I deeply felt, that I had been edified by what had fallen from his lips, and that I rejoiced to see him, on the verge of life, enjoying in so high a degree the consolations of religion. It is recollected by members of the family with whom I lived, that on returning from the meeting, I expressed, with much enthusiasm of manner, the same feelings which I communicated to him.

(24.) This is mere dust-throwing. Every one who has

read the early history of Friends, must be aware, that they did not go to the "steeple-houses" because the *law* required them to do so, nor merely to support their own legal and religious rights; but in obedience, as they believed, to the Spirit of God, to rebuke the priests and the people for their sins, and to bear testimony in favour of pure Christianity. Besides, their visits were not confined to the "steeple-houses" of the Established Church. For example:

"Thomas Bond, being at an *Independent* meeting in Great Yarmouth, (1655,) after their preacher had done, found a necessity upon him of speaking to the assembly, which he began to do, when one of their Elders, or Deacons, interrupted him, by thrusting him down over a high seat," &c. "He was taken and sent to prison, where he lay among felons."—*Besse's Sufferings of the Quakers*, vol. i. p. 487.

In the same work, (vol. i. p. 190,) it is stated that James Parnel, in 1655, when only 18 years of age, "went to Coggeshall, where the *Independent* professors had appointed a fast." He "stood still till the priest had done," when he entered into a discussion with him. "On his coming out of the steeple-house, he was apprehended, and after examination, committed to Colchester castle," on a charge of having entered the church "in a riotous manner," &c. He was afterwards tried, found guilty, "fined £40, and sent again to prison till payment."

Of course there was no law compelling Friends to go to the meetings of the Independents.

(25.) I have before me the Journal of Richard Davies, a work well known among Friends. On p. 37, after stating that he went to the "steeple-house," in Welch Pool, in 1657, where he addressed the assembly, he says:

"But I spoke but a little while, ere I was taken away to prison, with the young man before mentioned. . . . We were committed to prison on that LAW, made in Oliver's days, that none were to speak to the priest or preachers, neither at their worship, nor coming and going."

As the following cases of imprisonment, *for speaking in the "steeple-houses,"* occurred during Cromwell's reign, there is little doubt that they were for violations of the law above referred to.

"In this and the foregoing year, (1654-5,) Joseph Cole, Dorothy Waugh, George Adamson, Hannah Mills, Thomas Curtis, and Anne, his wife, were imprisoned at several times for offering to speak, by way of Christian exhortation, to the priest and people, when assembled in their place for public worship at Reading."—*Besse's Sufferings of the Quakers*, vol. i. p. 11.

"About this time, (1656,) several persons were committed to Newgate, in Bristol, for bearing testimony to the truth in the place of public worship there, viz :—Thomas Robinson, Josiah Cole, John Smith, John Waring, Henry Waring, Margaret Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall, Temperance Hignell, George Harrison, Christopher Birkhead, Benjamin Maynard, John Ware, and John Bezer."—*Ib.* vol. i. pp. 41—2.

"Mary Fisher, James Lancaster, and John Cunningham, for giving Christian exhortations to the priests and people, when assembled in the places for public worship, were committed to prison," (in 1655.)—*Ib.* p. 75.

"George Fox, for preaching the truth in the great worship-house at Carlisle, (1653,) after the priest had ended his sermon, and for witnessing a good confession before the magistrates and people there, was imprisoned seven weeks, sometimes among thieves and murderers." "Peter Head, for testifying to the truth in the steeple-house at Deane, was imprisoned fourteen weeks."—*Ib.* p. 127.

I might quote scores of similar cases, but the above will be deemed sufficient.

(26.) This is a very remarkable statement, and shows either great ignorance, or a disposition to deceive. It appears by Gough's history, that meetings of Friends "begun to be settled" as early as 1648; in 1650, they were called Quakers; and in 1652, the historian informs us that "THE SOCIETY increased under their sufferings," and that every obstacle "proved ineffectual to check the progress of this SOCIETY." Of course the Society could not have made

“progress” before its existence ; and hence we may conclude that Friends “became a Society” at least as early as 1652. Now all the cases of imprisonment for speaking in the church, quoted in the preceding note, occurred *after* this date ; and there are hundreds of a similar character on record.

“1657. William Callow was detained eight weeks in prison, for publicly reproving a priest whom he heard *abusing the Quakers** in his sermon to the people.”—*Besse's Sufferings*, vol. i. p. 269.

