

E  
449  
.S63  
copy2











# ABOLITIONISM EXPOSED!

PROVING THAT  
THE PRINCIPLES OF ABOLITIONISM

ARE  
INJURIOUS TO THE SLAVES THEMSELVES, DESTRUCTIVE  
TO THIS NATION, AND CONTRARY TO THE  
EXPRESS COMMANDS OF GOD;

WITH STRONG EVIDENCE

*That some of the principal CHAMPIONS of Abolitionism are  
inveterate Enemies to this Country, and are taking advan-  
tage of the 'ANTI-SLAVERY WAR-WHOOP'  
to disserve, and break up, the UNION.*

---

"While they promise them *Liberty*, they themselves are the  
*Slaves of corruption.*"—2 Pet. ii. 19.

---

BY W. W. SLEIGH, F. R. C. S. L.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY AND SURGERY, LONDON; HON.  
MEMB. R. W. L. S. I.; AUTHOR OF "THE SCIENCE OF  
SURGERY;" "THE CHRISTIAN'S DEFENSIVE  
DICTIONARY AGAINST INFIDELITY;"  
&c. &c. &c.

27.5

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
PUBLISHED BY D. SCHNECK,  
N. W. CORNER OF SECOND AND RACE STREETS.

Stereotyped by J. Fagan.

.....  
1838.

Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year 1838, by W. W. SLEIGH, in the  
office of the district court of the eastern district of Pennsylvania.



# CONTENTS.

---

	Page
PREFACE .....	4
CHAPTER I.	
Liberty and Slavery defined—Difference between Words and Things .....	5
CHAPTER II.	
The Principles, &c. of the Leaders of Abolitionism exhibited. .	16
CHAPTER III.	
The impracticability of the object of Abolitionists demonstrated.	24
CHAPTER IV.	
The Errors of the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, for April, 1837, respecting the Scriptural Words, " <i>servant</i> "—" <i>property</i> "—" <i>buy</i> ," &c., briefly noticed .....	43
CHAPTER V.	
The Conduct and Character of the Southern Slave-holder vindicated .....	49
CHAPTER VI.	
Colonization Principles vindicated—Calumnies refuted—The good the Colonization Society has already done—is doing—and the incalculable good it must do, if duly patronized...	66
CHAPTER VII.	
Colonization and Abolitionism contrasted.....	88
APPENDIX.	
Extract of an Address of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq., published in the London Patriot, of August, 1833.....	91
Conclusion .....	92

## PREFACE.

---

THE conflagration of the late "*Pennsylvania Hall*" having frustrated the contemplated discussion between some of the champions of Abolitionism and the Author, he feels it a duty he owes the public, and the best service he can render this country, to make known, through the medium of a Pamphlet, a few of the facts and arguments which he intended adducing on that occasion. Thus contributing his mite of information towards allaying the general excitement on this subject, and, if possible, to open the eyes of those who, *through mistaken philanthropy*, have become the *innocent* tools of a few reckless men, whose object, (to put the most favourable construction on it) may be, while indifferent of consequences, to render themselves conspicuous. Were he not convinced that the best interests of this country, that the real interests of the coloured population, bond and free, and that common humanity itself, are involved in the question of Abolitionism, he would not presume to obtrude himself on the notice of the Public, on a topic more or less now connected with politics, from which he has hitherto carefully refrained. He comes forward therefore, while he declares himself an eternal and uncompromising enemy to all *crucity, injustice, tyranny, and oppression*, not *against*, but *for* liberty—not *against*, but *for* the coloured man—not *against*, but *for* humanity.

# ABOLITIONISM EXPOSED!

---

## CHAPTER I.

LIBERTY AND SLAVERY DEFINED. — DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WORDS AND THINGS.

MANKIND has ever been disposed to be carried away with *names* and *words*, with the *representation* of things, rather than with *things themselves*: and that portion of mankind thus apt to be deceived by *mere sound*, is generally the most innocent—the best—the most unsuspecting—the most charitable—these very qualities rendering them the easy victims of design and imprudence: the history of the world proves, not only this, but also that demagogues are the *first* to fly from the commotions, which they themselves create; and thus leave their poor innocent victims to suffer the vengeance of an outraged and insulted community! They stand their ground while the weapons used are merely words, and “*rotten*” eggs, &c.; but when recourse is had to leaden balls, and swords of steel, they generally take good care to make a quick retreat, leaving their deluded followers to have the glory of martyrdom!

