

connection with the Missionary Herald. The Missionary Papers are a series of duodecimo pamphlets, designed to communicate information and promote interest in regard to the missionary cause. Of these papers a considerable variety have been heretofore published. Recently the series has been revised, and some discontinued, and others added to the series. As now arranged the numbers and titles of these papers are as follows:

- No. 1. Brief View of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and its Operations.
2. Hints to Collectors.
3. Moral Condition and Prospects of the Heathen.
4. The Savior's Injunction to his Disciples.
5. A Comparison of the Apostolic Age with the present, in respect to Facilities for conducting Missionary Operations.
6. When a Christian may be said to have done his duty to the Heathen.
7. Notices of Chippeway Converts.
8. Memoir of Asaad Esh Shidiak.
9. Something has been done during the last forty years.
10. The World to be reclaimed by the Gospel.
11. Missions will not impoverish the country.
12. Memoir of Keopulani.
13. On deciding early to become a Missionary to the Heathen.
14. Missionary Herald.

This list will probably be extended. In addition to the Papers in this series the Board also keep, for circulation in the same manner, the following published by other societies or individuals.

The Conversion of the World, or the Claims of six hundred millions, and the Ability and Duty of the Churches respecting them.  
Duty to the Heathen.  
Condition and Character of Females in Pagan and Mohammedan countries.

**MESSEURS. WORCESTER AND BUTLER'S REASONS FOR THEIR COURSE IN RELATION TO THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA.**

In the Herald for March, at p. 109, an account was given of the transactions connected with the discharge of Messrs. Worcester and Butler from the Georgia Penitentiary. A letter has since been received from them giving their own views in relation to these and previous transactions, which justice to them and to the subject requires should be published. It was written in February last, and is as follows:

It has seemed to us that it might not be amiss to address a letter to you, with leave to make it public if it be thought expedient, giving a summary view of the grounds on which we have acted from the beginning to the end of the late controversy between ourselves and the state of Georgia.

We were residing among the Cherokees for the purpose of communicating to them the knowledge of the way of salvation, in obedience to the command of our Redeemer to preach the gospel to every creature. This object we were aiming to accomplish by means of public preach-

ing and exhortation, by the publication of the written word of God, and other religious books in the native language, and through the medium of schools. In this residence and these labors, we had the sanction of the Government of the United States, and of the Cherokee nation.

While we were peaceably engaged in these labors, a law was enacted by the state of Georgia, asserting jurisdiction over the territory where we resided, and forbidding the residence of white men after a specified date, unless they should have taken an oath to support the constitution and laws of the state, and to demean themselves uprightly as citizens thereof, under penalty of four years confinement in the penitentiary. This oath the following considerations forbade us to take.

1. The oath required would have been understood on all hands, not only as *including*, but as *particularly intending*, an obligation to support the jurisdiction of the state over the Cherokee people; since the recognition of this jurisdiction was the immediate design of the requirement.

2. We had always considered the Cherokees as possessing both a natural and conventional right to govern themselves, subject only to such limitations of sovereignty as were expressed in existing treaties between them and the United States.

3. As we understood this right of self-government to be secured to the Cherokees by their treaties with the General Government, an oath to support those laws which deprived them of this right would have been inconsistent with an understanding which existed between ourselves and the General Government, that we should respect those treaties as the supreme law of the land.

4. We supposed ourselves required by the word of God to respect the rightfully constituted authorities of the place where we resided. This principle would require us to acknowledge, either the jurisdiction of the state of Georgia, or that of the Cherokees, whichever was the rightfully constituted authority; for both claimed jurisdiction as to the same matters, and both claims, therefore, could not be acknowledged. Supposing that the Cherokee government was of rightful authority, an oath inconsistent with the recognition of that authority would have been a violation of the injunction to regard the powers that be. We are the more particular on this point, because, by a *petito principii*, the requirements of scripture to which we refer, have often been urged as demanding of us that allegiance to the state of Georgia, which the oath would have recognised. Scripture could not require us to recognise at the same time two conflicting authorities.