On p. 303, of the same volume, I find no less than 28 cases ! But let me give a few instances from the history of Friends in our own country :

1657. “Christopher Holder and John Copeland, being at Salem, went to the place of public worship there, and after the priest had ended his service, Holder spake a few words, but was presently pulled backward by the hair of his head, and had a glove and handkerchief thrust into his mouth, and so was turned out, and with his companion carried to Boston next day, where each of them received thirty stripes with a knotted whip of three cords, the executioner measuring his ground, and fetching his strokes with all his strength, which so cruelly cut their flesh, that a woman at the sight of it fell down as dead.”—*Besse's Sufferings*, vol. ii. p. 183.

1657. “Sarah Gibbons and Dorothy Waugh, being come to Boston, after a public lecture there, spake a few words to the people, for which they were sent to the House of Correction, where, after being kept three days without any food, they were cruelly whipped.”—*Ib.* p. 184.

1658. “About this time Thomas Harris, from Rhode Island, came to Boston, and in the public meeting-place there, after the priest had done, warned the people of the dreadful, terrible day of the Lord, which was coming upon that town and country. He was presently haled by the hair of his head, and sent to prison. Next day he was cruelly whipped.”—*Ib.* p. 185.

Here are several instances, which occurred at a period

* *Could* he have abused them worse than G. F. White abused the abolitionists, or given a more just cause for reproof? He must have been uncommonly skilled in the art of vituperation, if he could.

when no one will doubt that the Friends had "become a Society."

1663. "Thomas Newhouse was whipped through the jurisdiction of Boston, for testifying against the persecutors in their meeting-house there; at which time he, in a prophetic manner, having two glass bottles in his hands, threw them down, saying, 'So shall you be dashed in pieces.'"—*Besse's Sufferings*, vol. ii. p. 232.

1665. "Thomas Newhouse, being in Boston on a lecture-day, went into the worship-house, and stood silent till the preacher had done, and then would have spoken, by way of exhortation to the people, but was immediately haled away to prison, and the next day whipped in the market-place with ten stripes, and then out of town with ten more, which punishment he again underwent at Roxbury and at Dedham."—*Ib.* p. 237.

1677. "Margaret Brewster had a foresight given her of that grievous calamity called the black-pox, which afterward spread there, to the cutting off many of the people. Wherefore she was constrained, in a prophetic manner, to warn them thereof, by entering into their public assembly, clothed in sackcloth and ashes, and with her face made black."—*Ib.* p. 260.

The question may well be put to the author of the letter, "Are thou an Overseer in Israel, and knowest not these things?"

(27.) True, I had "no right" in the *Society*, but I had right in the *meeting*, in common with every one who chose to attend. If it be said that I had no right to speak, in vindication of myself and others, when we were grossly abused and slandered by the minister, then I ask what right had early Friends to defend themselves, when they were assailed in sermons by the priests? What right had James Parnel, for instance, to "vindicate himself and brethren against the opprobrious misrepresentations" of the minister of the *Independent Church in Coggeshall*? [See Gough's History, vol. i. p. 183.]

(28.) I have furnished evidence, in the preceding notes,

that so far from slandering the Society, I only stated a fact, which no one acquainted with its history can deny.

(29.) Was it an "outrage" to deny that abolitionists were guilty of "blasphemy," and to challenge an examination of their official documents in proof of innocence? The sensitiveness of some persons in their relation to what I said on that occasion, reminds me of the man who gave as a reason for being angry when another called him a liar, that "the rascal *proved* it!" If there is not a conviction that what I said on that occasion was *true*, why this effort to exciteodium against me for having spoken? The fact of speaking is of itself of little consequence, and would have been passed by as the idle wind, if I had not uttered unwelcome truth.

(30.) The paper in question contained nothing which, by any possible construction, can be regarded as an attack upon the Society of Friends. The conduct of G. F. White, and of the "governing influences of the Rose-street meeting," is indeed spoken of with great plainness; but they are not *the Society of Friends*; nor do I believe that the Society will sustain them in their course.

(31.) This is a mistake. There were *two* members of the committee, residing in the city, who were not Friends.

(32.) "No *public* notice." The answers were to be *private*, so as to deprive me, if possible, of the power of reply. I leave it for others to judge, in view of the facts, why darkness was thus preferred to light.

(33.) The use which has actually been made of the letter shows how much was intended by the liberty here given. It was to be handed about to individuals, and read in private circles—and *not published*.

I have thus replied to all those parts of the letter of Robert Hicks, which appeared to me to demand notice. It was with reluctance that I entered upon the task; and the readers of the Standard will not regret more sincerely than I do, that

the letter and reply occupy so much room. The latter I have endeavored to make as brief as was consistent with its object.

Isaac T. Hopper has made a brief answer to those parts of the letter which relate particularly to himself, which I annex.

“Without concealment,
Without compromise,”

Yours, &c.