*Liberty* is a glorious term—so is *Christianity*—but under the sacred garb of both one and the other, the

foulest deeds have been, and may be, perpetrated! Under the name of *Christianity*, the holy crusades, in which thousands were slain, were instituted and carried on, by Englishmen! And under the name of *Liberty*, men, women, and children were, in 1793, slaughtered by Frenchmen! Be not therefore carried away by *sounds*—by mere *words*.

*Slavery* is a horrid term! But why? Not that bondage or slavery is uncommon, or rare; for there are few, very few men, white or black, on the face of the Earth who are not *SLAVES*! He who commits sin is the *slave* of lust—so says the Bible—Let God be true, and every man a liar. Who therefore is not a slave? Was not Buonaparte, while he was the Emperor of nearly all Europe, a *slave* to his god—ambition? And is not the *covetous* man a slave to his idol—gold?

“He is a freeman whom the truth makes free,  
And all are slaves beside. There’s not a chain,  
That hellish foes, confederate for his harm,  
Can wind around him, but he casts it off,  
With as much ease, as Samson his green withes.”

The principal reason why we abhor so much the term *slavery* is, the base cruelty with which *some* tyrant slaveholders, for there are wicked slaveholders as well as wicked husbands and masters, have treated their slaves. Hence we are very apt to use as synonymous terms, *slavery*, *cruelty*, *tyranny*, and *oppression*. Moreover it is the interest of certain persons so to use these words, for the purpose of getting more ready access to the hearts of good-natured men and women. Does any one really believe that a man *cannot* treat his slaves *kindly*, *tenderly*, and *affectionately*? If any one thinks it *possible*, then let not, for the future, the terms *slavery* and *cruelty* be inseparably

united. But if he thinks it impossible, then it is evident the testimony of some thousands of disinterested, good, and religious men, who have visited the South, and who have most solemnly borne testimony to the kind, tender, and Christian manner in which *numerous* slaveholders treat their slaves, must be rejected! If all this is to be rejected, then let the doubter, who is so charitable towards the coloured population, exercise a little of that charity, "which rejoiceth not in iniquity," and is "without partiality," towards his white fellow citizens, and ere he slanders them, or encourages those who bear false witness against them, pay the South a visit, and judge for himself, with his own eyes, and his own ears. Methinks he replies, "but I have it from those who themselves have witnessed it!" Witnessed what? Is it that *all* the slaveholders in the South treat their slaves with *cruelty* and *barbarity*? Oh no, perhaps he says, not *all*, but many of them! Many thanks! This is fully admitted, and much regretted; but this exception proves the very proposition with which we started, viz. "that slavery, and cruelty, ought not to be used as *synonymous* terms!" Again, fresh he is no doubt to the charge, with the thrust, "but this fact of many of the slaveholders treating their slaves with cruelty, shows there ought to be no slavery!" Avast, friend! is the *abuse* of a system a just cause of condemnation? Do you say it is: then the system of apprenticeship—of guardianship—of matrimony—*Liberty*—and *Christianity* themselves, ought to be condemned, for they all have been abused—all have had the most *cruel*—*tyrannical*—and *Satanic* acts, committed under their names! Therefore, according to the very argument by which you would have slavery condemned, you would also



have *liberty, matrimony, and Christianity*, banished from the earth!—You cannot get out of the dilemma—there is no possible alternative—if *slavery* is to be condemned because it has been *abused*, so are Liberty and Christianity! Out of thine own mouth thou art condemned!

A total recklessness of truth is a remarkable feature in the arguments adopted by the advocates of Abolitionism; while they give no credit to the statements of those differing from them! they unblushingly assert that *all* slaveholders are *tyrants* and *cruel*! Does truth require falsehood to make it conquer? Ought not those preposterous misstatements open the eyes of the public to the real character, and motive, of those men?—The cause of God they cannot be advocating, for his cause requires not the weapons of Satan! Error invariably stands in need of lies for its support.

That there is great cruelty in the South, no one denies; but is there no cruelty in the North? Are there no cruel, tyrannical, husbands and masters in Philadelphia or in Boston? Are no acts of oppression committed north of the Chesapeake? These cannot be attributed to slavery! There is, rely on it, a deeper, a more concealed, a more galling *slavery* and *bondage*, to which these evils are attributable, even the slavery of the soul to sin and to Satan. To this one, and the same *mental slavery*, both cruelty and tyranny in the South, and in the North, are alike referable. Therefore attributing these detestable evils, cruelty, and tyranny, to *corporeal* slavery, is not only unphilosophical and unscriptural, but fatally erroneous; for it leads us to attack the *effect*, and not the *cause*.