5. The extension of the jurisdiction of the state over the Cherokees we regarded as unjust and oppressive; and we could not swear to uphold that injustice and oppression.

6. Believing that the lawful jurisdiction of the state did not extend to the territory where we resided, and having never lived under its jurisdiction, we did not suppose ourselves to be citizens of the state. An oath to demean ourselves uprightly as citizens, would be an acknowledgment under oath that we were such—a virtual declaration upon oath of what we did not believe to be true, and therefore *perjury*. This utterly precluded the possibility of our taking the oath.

In these circumstances and with these views, our only alternative was, either to be banished from our homes, and from the field of our interesting and important labors, or to suffer temporary imprisonment, and appeal to the justice of our country in defence of our constitutional rights, in defence of the cause of religion as involved in the privilege of publishing to all men the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in defence of the rights of a much injured people.

We will next state the reasons by which we were induced to adopt the latter alternative.

1. We had no doubt of our *civil right* to refuse obedience to the law in question, appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States to sustain us in that refusal. We regarded the law as manifestly unconstitutional, and therefore *no law*; and we could not see to what purpose the constitution should forbid the enactment of such and such laws, if when those laws are enacted, any individual, who suffers by them, may not rightfully appeal to the judicial tribunals against their operation.

2. We did not see that our character as missionaries either exonerated us from the obligations, or divested us of the rights, of American citizens.

3. Not only our rights as *citizens*, but our rights as *missionaries* were infringed. It is said, indeed, that we were not forbidden to preach the gospel in the disputed territory. True—but every one must perceive that the prohibition of the residence of missionaries within a given territory is a great RESTRAINT upon the preaching the gospel there. The law did prohibit the residence of missionaries, except upon terms to which no missionary who was then laboring in the territory in question, with a single exception, could conscientiously accede. If submitted to, it was to break up several important missionary stations. It was greatly to hinder the preaching of the gospel. It was to put almost an entire stop to one important branch of missionary labor, viz. that of training up youth under the influence of the gospel by means of mission schools. And another most important branch, in which one of us was engaged, the translating and publishing the written word of God, could not, under existing circumstances, be successfully prosecuted, except at a place within the prohibited territory. This labor must be interrupted by removal.

And the law not only *did* operate, but it was *designed* to operate, as an interruption to missionary labors. We do not make this statement without grounds. We have good reasons for believing that the expulsion of missionaries was the *particular object* of the law. This opposition to missionaries was grounded in *part* upon the *mistaken* apprehension that we were endeavoring to persuade the Cherokees not to remove. But this was not all. The authorities of the state had charged it upon the Government of the United States, as a violation of the compact with Georgia, that they had caused the Cherokees to be instructed, because their progress in knowledge and in civilization had the effect to attach them to their home, and render them unwilling to part with those lands, which the United States were conditionally bound to purchase for the use of the state. The authorities of the state were therefore opposed to the instruction of the Indians within her chartered limits, and wished to expel the missionaries because they communicated that instruction. We did not consider the desire of the state to obtain the lands of the Cherokees as a sufficient reason why they should

be left to perish through ignorance; and, believing that the laws of our country were on our side, we were disposed to contend for the right of continuing among them our labors for their temporal, and especially their eternal welfare.

4. The rights of thousands were involved with our own. We have already said that we regarded the extension of the jurisdiction of the state over the Cherokees as most unjust and oppressive. We believed that the design of their extension was to force the Cherokees away from the soil which was their own, and which, so long as they were disposed, they had a perfect right to retain. The effect upon the Cherokees, we believed, would be ruinous. And as their rights and ours were involved in the same question, we felt, that, in maintaining our own, we were maintaining theirs also. The constitutional question involved appeared to us so plain, that we could not expect any other than a decision in our favor, when our cause should come before the Supreme Court; and we could not but hope that, when that court should have sustained by its decision the rights of the Cherokees, those rights would be defended by every department of the national government, and this unhappy people be saved from the oppression under which they groaned. We felt, therefore, that Christian philanthropy demanded a temporary sacrifice of our personal liberty, in order to obtain a decision of so much importance to thousands of our fellow-men.