OLIVER JOHNSON.

STATEMENT OF ISAAC T. HOPPER.

After what Oliver Johnson has written, there seems but little left requiring my attention ; as I think every one, who carefully examines the subject, will see, that the bold and positive assertions of the writer of the letter he has reviewed, are entitled to no credit ; and yet there are a few points in it, that appear proper for me to notice.

The writer of the letter says, that “ Oliver Johnson is ostensibly the sole author of the pamphlet ; but it is not doubted by Friends here, that he is a tool of these parties, employed by them to do that which they, as members of Society, dare not do themselves.” The plain English of this, according to my understanding, is, that Friends here believe that myself, with some other members of the Society, are the *real* authors of the pamphlet entitled, “ Correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White,” &c. That great efforts have been used by some individuals in this city to make such an impression, is unquestionable ; verifying the truth of the Scripture declaration, “ An evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things.”

The publication of Oliver Johnson’s pamphlet produced an agitation and angry feeling, wholly incompatible with that stability and settlement of mind which is the invariable attendant of those who have experienced, in any considerable degree, a settlement upon that foundation, against which the rains and the floods beat in vain ; and as he is not a member of the So-

ciety of Friends, some individuals appear to have sought for other objects on whom to pour out their vengeance.

The writer of the letter asserts, that Oliver Johnson says, I “furnished him with the cases he has cited, to prove that early Friends unlawfully disturbed the meetings of other denominations,” and that I “endorsed his character as a respectable, worthy man.” Here is the evidence upon which Friends found their belief, if they really do believe, that I and some other Friends, are the real authors of the pamphlet. Rather flimsy grounds upon which to accuse us of falsehood.

To the former of these charges I will just say, that, at his request, I lent him George Fox’s Journal, which abounds with such instances. To the latter I would reply,—I did so, and feel no regret for having done it; and with all the disposition which the writer of the letter under notice manifests to render him odious, he has entirely failed to fasten a stain upon his reputation, or to show that he is unworthy of the character I have given of him. This is all I had to do in getting up the pamphlet, though at the time I had no idea that a pamphlet was to be made.

There is another part of Robert Hicks’ letter that is still more extraordinary than those above quoted, where he says, “The attack made by Oliver Johnson upon George F. White was a premeditated one, *Isaac T. Hopper was cognizant of this fact*; and on the morning when it was made, several members of his family were at the meeting, (not the one to which they belong, and which they usually attend,) apparently with the view of witnessing the outrage.” Here is a positive assertion without even a shadow of evidence to sustain it. It is not true. But *one* member of my family was present at that time, and he was in the frequent practice of attending; but he did not even know that Oliver Johnson expected to be there on that day. James S. Gibbons and his wife were there, it is true; but they are not members of my family, and they both declare, that they had no knowledge

of Oliver Johnson's intentions of being at Rose-street at that time. They were both in the habit of frequently attending that meeting.

In speaking of James S. Gibbons, Charles Marriott, and myself, the writer of the letter says: "These persons, after having made efforts to introduce their agents and lecturers among Friends in this vicinity, and having utterly failed, have now commenced an attack upon us." Here is another charge as groundless as the preceding. We never did make any efforts to introduce "agents and lecturers" among Friends in this vicinity, or any where else. Oliver Johnson delivered two lectures in Friends' meeting-house at Marlborough, Ulster co., in this State, by the invitation of some Friends there; and he also lectured twice on Long Island, at the request of some members of the Society of Friends in the neighbourhood where they were delivered. But he was not sent by us, neither did he, or any other person, ever deliver a lecture "among Friends" at our request; neither is it true that we have ever "commenced an attack upon Friends."

I have never wished to conceal the fact, that I receive a salary of six hundred dollars per annum for my services. At the annual meeting in the 5th mo. 1840, I was appointed Treasurer of the American Anti-Slavery Society. I was also solicited to take charge of the sale of the books in the office, and attend to such other matters as might require attention connected with the establishment. I consented to do so. These objects occupy my whole time, and I feel perfectly at liberty to receive a compensation for it. I have devoted a large portion of my time for many years, and have spent much money, without any other reward than that arising from having been instrumental in relieving many of my coloured brethren from cruel oppression. The Society of Friends have always, since I have known them, been in the practice of paying for transacting their secular concerns,

precisely the same in nature with those in which I am engaged ; but I have never heard it charged as a crime.

I will now leave Robert Hicks to settle this matter with his own conscience and with his friends, whom he has so grossly abused by misrepresentation, not to say downright untruth. I have spoken plainly—the circumstances of the case require it—and I regret the occasion which has made it imperative that I should do so ; but I have no hostility towards the individual with whom I have dealt so plainly.