The Author, while listening last week to the Aboli-

tion Champions in the late "Pennsylvania Hall," was forcibly struck with the strong similarity between the *mode* of argument adopted by them, and by the champions of Infidelity in the late public discussions, between them and him, in New York! They commenced their addresses with high-sounding words about *liberty! oppression! tyranny, &c.!* Having by this mode (*and they know the value of it!*) got ready access to the hearts of their audience, and made a favourable impression, so as to make the females whisper to each other, "Oh what a fine, good man, that must be," &c.(!) then they depicted, in the strongest colours, the horrors of slavery—next they issued forth a tirade of slander and abuse against all slaveholders; and lastly they proceeded to undermine the character of every man opposed to them—the credibility of every witness bearing testimony against them—and the motives of all men, *except themselves!* Moreover they invariably attacked the *abuses* of each system (as if a system were answerable for its abuse) holding up to public odium, what every good man from his heart must condemn, viz: oppression, tyranny, and cruelty; thus leaving the vast majority of the audience under the impression that it was the *thing itself*, and not the *abuse of it*, on which they were animadverting!

LIBERTY—there is scarcely a word in the English Vocabulary so often perverted as the term *liberty*.—A vast mass of mankind conceive that the meaning of the word is, a perfect privilege and license for each and every man to do as he pleases.—If this be the real and true meaning of liberty, and that where this is *not*, there is *slavery*, then there is no liberty in the United States, (and God forbid, say I, there ever should be here such liberty,) and every man, woman, and child in the

Union, is a *slave*! I doubt not this is the kind of liberty at which some of the champions of Abolitionism, viz. Fanny Wright Darusmont—Owen—et hoc omne genus, are aiming! But is this the liberty sanctioned by God? No! Is this the liberty guaranteed by the declaration of Independence? No! Is this the liberty for which the Fathers of this Country fought and bled? No! No! Such liberty would be the most awful tyranny and oppression—The liberty authorised by God, and sanctioned by the laws of this Country, is, that no man shall do aught to the injury, prejudice, or hurt of his neighbour—This is the only true liberty granted by God to man; yet this is the very liberty, the advocates of Abolitionism turn into ridicule, and attempt to destroy, under the plausible plea of vindicating the rights of man! This was the plea of Thomas Paine—This was the plea of Robert Owen—this is the plea of Fanny Wright Darusmont—this is the plea of all the infidels on the face of the earth! But, say Abolitionists, the Bible commands us, to “do unto others as we would be done by.” Admitted. This very passage was addressed by the Infidels in their discussion with me to show the absurdity of the Bible: and according to the use made of it by Abolitionists, the argument of Infidels would be unanswerable! But will Abolitionists stand by this rule? They will not: for if they did, they would instantly abandon their crusade against their southern fellow citizens: and if they will not, then let them no longer quote that as authority, by which they themselves will not be governed! [See this subject further illustrated in a subsequent chapter.]

Liberty then may be defined to be, *the privilege of doing all that is good—and nothing that is evil*—But who is to decide that which is good, and that which is evil?



The Creator of the universe—Man unassisted by revelation never was, and never will be, able. The Bible which contains the revealed will of Omnipotence is that volume, and that only, which constitutes the umpire of good and evil\*—The very fact of the existence of laws in the land, proves man is not at liberty to do as he pleases : for, “law is a rule of action :” actions therefore must be controlled—Society demands it—God has authorised it—And perfect Liberty maintains it.

The Pirate boasts of liberty—preaches liberty to his comrades—and condemns all law ! Here is a specimen of perfect liberty ! He may with equal propriety, when taken prisoner, urge the Abolition text, “do unto others, as you would be done by.” Now, if you had been a pirate, (he would say) and had the misfortune of having been taken prisoner, would *you* not *wish* to be set at liberty ? You reply, yes, certainly—then he says, the Bible commands you to do unto others as you would be done by ; and, as you would *wish* to be set at *liberty*, were you in my situation, if you regard the authority of God you will set me *free* ! The reader must perceive to what lengths this principle may be carried out—even to the utter destruction of all society !