5. The faith and justice of our nation were at hazard. That faith and justice were pledged for the protection of the Cherokees in their rights; but that pledge was apparently about to be forfeited, that faith to be broken, and an act of flagrant robbery to be committed upon a defenceless people, with the sanction of our national authorities. Whether this should be done was not a question of mere political expediency, but of clear moral obligation—a question of right or wrong—of keeping or violating the commands of God, of obtaining, as a nation, Divine favor, or incurring Divine vengeance. We hoped that a decision of the Supreme Court might be the occasion of arresting the hand of oppression—of averting from our beloved country the guilt of covenant breaking, and robbery, and the vengeance of heaven. We did not know but these consequences might depend upon our maintaining our ground, and appealing to the highest judicial tribunal of our country in our defence. While suffering for this object, we felt that we were suffering for righteousness' sake. And we feared that, if we should shrink from that suffering in such circumstances, we should be partakers of the guilt in question. We wished, if the people among whom we had labored in the work of the gospel were to sink under the weight of oppression and injustice, to be found guiltless not only of participation, but even of acquiescence.

Why then, it may be asked, if we were impelled by a sense of duty to make our appeal to the Supreme Court, did we not insist to the last upon the execution of its decision? Not, we answer, from any change in our views, but on account of changing circumstances.

1. The law which had prohibited our residence in the former field of our labors had been repealed. We had no longer to contend for the right of laboring among the Cherokees without restraint in the work of the gospel.

2. There was no longer any hope, by our perseverance, of securing the rights of the Cherokees, or preserving the faith of our coun-

try. The Supreme Court had given a decision in our favor, which recognised the rights of the Cherokees; but it still rested with the Executive Government, whether those rights should be protected, and it had become certain that the Executive would not protect them. The utmost we could expect from that source was interference to the extent of executing the mandates of the court; and as those mandates could extend only to the cases before the court, the execution on them would only effect our release from confinement, without benefitting the Cherokee nation.

The leading motives, therefore, which first induced us to make our appeal, existed no longer. In the mean time, however, other motives had incidentally arisen. The supreme judicial tribunal of our country had given its decision in our favor, and the state which held us in unlawful and oppressive servitude was trampling the authority of that tribunal under her feet. Did not patriotism, therefore, require us to insist upon the maintenance of the authority of the court? For a time it was our impression that it did. But we had to consider that

3. Any advantage to be derived from our perseverance, as to maintaining the authority of the Supreme Court, was extremely doubtful. The state had placed herself in an attitude of resistance, which it appeared evident that nothing but force could overcome; that force could not be obtained without the agency of the President of the United States; and we had much reason to believe that the President would not interfere.

4. Had it been ever so plain that our cause could and would be maintained by force of arms, and however plain it is that, in case of our perseverance, it would become the duty of the Executive to maintain at all hazards the authority of the law, it was not so clear that it was our duty to insist upon this course. It is no sacrifice of the authority of the law, for an individual to yield his lawful right, rather than that blood should be spilt in his defence. While the right of preaching the gospel without restraint, and the question of grand moral obligation respecting the rights of the Cherokees and the faith of our country were depending, we felt it to be our duty to go forward; but the aspect of the case was changed, when the former of these was no longer to be contended for, and our further perseverance could not affect the latter.

5. The political aspect of our country was in other respects such, as to render it doubtful, in our apprehension, whether the public would not sustain injury by the prosecution of our appeal.

6. As far as our personal liberty was concerned, it were better to suffer unjustly, than to seek redress at the hazard of civil war.

