old fellow, on my return from an anti-slavery mission, I noticed in
looking over the pamphlet Christian a letter from M' Art Henry in
which he asks, "Can a non-resistant be put in a U.S. here emancipate
a slave without a violation of his principles?" The question
Maxwell's answer is the agent of the Commonwealth's Mission
throughout the nation, according to the principles
of the Commonwealth, to emancipate the
slave from the hands of the slaveholder, a violation of
the non-resistant or Christian principle.

Let us look at this whole matter in the face of what is
wrong, whether it is right, or wrong. It would seem that
authorities in order to punish him, at some
doctrine, in the union of slavery, as he governed to it in the federal
Government, has passed a decree "in contradistinction to the slave owner
when he brings his slave into this State, that the slave shall
have the benefit of the common law. The principle of natural
justice shall be allowed to every human being protected as a citizen of
Massachusetts in contradistinction of the will of his claimant.

Thus it is good. Again when a slave owner comes into this State
and contrary to the decree of the Commonwealth, restrains his
slave or his as an liberty, or right to go out free, it has authorized
its agent to issue the Habeas Corpus in the State, by another
agent, by taking the slave from the claimant, bringing him
before the judge, that he may proclaim liberty to go free in
Massachusetts. This he may do on his own personal knowledge
of a man or woman being restrained of liberty, or on a complaint of
the Commonwealth of Chief against slavery in the Commonwealth.
All this is good. But now comes the way of enforcing the will of the
slave by a forcible seizing of the person and holding captive
the slave. A writ of the Commonwealth is, and summoning
the master to appear if he sees fit to show why he detains
the slave. Both parties to the Commonwealth's claim are
notified to appear before the Commonwealth's Agent, the one to
have liberty proclaimed unto him - the other to show why it should not be
done. This is an expert statement of the case in the common
law. There was no brute force exercised. Every thing was conducted strictly according
to the principles of not inflicting cruel and unusual punishment upon any
one. No punishment inflicted on the claimant, on account of the
But government believes it right to make provision
for enforcing its provisions. If it does, if worst comes to worst - if
the slave claimant resists the agent, in seizing the slave - then
the agent resorts to another set of means to
force the slave in criminal weapons.

Now I protest to the Commonwealth against its using such
means - so far as its laws are in harmony with the principles
of natural justice - its means of applying its laws respecting
are not violation of the Christian principles have no objection
in the government.

Was what did I do that was a violation of Christian principle?
I did not ask the government to injure the slave, but apply its moral just principles
and, upholding the side of the public that she should be free. I did not ask the government
to injure the slave claimant. To utter any word to him for the sake
he was going to the slave - but to notify him to appear & show why on -
what purpose he was restraining the slave contrary to his own will.
This was all I asked the government to do - This was all the government
did - the agent did just what prayed him to do - no more.
Was there any violation of Christian principle in my asking the government to do this—was there any violation of Christian principle in doing what it did, what I pressed it to do?

Thus my responsibility ends.

But, says one you know, the government had no stipulations about the use of bloody deadly weapons, and furthermore that it would have used them for the worse of the worse if it found them necessary. This was a possibility of the worse channel rather than the agents of the government, in which case the government would have wanted to do the more immoral unto Christian means to do the will of the Commonwealth in the instance. That asking the government to make use of these means which were immoral might put it in operation to punish occasion for it to use them which were immoral in case the wicked slave held united. Even the agent might have held it constant as some supreme object.

May we never ask a man who believes that self defense is the first law of nature—who believes it right for him to fight his enemies, who does occasionally do so—who keeps deadly weapons about his person not to do a moral act, not knowing that there is a possibility that in attempting it the may be united shall then will do a wrong act there. I responsible for his wrong acts. Because I put a moral a part machinery in operation and I responsible for the immoral machinery that may be put into operation. What would in all probability might not otherwise been wanted to. I think not.

May we never ask a wicked man who holds to some part some immoral principles and means, to do a good act because there is a possibility of his doing well in the mean time? The government a great man in whom much opinion is concentrated, has some good principles some bad, some good means a some bad. Do I recognize its authority its rightfulness, I become any way responsible for its immoralities because I ask it to do good and in attempting to do the good, it does the bad. Truly I am responsible for that only while I ask it to do. Not what I am opposing to its demands that that be in some measure.