ISAAC T. HOPPER.

B

[See page 18.]

RARE SPECIMEN OF A QUAKER PREACHER!*

“The prophets prophesy LIES in my name ; I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them : they prophesy unto you a FALSE vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.”—*Jer. xiv. 14.*

—
 “Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame.”—*Jude 14.*
 —

We have placed these graphic and terrible quotations from the Inspired Volume at the head of this article, not in a moment of excitement, to gratify a censorious or retaliatory disposition, but because, after calm and mature deliberation, we believe them to be strictly and fearfully applicable to the

* NOTE TO THE ABOVE.

It is with much regret that I place this article before the reader. It is necessary, however, that it should be done, in order to complete the narrative of the proceedings in my case ; and to withhold it, would be doing injustice to my adversaries, as it is the alleged cause of action against me. It is mournful that such a state of things as it reveals, should ever have existed in the meeting alluded to. And, however much we may regret the exposure of such impropriety, it must be borne in mind that the facts contained in the statement have not been controverted or disproved.

The members of the Monthly Meeting could quietly listen to the viru-

individual of whose conduct we are about to speak. The grounds of this opinion will be seen from the statements which follow.

On the 8th of November last, the writer of this, having understood that THOMAS M'CLINTOCK, (an active abolitionist, and a highly esteemed minister of that division of the Society of Friends not called Orthodox,) would be present, was induced to attend the Rose-street meeting of Friends in this city. On that occasion, Thomas M'Clintock spoke against slavery and other national sins with great plainness and fidelity, as a genuine *Friend* might be expected to do. His communication was received with evident marks of dissatisfaction by many, and he was several times disturbed, when alluding to slavery, by *the shuffling of feet!* An oc-

lent abuse which was so freely poured out upon an unoffending class of individuals, and instead of discountenancing the slander, and objecting to such a prostitution of the sacred functions of the ministry, they seemed to evince every indication of entire approbation. But as soon as a revelation of such misconduct is made, as soon as the light of day shines upon their doings, agitation and alarm become apparent; and a course of the most flagrant persecution ensues; and every one who raises a voice against such unchristian attacks, is proscribed.

I had no hand whatever in preparing the article, nor had I the authority to suppress it, and my attachment and regard for the credit of the Society of Friends, have frequently induced me to regret that such an exposure was ever made. But it plainly shows the condition of a body that could sanction such proceedings. It is cause of sorrow that the state of any Monthly Meeting should be so weak and low; and I greatly fear, from present indications, that it is becoming weaker and weaker. It is, however, the natural and inevitable result of such conduct as has been too long pursued by those whose general course of life, pursuits, habits, thoughts, and interests, but little qualify them to take part in concerns of a religious and disciplinary character. Had there not existed in the Monthly Meeting of New-York, this inherent weakness—had it been composed of the elements essentially necessary to constitute a sound, enlightened, judicious, and dignified body of Friends, I assert with confidence, that the cause of the difficulty narrated in these pages would never have existed, or would have been checked in its incipient budding; and the whole train of mournfully disorganizing consequences would have been averted, and the Society at large saved from their inauspicious influence. This opinion, I believe, will be sustained by Friends generally. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

I. T. H.

currence so extraordinary, in a meeting of Friends, could hardly fail to excite attention, and lead to an inquiry for the cause which produced it. Having learned that GEORGE F. WHITE, a minister belonging to that meeting, was in the constant practice of denouncing abolitionists in the most offensive and opprobrious terms, we were at no loss to account for such disgraceful conduct; and accordingly, in the Standard of Nov. 12, after stating the fact of the disturbance, we made the following remarks:

“Nor is such conduct much to be wondered at, when it is considered that the most prominent minister in the meeting is in the habit of denouncing, not only anti-slavery, but temperance societies, in the most reproachful terms, in his public communications. This rude pro-slavery demonstration was made, however, by a small portion of the assembly, and will meet the disapprobation of many who are not abolitionists. If the young men who thus disgraced themselves had not been nursed in a pro-slavery atmosphere at home, and felt themselves sustained by the opposition to the anti-slavery enterprise, which generally prevails in the meeting, they would not thus have presumed to disturb the ‘quiet’ of their fellow-worshippers.”