7. We had the assurance of an unconditional release, provided we should desist from the attempt to obtain that release by force. This assurance came, not from any solicitation on our part. We made no solicitation, no overture, no compromise. But we were often and earnestly solicited by persons in the confidence of the governor, to desist from the prosecution, and assured that if we did so, we should not long remain in prison. So long ago as last August we were told by Col. Mills, that the governor had expressed to him his intention to release us as soon as the Cherokees should form a treaty of cession, or as the state should have taken actual possession of the territory by the operation of existing laws, and added "You may tell

them so." After we had given notice of our intention to move the Supreme Court for further process, Gen. Coffee and Judge Schley, two members elect of Congress, earnestly solicited us to recall the notice, and said that, though they were not sent to us, and did not give the assurance *officially*, yet they had conversed with the governor on the subject, and knew his views; and we might be assured that, if we should withdraw our suit, we should be discharged without any concession, or condition, or even an application to the governor, before many weeks. Mr. Cuthbert, another gentleman in the confidence of the governor, and who had also solicited us to withdraw the suit, told us that he had received the most unqualified assurance from the governor, that if we did so, we should be discharged immediately after the adjournment of the Supreme Court. Mr. Forsyth had called on our counsel, Mr. Wirt, for the purpose of bringing about the same object, and had expressed his full confidence, though he said he was not empowered to give any pledge from the governor to that effect, that we should be discharged *immediately* on the governor's receiving information that no motion would be made before the court. We at first believed, and have since been informed, that Mr. Forsyth was authorised by the governor to give Mr. Wirt such assurance.\*

Since our release the question has been asked, What have the missionaries gained by suffering imprisonment, and appealing to the Supreme Court? This inquiry may deserve a reply.

1. Suppose we have gained nothing. Ought we therefore to repent of having made the attempt? Are we never to make efforts and sacrifices for the accomplishment of an important object, without the certainty of success? Or when we have done it, and failed, are we therefore to wish we had not done it? No. If we have gained nothing else, we have at least gained a very cheerful testimony of our consciences, that we have done what we could, for the prevention of injustice, oppression and robbery, and the preservation of the national faith.

2. If we have not gained, we have at least not lost, the privilege of laboring among the Cherokees in the work of the gospel.

3. We have gained in behalf of the Cherokees a decision of the Supreme Court, which, although it does not avail for the protection of their present rights, may nevertheless have a very important bearing on their future prosperity—a decision worth far more than the sacrifices we have made to obtain it.

We do not repent of what we have done. We greatly rejoice in it. And now that we are free, it gives us consolation to reflect that we have not obtained our freedom by any abandonment of principle, or by ceasing to bear our testimony against the injustice of the measures by which the Cherokees are deprived of their possessions. We felt it to be due to the cause of justice in announcing to the authorities of the state our determination to prosecute the case no further, to declare our unaltered conviction of the correctness of the principles on which we have acted. Having made the declaration then, we feel a freedom which we should not otherwise feel in making it now.

\* We ought, perhaps, here to say, that Mr. Wirt did not give us any advice on the subject, preferring, as he said, to sustain to us simply the relation of legal counsel.

We know not but we shall be considered as having used language unjustifiably severe, in this communication, respecting the proceedings of the state of Georgia; but our own vindication appears to require that we speak of things as they are in our own view. The nature of the proceedings by which the defenceless Indians are deprived of their possessions appears to us very plain. We wish certainly to avoid opprobrious language, but we cannot see why, when we have felt ourselves called upon to oppose a torrent of iniquity, we should attempt to gloss over that iniquity by giving it names too smooth to express the truth. And we feel unwilling to retire from the contest into which we have been led, without giving our decided testimony against what it is impossible for us to regard in any other light than *injustice, oppression and robbery*. Towards the state of Georgia or her authorities we are conscious of no vindictive feelings. It is our unceasing prayer that her transgressions and the transgressions of our countrymen be forgiven, and those judgments of heaven averted, which there is too much reason to fear.

We are yours with much esteem and affection  
 S. A. WORCESTER,  
 ELIZUR BUTLER.

**AID RECEIVED BY THE BOARD IN SUPPLYING ITS MISSIONS WITH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND RELIGIOUS TRACTS.**

FIVE thousand dollars have been received by the Board from the American Bible Society, in pursuance of a grant made by that society some time since, to defray the expense of printing an edition of 20,000 copies of the New Testament in the language of the Sandwich Islands.