Again ; would opening the doors of a lunatic asylum, and letting free the patients thereof, be an act of kindness or friendship towards them ? You reply, Certainly not ! Yet this would be granting them immediate liberty—this would be pure abolitionism ! But, you rejoin, the condition of the persons—their mental inabilities disqualify them for liberty till they are cured—till they can take care of themselves—till there is no danger of their doing violence to others ; therefore, keeping them confined till *then*, is in fact an act

---

\* See Appendix A.

of kindness towards them,—and the opposite course would be most injurious to them! Thank you, kind reader, these are identically the same reasons I give for not advocating the *immediate* emancipation of the slaves. I give you full credit for the wisdom and propriety of your reasons: be so liberal as to grant me the same indulgence—to give me the same credit for the sincerity of my actions. It is probable the Abolitionist will reply, that the condition of the slaves, and of the inmates of a lunatic asylum, is very different. I answer, without fear of contradiction, that, as far as mental incapability, the vast mass of the slaves are as incapable of taking care of themselves as the great proportion of lunatics; and this we shall fully demonstrate in a subsequent chapter. Again; do you think children ought to be freed from all parental control? You reply, certainly not; and you give the same reasons as you have just adduced for not setting lunatics free. Is not this, then, a case parallel with that of the slaves? And in both, I may as justly accuse you of oppression, of tyranny, of a hatred to liberty, because you will not emancipate lunatics, and all children, as you accuse me, for not advocating the immediate abolition of slavery.

*Slavery* is derived from *slave*; as *servant* comes from *service*. In the English language the two are distinct from one another; the former term being applied to *involuntary*, the latter to *voluntary*, servitude. But this is not the case in either the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin tongues; one and the same word, in each language, signifies both voluntary and involuntary service. Thus “*obed*,” in Hebrew—“*δουλος*,” in Greek—and “*servus*,” in Latin, signify what we mean by the terms, *servant* and *slave*. Hence in works written in

any of these languages, we can never tell from the word *itself* whether the person to whom the term is applied was a *slave*, or a *servant*: it is therefore only by concomitant expressions or circumstances that we can come to a conclusion as to the actual nature of his situation. This is the case both in the Old and New Testament.

For instance, when we read of individuals having been *sold*, having been *purchased*, having been “bought *with money*” &c., we cannot doubt for a moment the propriety of applying to such persons the term *slave*: and that, no matter whether their servitude was temporary, or for ever—whether they had sold themselves, or were sold by *others*; they were *slaves* to all intents and purposes—from the moment they were sold they became subject to *involuntary* servitude.

Again, while it by no means follows that every servant (“*obed*”—“*δουλος*”—“*servus*,”) mentioned in the Bible, was a slave, it does follow that every slave was a servant!

Ere I make the next statement, I request it may be distinctly understood, 1st, that I consider the “*Slave-trade*,” and “*Slave-holding*,” two distinct things: 2d, that I do not consider “*slave-holding*,” “*cruelty*,” “*oppression*,” and “*tyranny*,” synonymous. While therefore I pronounce the former, that is *the slave-trade*, to be barbarous, iniquitous, and *unscriptural*, I cannot find a single passage in the whole word of God which either denounces *slave-holding*, or commands the owner to liberate instantaneously his slaves. And I fearlessly defy all the Abolitionists on earth to produce one such passage. If therefore the Bible is to be the umpire, and to its authority alone I ever consent to strike, that sacred book announces that

“WHERE THERE IS NO LAW THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION;” (Rom. iv. 14): and as there is no law prohibitory of *slave-holding*, it cannot be considered *sin* (for sin is the transgression of the law) by any, except those who aim at possessing a higher degree of moral worth and righteousness, than the Lord Jesus Christ himself; and, “who by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.”

While I thus humbly vindicate the slandered slaveholder, I desire equally to denounce all cruelty—all inhumanity—all oppression—the same law of God which desires the slave to “be obedient to his master, with fear and trembling” (Eph. vi. 5–9) commands the Master, “to FORBEAR THREATENING”—(for “vengeance belongeth UNTO GOD”) “to give that which is *just*, and *equal* to his slave; knowing that there is a MASTER in Heaven; who will render to every man, without respect of persons, according to his deeds.” (Col. iv. 1.)