These remarks, as might have been expected, created some excitement among the leading individuals in the Rose-street meeting, which was increased by their subsequent appearance in the Pennsylvania Freeman, accompanied by the following appropriate observations by the editor of that journal:

“SHAME ON THEM.—Our readers will be surprised to learn—as they will, by an article which we copy below from the National Anti-Slavery Standard, that an approved and highly estimable minister of the Society of Friends has been interrupted in the midst of a religious discourse in a regular meeting for worship at one of the Friends’ meeting-houses in New-York city, by such tokens of dissatisfaction as ought to be regarded as disgraceful even to the political caucus;—that conduct was witnessed in an assembly of this quiet and orderly denomination, which we venture to say would not have occurred,—and certainly would not have been tolerated

in a religious meeting of any other sect in the country. And why was this outrage upon the rights of the preacher, and the quiet of the assembly to which he had come as a messenger of God's truth? For no other reason, it appears, than his noble faithfulness in maintaining, and honest plainness of speech in setting forth one of the greatest testimonies of the Society.

Has it come to this? Has this glorious testimony already, by reason of the growing tendency among the great body of its members to conform to the corrupt public sentiment and wrong customs of the world around, so far lost its excellency in the eyes of its professed upholders, that they can no longer abide its promulgation in its purity, simplicity and unabated fulness?

If Friend M'Clintock had qualified his righteous condemnation of slavery with a liberal share of abuse and calumny and bitter denunciation lavished upon those of other sects, who concur with him in holding, and are faithful in proclaiming the same testimony, would he have been thus insulted, and his rights as a man and a minister of the Most High been so trampled on in that meeting?

We are far from believing that the minister alluded to by the Standard, as being 'in the habit of denouncing not only anti-slavery, but temperance societies,' would himself approve the indecorous behaviour we have had occasion to comment on:—this most unquaker-like, unchristian, unmanly and indecent outrage upon propriety and the good order of a religious assembly."

Whether George F. White deserved the charitable exculpation, with which the editor of the Freeman closes his remarks, will appear from the history of his subsequent conduct. That he would *openly* justify the disturbance, we do not believe; nor have we ever learned that he deemed it worthy of public censure. That we were right in speaking of it as the natural effect of his furious denunciations, no one who has attentively watched the progress of the anti-slavery cause, or who understands the workings of human nature, can for a moment doubt. The worst mobs which abolitionists have ever encountered, were excited by the misrepresentations and falsehoods of "hireling" editors and

preachers, who professed to be "as much opposed to slavery as any body," and who, when the responsibility of such outbreaks was laid to their charge, were wont to repel the imputation with scorn, and to exclaim, in the indignant language of the messenger of the proud king of Assyria, when the Hebrew prophet told him of the crimes which he would commit on his accession to the throne of his master, "But what? is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?" It is certainly no wonder, that those who are not restrained by high moral and religious principle, and whose minds are filled with that vulgar prejudice against our coloured population which so extensively prevails, should be led, by such passionate and sweeping denunciations as those of G. F. White, to imbibe that kind of hostility to abolitionists, which would naturally find vent in rude and indecent behaviour, whenever anti-slavery principles are advocated in their presence. *Their* spirit and conduct are but the counterpart of *his*. *They* deserve commiseration, on account of their ignorance, being deluded by those whom they have been taught to regard as models of Christian forbearance and charity; while *he*, and his more intelligent supporters, are worthy of indignant rebuke, as in the sight of God the *real* authors of the disgraceful conduct in question.

On the 15th of November, we went again to the Rose-street meeting. We will not conceal, that, in doing so, we were influenced, in some measure, by a painful curiosity, very natural to us as an abolitionist, to listen to the preaching of a man, the vituperative character of whose ministry had become so notorious. It wanted a more vivid imagination than ours, to conceive how a *Quaker* preacher would look at this period of the Christian era, and at this advanced stage of the anti-slavery enterprise, breathing out wholesale denunciations of abolitionists and their measures, in a style so coarse and vindictive as might well put the *New-York Courier and Enquirer* and the *Washington Globe* to the

blush! Such a character was so incongruous with all our ideas of Quakerism, so inconsistent with all that we had ever seen of that moderate and imperturbable sect, that we listened with involuntary incredulity to the statements of others, and determined to see and hear for ourselves.

On the occasion above alluded to, we witnessed the "anomalous" exhibition, a description of which had failed to make any well-defined impression upon our mind, so difficult was it to believe that the description was not greatly exaggerated. It was the Sabbath next succeeding that on which Thomas M'Clintock had borne his solemn testimony against slavery. George F. White delivered a discourse, (if we may call it by that name,) which, for incoherency of argument, misrepresentation and caricature of the sentiments of others, abusiveness of style, and passionate ferocity of manner, exceeded any thing which we had ever heard from a man professing to be a minister of the gospel. To say that we listened with painful surprise to *such* a discourse, in *such* a place, would be too faint an expression of our feelings. Our emotions were those of utter astonishment—nay, almost of horror! We were reluctantly compelled to acknowledge, that the half had not been told us, and for a time we could hardly believe the testimony of our own eyes and ears. But for the outward peculiarities of a Quaker assembly, which we saw about us, we should have been ready to conclude that we had missed our way and gone to a political caucus, and that we were listening to the harangue of some unscrupulous demagogue, who supposed that his only chance for preferment depended upon the facility with which he could blacken the reputation of his neighbors. The expressions, "hireling lecturers," "hireling editors," "hireling printers and book agents," "servants of the devil," "emissaries of satan," "hypocrites," "blasphemers," "hypocritical workers of popular righteousness," "coming up out of the bottomless pit," &c., were used with an indiscriminate frequency no less

