

serve 'their party in.' And with these men the Liberty party can hold the fullest communion; while

they reject, and would gag to an anti-slavery death, if they could sway one of the American Anti-Sla-

very Society's members, as the following extract or text of the circular, issued by the Liberty party, from the Syracuse Convention, clearly shows:

'EXTRACT FROM GODDELL'S CIRCULAR-A LIBERTY Glee.'

The substance of what we wish to present, may be expressed in four propositions:

I. 'The whig and democratic parties, so called, are fully subservient, in all their great national arrangements and measures, to the slave power.'

II. 'A Abolitionists, therefore, cannot, either immediately or wisely, retain a connexion with these parties.' (2)

III. 'The American Anti-Slavery Society does nevertheless, by its leading members, agents and publications, encourage a continued connexion with them.' (3)

IV. 'Abolitionists, therefore, who believe it wicked and foolish to retain a connexion with these parties, ought not to participate in the American Society's publications or agents, or identify themselves with their meetings.' (4)

A FEW NOTES.

(1) James G. Birney being witness, the great national religious parties, commonly called 'christian churches,' are 'subservient to the slave power.'

the slave power'. They are the 'bulwarks' of that bloody and murderous power.

(2) 'Abolitionists, therefore, cannot either innocently or wisely retain a connexion with them'.

(3) 'The Liberty party are, nevertheless, by its leading members, agents and publications, encouraged a continued connexion with them.' Even so much that a great portion of its members are opposed to making it a duty to leave these pro-slavery churches.

(4) Abolitionists, therefore, if the rule of Liberty party is correct, who believe it wickled to retain a connexion with 'pro-slavery parties,' ought not to patronize the 'Liberty party,' its publications or agents, or identify themselves with them at their meetings — for it is a 'bad rule that will not work both ways'.

But are the Liberty party men prepared for this? If not, I cannot see where is their claim for honesty. If they are, I trust they will soon be, where their candidate for Governor of this State, said to me a year or so since they would be, if, as I was urging, they should adopt 'this rule, *unlike to me men, to go with them in the political party.*' Hence the studied silence of the leading members of the third party, in relation to the support given to slavery by the great national *pro-slavery religious parties.* A year and a half ago, this position was taken by the *Pro-Slavery* *Evangelist*, but it is latterly evaded. Even the 'Abolitionist,' published by L. Myrick, and edited by James C. Jackson, both of them formerly outspoken opponents of sectarianism, and in favor of dissolving at once all the party combinations of religionists, is now silent on this subject. I was informed by a prominent abolitionist in Port Byron, that Alvan Stewart said, in a speech made at that place, that he 'thought perhaps too much had been said against the pro-slavery ministers and churches' —

(—) But,

'ALL IS FAIR IN POLITICS.'

and as the Liberty party is now seeking political triumph upon the back of the pro-slavery slave, probably it is thought *fair* to let the sects alone, if they will let the party go ahead, and support it—the motto being,

'Tickle me, Billy, do, do, do.  
'And in my turn I'll tickle you.'

And this will account for the willingness of the Liberty party to join in with the outcry of sectarianism and cry the people against the American So-

abolition, if that the party in Massachusetts. I regret only, that several of our pure-hearted men in this State are deceived into such measures. Many there are who much dislike the associations of proscriptive sect, but are still anxious to aid in a political party, and thus go along with the party in question, without seeming to realize the dilemma into which it is surely leading them. More anon.

Yours, with much esteem,  
J. N. T. TUCKER.

A New Witness.

BROTHER GARRISON:

Permit me to say a few words in your paper, and to express the sentiments of my heart as it regards the subject of slavery.

Sir, I have never taken a very active part in the cause of the abolition of slavery, supposing it to conflict with the religion which I have been taught to believe. But being present at the meeting held at Faneuil Hall, last Sunday evening, to discuss the case of Latimer now incarcerated in Leverett-street jail, my mind was brought to see things under a new light—that of regarding a man of color. It was convinced there, had those men the power, they would gag every man, white or colored, who dared to speak upon the subject of abolition.

I have said but little on the subject of slavery in the church, heretofore, knowing but a few to differ from mine; and, thinking it almost criminal to speak against those religious institutions which favor slavery. They blinded my eyes, so that I could not see slavery as it is; and I verily thought to speak against the organized churches, was speaking against the church of Christ. But I now see, when teaching one kind of religion, and the church of Christ, the true church existing in the soul of man, teaching something quite different,—it giving a man both temporal and spiritual freedom.

Since I have been connected with an organized church, upwards of six years, as a professor of religion upwards of eight years, I have been taught to believe in a human creed, and adhere to that; to use my influence to help build up that particular sect; and have been brought up very rigidly, and taught that to speak disrespectfully of its members, let them do never so bad, I was committing sin against God. In this persuasion, however, within a year

past, to testify against these corrupt bodies, seeing they take little or no interest in the subject of sla-

very, and other unpopular reforms. Christ says, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' 'He that is not for me, is against me.' I have been stigmatised with the name of heretic and infidel, and thought by some crazy; but things have come to pass which I cannot hold my peace. If I did, the stones would cry out. But as it regards my being called infidel, &c. I heed it not, not though it came from professed Christians. Better men than myself have been stigmatised with those names. Coming from that source, my feelings were hurt somewhat; but first of all, I was acting conscientiously; and but as I now see the truth, I cannot refrain from speaking about it. Seeing slavery in its most damning form, I feel it my duty to do all I can, so far as my influence goes, to suppress the evil.

I am conscious that taking the position which I do, I shall suffer much persecution; but that I cannot help. If persecution must come, let it come, rather than conceal the truth. As a Christian, I am commanded to speak the truth wherever I find it.—Christ says, 'The truth shall make you free'—and what is truth but perfect freedom—love to God, and love to man? We are happy no farther than we are free to speak. The idea of a man being happy, bold as property, is a perfect absurdity. Slavery is wrong, altogether wrong, view it in what light you may. It is my duty to speak against evil wherever I find it, please or displease whom it may. I conceive slavery to be the worst of all evils. I cannot hold fellowship with a man who is a slaveholder, or one who countenances it. I would not use physical force to suppress the evil of slavery. No, thank God, there is something better—that is, moral influence. I would convince men of its evil.