But so far from the Bible condemning *slave-holding*, I maintain it recognizes the practice by giving laws, and directions, both for Master and for slave—and so far from encouraging the slave to run away from his master, as the principles of Abolitionism teach, it unequivocally exhorts and commands “*every* man to ABIDE in the same calling wherein he is called”—“if called, *being a slave*, care not for it; but if thou *mayest* (i. e. if thou lawfully) be *made* (set) free, use it rather.” (1 Cor. vii. 20, 21.) This is my *guide*, this is my *principle*, this would be the foundation of my advice to all.—But how opposite are the principles, the advice, and the conduct of Abolitionists, to the inspired Apostle! Paul says to the slave, “be obedient to your Master—care not for being a slave”—*abide* in it, un-



less "*lawfully* you can be made free." The Abolitionist says to the slave: "your Master has no lawful control over you—run away from him the first opportunity—take with you whatever of his property you can, *for it is yours not his!*—and I will shelter you!" Thus it will easily be perceived, that a very different spirit actuated Paul, from that which now actuates the Abolitionist! More about this hereafter.

If it be now enquired whether I consider slave-holding a sin and an evil, I readily reply, I do consider it an *evil*; but I do *not* consider it a *sin*! I am aware Abolitionists confound the two terms together, some through design, and, no doubt, many through want of reflection or ignorance. Now although every *sin* is an *evil*, yet every evil is not a sin—I hesitate not to pronounce slavery one of the *effects* of sin—hence an *evil*: for all evil is the effect of sin. Disease, famine, poverty, &c., are all evils; but who will venture to affirm that they are therefore *sins*—I would use means to the best of my judgment to assuage those evils—yea to remove them; but I would not in order to remove *suddenly* a disease, adopt a remedy which if it would not *instantly* cure it, would in all human probability destroy the individual, or produce a greater disease—this would be Abolition practice! Nor would I desire the poor man, in order to get rich *instantly*, to go and plunder a bank—this would be Abolitionism! But I would in the former case, adopt such remedies as would, with the least possible danger to my patient's life, be calculated to assuage or *remove* the disease; and if it could not be removed, without having recourse to a measure which would put his life in *jeopardy*, I would not, provided life could be sustained at all, adopt any such measures; but use every means

in my power, to mitigate his sufferings — allay all pain — and make his life as comfortable as possible. As to the latter case (the indigent person) while I would relieve him to the best of my ability, I would exhort him, not to have recourse to violent measures — not to commit evil ; but to put his trust in an all-wise and benevolent Omnipotence, and by slow and sure means, by active industry, to endeavour to better his condition—the opposite course I leave to Abolitionists for adoption.

Upon the principles inculcated in the cases I have just related, would I act towards the slave, and the slave-holder ; as more fully explained in another part of this treatise.

---

## CHAPTER II.

THE PRINCIPLES, &c. OF THE LEADERS OF ABOLITIONISM EXHIBITED.

As Abolitionists are constantly taunting the friends of Colonization with the charge, that the founders of it were Slave-holders, (which, by the by, like almost all their other statements, as will be shown in a subsequent chapter, is destitute of truth,) they cannot complain at their opponents taking a *peep* into the *principles* of some of their *Chief Champions*, and Promoters of Abolitionism—And, as WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq. stands pre-eminently distinguished as their great Apostle, we shall let the public know what this Gentleman's *principles* are ; with his abilities, character, moral or religious worth, we have nothing to do—And as they have made him their head, and sent him as their representative to

England, we are fully justified, in concluding that he spoke his sentiments not as an individual, but as the deputed representative of those who sent him there; viz. the Promoters of Abolition in this Country:—Therefore we need not further or stronger evidence of the nature of sentiment, opinions, and objects of these Gentlemen. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

To begin,—

Who was sent to Europe, a few years ago, as the REPRESENTATIVE of the American Anti-Slavery Society?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who, in that Country, publicly pronounced the American Union to be, “the most bloody and heaven-daring arrangement ever made by man”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who, in said Country, and in said year, called the said *Union*, “A wicked and ignominious compact”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who, in said place, and said year, denounced the SIGNERS of the Declaration, to be men who, “virtually dethroned the Most High God”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who pronounced the *American Union* to be, “the most atrocious villany ever exhibited on earth”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who declared, “he recognized the Union with feelings of shame and indignation”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who predicted that the Union “would be held in everlasting infamy throughout the World”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who pronounced the Union an “unholy Alliance”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who has pronounced the Union “to be null and void from the beginning”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

Who has asserted, “that the Signers of the Union had no *lawful* power to bind themselves, or their posterity for one hour—for one moment”?

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.!