shocking to a charitable mind than repugnant to a refined taste. Of the *manner* of the speaker it is enough to say, that it corresponded with his *matter*. The tones of his voice were harsh, and his countenance and gestures (particularly the former) were indicative of a high degree of morbid excitement and vindictive passion. It was apparent, notwithstanding his frequent asseverations that he was required by God to speak as he did, that his "inspiration" was mainly derived from his strong displeasure on account of the anti-slavery preaching of the previous Sabbath, and his anxiety to remove any favorable impressions it might have made upon the assembly. As an illustration of the manner in which he caricatured the sentiments of those who were the objects of his attacks, we may observe, that he accused the friends of the temperance reform of impugning the wisdom of God in their warfare against intoxicating liquors, alcohol being one of the "good things" intended for the benefit of man! Instead of candidly and truly stating their real position, viz: that the *use* of alcoholic stimulants as a *beverage* is contrary to the laws of health and animal life, and therefore sinful, he represented them as holding the absurd doctrine that *sin* was inherent in the alcohol itself! On this ground he charged them with "blasphemy," and with assuming to be wiser than God! That he knowingly and wilfully misrepresented their sentiments, we will not take it upon us to say; but, that such a statement, at this day, is the fruit of honest ignorance, seems almost too incredible to be believed. Nevertheless, we will be as charitable as possible.

Soon after the time above mentioned, a highly respectable member of the Society of Friends informed us, that on a subsequent day, when we were not present, the same preacher had charged members of a society professing non-resistance principles with threatening to enter a meeting house by force. Being a member of the society to which he was understood to refer, we addressed him a respectful note, asking to be

informed on what authority he had made this serious statement. Instead of frankly complying with our request, as he was bound in honor to do, and as he would have done if he had been sustained by a consciousness that his charge was well founded, he sought to evade the question, and to shield himself from responsibility by making false issues upon immaterial points; and when he could no longer withhold the information we sought, without inflicting upon himself positive disgrace, he accompanied it with a tirade of personal abuse and low sarcasm, such as it had never before been our lot to receive at the hands of any man professing to be governed by the principles of the gospel.

On the 19th of November, while this correspondence was in progress, we went again to the Rose-street meeting. At this time, he not only repeated his *usual* denunciations, but charged the whole body of abolitionists, without exception or qualification, with holding the doctrine, *that the only hope of the slave was not in God, nor in truth, but in themselves.* This doctrine he pronounced "FLAT BLASPHEMY." If he had contented himself with general denunciation, we should have been silent; but here was a definite charge brought against abolitionists, in the presence of 800 people—a charge which we knew to be false, and which, if left uncontradicted, might do no small amount of mischief. As one who had been identified with the anti-slavery enterprise from its commencement, and especially as a member of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, we felt it to be our duty, in the most unequivocal and explicit terms, to deny its truth. This we did as briefly as justice to the accused would allow, and in a tone and manner with which the warmest supporters of George F. White have never ventured to find fault, although they were much displeased with us for presuming to ward off a blow thus cruelly aimed at us and our associates. It was one of those acts of self-defence which haughty sect never can forgive. At the

conclusion of our remarks, we expressed the hope, that the members of a society whose early founders had often felt themselves called upon to address the religious assemblies of other sects, not only contrary to the rules of those sects, but even to the laws of the land, would not judge us harshly or uncharitably for venturing to speak under such extraordinary circumstances.

After we sat down, George F. White arose and declared, that he had ample vouchers for all that he had said, which he would exhibit to any body who would call at his house or store. He also (strange infatuation!) charged me with falsehood for saying that primitive Friends had violated the laws of the land by speaking in the meetings of other sects! This charge certainly displayed great ignorance of the early history of the Society, or an utter recklessness of truth. On the next evening, availing ourselves of the invitation thus publicly given, we went to his house, in company with James S. Gibbons, and asked for the privilege of looking at the vouchers for his charge. Will the reader believe us when we say, that he not only refused to exhibit them, but ordered us, in a haughty and imperious tone, to leave his house, and heaped upon us the grossest personal abuse? Incredible as it may seem, such is the fact. To James S. Gibbons, however, he showed his proof, which consisted of a resolution passed by the *Junior Anti-Slavery Society of Philadelphia!* On a palpably strained and false interpretation of that resolution, he persisted in charging the whole body of abolitionists with uttering "blasphemy." Certainly, this is not less unjust than it would be for us to make the whole body of Friends responsible for his uncharitable aspersions. Who would hesitate to say, if we were to avow a principle so absurd, that we were either strangely deluded, or knowingly guilty of bearing false witness!