It is stated in the New York papers, received at the time this article goes to the press, (April 15th,) that the Managers of the American Bible Society have resolved upon appropriating thirty thousand dollars towards meeting the demand for the Scriptures in foreign countries, (chiefly those in which there are American missions,) in case they are sustained by the churches in this most commendable effort.

So far as the demand for the Holy Scriptures is concerned, it would be easy to show that appropriations to the amount of 50,000 dollars, might now be judiciously made for the printing and distribution of the lively oracles in connection with the missions of the Board alone.

The appropriations of the American Tract Society of five thousand five hundred dollars for the printing of Religious Tracts at the stations under the care of the Board, have all been paid.

**SIAMESE MISSION.**

Mr. Abeel had returned to Singapore from Siam, in November last, on account of a second failure of his health. He was about to accompany *Mr. Mason*, of the London Missionary Society, to gain more information concerning *Siam*, and Borneo and

other islands. He says that "men, who have no objection to holding their lives loose, may find, or force themselves into, many most important places." The last letter received from him was dated Nov. 29, 1832.—Immediately after the meeting of the Board in October, the Committee sent an invitation to Mr. Abeel to revisit his native land, agreeably to an understanding with the commissioners from the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church. Should his life be spared, he may be expected in the autumn.

**SANDWICH ISLANDS MISSION.**

A skilful book-binder is needed for this mission, who shall go out as an assistant missionary.

**Donations,**

FROM MARCH 16TH, TO APRIL 15TH, INCLUSIVE.

**I. AUXILIARY SOCIETIES.**

<b>Cheshire co. N. H., C. H. Jaquith, Tr.</b>	
Fitzwilliam, Mon. con.	34 21
Keene, Mon. con.	19 93
Nelson, Juv. so. 8,08; a revol. soldier, 4;	19 08
Rindge, Mon. con.	93 00
Try, Mon. con.	12 00
Walpole, Asso.	33 00
Westmoreland, Rev. Mr. Pratt's so. 8,78; H. G. 5;	13 78—148 00
<b>Columbia co. N. Y., I. Platt, Tr.</b>	
Ghent,	95 76
Hudson,	110 28
Kinderhook,	76 48
New Lebanon,	14 00—296 52
<b>Cumberland co. Me. W. C. Mitchell, Tr.</b>	
Baldwin, Jews so.	4 00
Cumberland, Mon. con.	11 15
Minot, La.	21 75—36 90
<b>Essex co. Ms. J. Adams, Tr.</b>	
Beverly, Gent. 56,50; la. 31,18; mon. con. 48,17; a new year's gift, 5; ded. am't. prev. ackn. 38;	102 85
Boxford, Gent. 20,50; la. 28;	48 50
Danvers, N. par. Gent. 69; la. 53,97; S. par. 200; ded. amt. ackn. in April, 180,63;	122 97
Essex, Gent. (of which to constitute the Rev. ROBERT CROWELL an Honorary Member of the Board, 50;)	19 37
Gloucester, Sandy Bay, Gent. la. and mon. con.	52 21
Lynn, Rev. Mr. Peabody's so.	50 00
Manchester, Gent. benev. so. 43; la. 25,50; mon. con. 10;	95 00
Salem, S. so. Gent. 75,50; la. 60,93;	78 50
Crombie-st. chh.	136 43
Tab. chh. Gent. 130,25; la. 187,53; mon. con. 11;	117 00
Topsfield, Gent. 53; la. 58,18; mon. con. 12,89;	398 78
Wenham, Contrib. after sermon,	124 00
Essex co. N. J., T. Frolinghuysen, Tr.	92 06—1,296 97
Fairfield co. East, Ct. S. Sterling, Tr.	393 18
Danbury, Indiv. for fem. school in Bombay,	75 00
<b>Geauga co. O., J. H. Matthews, Tr.</b>	
Claridon, Gent.	8 25
Hamden, Asso.	2 25
Huntsburgh, Asso.	3 19