The charge against non-resistants was no better substantiated than the other. After tracing it to its source, it was

found to be “a false vision and divination, a thing of nought, and the deceit of the heart.” It was nothing, in fact, but a piece of gossip and scandal, which, falling in with his bitter prejudices, and feeding the fire of his implacable hostility to a philanthropic association, he had the folly and presumption to deal out in a religious discourse, under the sanction of Divine inspiration ! Our correspondence with him in relation to this charge is before the public, and to it we refer the reader for additional information. The same pamphlet also contains a refutation of the charge of blasphemy against the abolitionists, and ample proofs, from the Journal of George Fox, that our statement respecting primitive Friends was strictly and incontrovertibly true. It is certainly a matter of wonder, that a *minister* of the Society, (and one, too, of the pretensions of G. F. White !) should be either superficial or hardy enough to deny the truth of our remark on that subject.

Let no one say, that we have attached undue importance to the accusations of such a man, or suppose for a moment that any motive of a personal nature has drawn us into a conflict with him. By his standing in that division of the Society of Friends to which he belongs, and by his reputation as a preacher, he has done much to poison the minds of others, and to keep the Society itself from taking the position in relation to our cause which its principles demand ; and hence, a thorough exposure of his conduct will exert a beneficial influence. Multitudes in the Society, who are extremely pained and mortified on account of his course, heartily rejoice that such an exposure has been made ; and the information which we have received from various quarters where the pamphlet has been read, leaves no room for doubt that it will do great good. A highly esteemed minister of the Society writes to me as follows :—

“ I will just state, that I have lately read a correspondence between thee and a member of our Society, and that my soul has been brought into near sympathy with thee on account

thereof. The subject needs no comment of mine. The language and spirit of thy opponent are enough to satisfy me, and I think they must satisfy every one who truly loves God and his creature man."

Another minister of the Society, in a letter enclosing an order for 25 copies of the pamphlet, says—

"In view of all the circumstances, I approve of the publication of the correspondence, and I cannot see any thing in the part thou hast acted to which I can object; but I am astonished and mortified at the course of G. F. White. Whether the Friends of Rose-street meeting can, hereafter, receive his ministry, I shall leave for them to determine. Upon reading his last letter, I said to those around me, that I had much rather have made the threat in question, [to break into a meeting-house] than to have put my name to a document of the style, and breathing the temper of that letter. It would give me great pleasure to know that he had discovered his error, and promptly condemned it. But let us forgive him, supposing he knew not what he did."

I have seen a letter from another minister, of high standing in the Society, expressing his disapprobation of G. F. W.'s conduct in still stronger terms. A friend in Philadelphia writes:—

"George F. White's part of the correspondence, as far as my knowledge goes, finds no defenders, and few apologists. Those who are free from sectarianism in the Society think him in a very unpleasant predicament, and I guess his warmest friends could wish his letters had never come to light."

An individual of great worth, who is extensively acquainted with Friends, writes thus:—

"A person of my acquaintance, who at first hearing of your difficulty with G. F. W., (I suspect partly at least from him,) thought you much in the wrong, called you in effect ungentlemanly and unmannerly, to say no worse, has since read your correspondence, and says George is a *sad specimen* of a Quaker preacher, and that he has *no kind* of excuse for his shameful treatment of you, while you have given full evidence of your veracity, gentlemanly manners, and Christian forbearance."

These are but specimens of numerous testimonies, of a similar character, which we have received from persons living out of the pro-slavery atmosphere of New-York; and there are those even here who will rejoice to see them. George F. White and his supporters may read in them the verdict of the great body of the Society in relation to his course.

Friends abroad will be interested to learn what effect the publication has had in the city, and whether G. F. W. still continues to denounce abolitionists and others as formerly. We are sorry to say, that he has "waxed worse and worse," having added to his former list of epithets those of "wolves," "reptiles," and "household vermin." His discourses abound even with gross *personal allusions*! On Wednesday of last week we attended Rose-street meeting. In his sermon on that day, after stating the general principle that men are humbled and subdued by suffering, and referring to the judgments of God upon Pharaoh as a case in point, he gave an illustration, which we will repeat, as nearly as we can recollect, in his own words:—"Just as a slave, recently, who had suffered the effects of his criminal conduct, and been thus led to calm reflection, chose to go back into slavery with his master, and to endure all the evils of that condition, notwithstanding his former experience of them, rather than stay with those hypocritical workers of popular righteousness who had interfered in his behalf. For my own part I commend his choice. I had a thousand times rather be a slave, and spend my days with slaveholders, than to dwell in companionship with abolitionists."

This was an allusion, which every one present understood, to the case of Thomas Hughes, formerly the slave of John P. Darg, whose history is given in our columns to-day, by Isaac T. Hopper, as No. XVI. of his "Tales of Oppression." It was also understood and intended as a thrust at Isaac T. Hopper, who went to Sing Sing, to act the part of

the good Samaritan, by informing Tom that he was free, and offering him protection. That the pro-slavery press should speak of this act of disinterested benevolence in contemptuous and reproachful terms, and exult over the weakness of the unfortunate colored man in placing himself in the power of a gambling slaveholder, was no more than might have been expected; but, that a Quaker preacher should seize upon such an occurrence, with an avidity which would not allow him to wait for a proper understanding of the facts, for the purpose of inflicting a wound upon a worthy and venerable member of his own religious society, (the latchet of whose shoes he is unworthy to unloose,) and to bring the anti-slavery cause into contempt, is a fact which may well excite both our astonishment and indignation, and lead us almost to conclude, that his own expression of his feelings is indeed too true, and that he is far better qualified to associate with slaveholders, than with the humane and conscientious portion of community. If a man may be known by the company he *prefers*, what shall we say of such a preacher?

But it was not true that Tom Hughes went back to the South *as a slave*. For this reason we deemed it our duty, at the close of the sermon, to rise and say—"Tom Hughes, formerly the slave of John P. Darg, on his release from prison recently, returned with his master to the South, NOT AS A SLAVE, preferring slavery to freedom, but AS A FREE MAN, under a promise of being permitted to enjoy his liberty and to live with his wife. I state this to prevent misapprehension."* This was all I said. If I had uttered a falsehood, the Lords Spiritual of the meeting would have cared very little about it; but, as my statement was TRUE, and could not be contradicted, it gave great offence, and led to a determination to exclude me hereafter from the meeting. Accordingly on Saturday last, I was waited upon by George

* See note on page 44.

T. Trimble and Nathaniel Merritt, who announced to me officially, that the door-keepers had been instructed to prevent my entrance in future. I informed them that, previous to their visit, I had concluded that my mission to that meeting was ended, at least for the present; and that, if they could tolerate a ministry so false, abusive and corrupt, I could only say I deeply regretted it.

It may well be supposed, from this statement of facts, that the governing influences of the Rose-street meeting are not very deeply imbued with the genuine spirit of Quakerism. The character of too many of them, we fear, may be accurately described in four scriptural words—"GREEDY OF FILTHY LUCRE." And these men, whose "*godliness is gain,*" have the effrontery to charge abolitionists with being actuated by pecuniary and sinister motives in all that they do to promote the anti-slavery cause! The censure of such men is more to be desired than their approbation: the latter we should feel as a stain, but the former we regard as one of the strongest evidences that we are doing right. We rejoice to be "counted worthy" of suffering reproach and denunciation from such a quarter. "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?"

We have given this exposition of the intolerance which prevails in one division of the Society of Friends in this city, because the peculiarly aggravated form which it has assumed appeared to require it at our hands. It is due to Friends abroad that they should know the facts, that they may duly weigh their own responsibility for these exhibitions of tyranny.

We have only to add, that the columns of the Standard are open to George F. White and his friends, if they should wish to make any reply to the foregoing statements and remarks. We court investigation in respect to all that we have said, and have no committee of vigilance to exclude

any one from the platform on which we stand. We do not claim a right to make statements implicating the character of others, and then to prevent them from opening their mouths in their own defence.

P. S. This seems to be the proper place to state, that we have been visited by two leading *Orthodox* Friends of this city, who expressed their regret, that, in the correspondence, we had not been careful to state, distinctly, to which division of the Society of Friends George F. White belonged. We had supposed that he was so generally known, and the separation so well understood, that no one would be led into error on this point. They assured us, however, that many did not make the proper distinction, and that they and their friends were therefore liable to suffer from the disgraceful conduct of G. F. W. In these circumstances, justice would seem to require us to state, distinctly, that he does not belong to the *Orthodox* Society. It is right that responsibility should rest only where it belongs.

RD 1.8.01







ST. AUGUSTINE
DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 889 3