*Finally*, who in the same country and year announced that the American Union “was not valid when it was made, *and is not valid now?*”

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq. !\*

Again, who, on Tuesday, May 14th, 1838, in “Pennsylvania Hall,” Philadelphia, Pa., in the presence of nearly two thousand persons, announced that “he hated, from the bottom of his heart, *prudence, caution, and judiciousness?*”

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Esq. !

What can be thought of a system which has such a person for its head, its chief champion—its Apostle? Was this gentleman *in earnest* when he used this language last week; or was he only “in fun” (!) (to use the expression by which one of his friends attempted to excuse him) or was he out of his senses? The last excuse is the only justifiable one—for if *in earnest*, the public need not be surprised at the Utopian scheme (abolitionism) of which he is the principal promoter.—If on the contrary, he was only “*in fun*,” it proves what an adept he is in assuming to weep over the evils of slavery, while he was actually *quizzing* his audience! But peradventure he meant only *colonization* caution and prudence! Well did Dr. Reese say of him, in his letters to the Hon.

---

\* Extract of Address of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq., published in the London Patriot of August 1833. See *Appendix B*.



William Jay, (page 7) that “just so far as he (Mr. Garrison) was believed in Great Britain, the (American) Society and Nation, would be viewed with *abhorrence!*” This is the gentleman sent to this city of *brotherly love*, who during the last week insulted not only the public at large, but the tried, and disinterested, friends of the slave! He opened his mouth with a tirade of abuse against that unremunerated friend and advocate of the oppressed African, *David Paul Brown, Esq.*, whose judgment and talents would adorn the cabinet of any nation under heaven.—He could not spare even this gentleman, whose person and property have so frequently been threatened by the populace, for the part he has so often taken in gratuitously defending the man of colour. And all this because forsooth Mr. Brown, not having the fear of William Lloyd Garrison before his eyes, but being tempted and seduced by a love for his country, ventured to say, “if the question was, whether the Union, or slavery, should be preserved, he would say the UNION.” For this unpardonable expression of love and attachment for his country, Mr. Garrison said that either Mr. Brown, or his speech (I did not distinctly hear which he said) ought to be tied to a millstone and cast into the depths of the sea! He next assailed Elliott Cresson, Esq., who has by his talents, property and zeal, done more service to the African, than the whole Abolition Society has, or ever will, do.—Lastly, he could not let pass the humble Author, whose *nothingness*, as yet, in the cause of the poor man of colour, ought to have sheltered him from notice; but even the professed *intention* of exposing the designs of Abolitionists appears quite sufficient to stir up the ire of this gentleman; hence he denounced me, “as a foreign adven-

turer !” In this instance he has truly proved the truth of his declaration, “that he hates caution and prudence,” for verily if ever I can get the opportunity of meeting him on a platform before the public, he may ever after go to the South with perfect impunity. His friends say, the Southerners have offered *five thousand* dollars for his head. If this be like the numerous other misstatements respecting the South, little confidence is to be placed in it ; but if it be true, and that the above event ever takes place, I guarantee they will no longer offer one dollar for it, except they have a particular fancy for purchasing empty skulls, as I shall demonstrate there is little or nothing in *his*. This is the only retaliation I shall seek for his *urbanity* towards me ; and in this, it will be perceived, I will be returning only good for evil.

Let not Abolitionists at large mistake me—I do not intend to accuse them, directly or indirectly, of impure motives—quite the reverse—I do really believe all the Abolitionists, with very few exceptions, are the best, and the most moral, and philanthropic men, in America ; and are actuated by the purest motives of doing good to all—relieving the oppressed, and crushing tyranny. But at the same time, I do confess I perceive strong symptoms of other motives actuating *some*—we know not the heart of man—God only knows that—therefore, we can only judge of men’s views by their acts and deeds. I do not accuse even the gentleman whose name has occurred so often in the preceding pages—he may be one of the best, and sincerest men on earth, for aught I know, and I hope he is ; but then he must, *if that be the case*, be labouring under *monomania* : and in that case, he certainly is not the most judicious person to *lead*—to

*advise*—or to *govern* a political party composed of thousands! One fatal *step*—one fatal *word*, of such a man, may plunge thousands into ruin! He is, or he is not, a fanatic—even he himself tells us, “he hates *caution, prudence, and judiciousness.*” Therefore, if we are to believe himself, and far be it from me to doubt his word *on this occasion*, he is not a cautious man, nor is he a prudent man, nor is he a judicious man! Who, therefore, can for the future adhere to the principles of such a person, if he were almost an angel from heaven?

Is he a fanatic? I hope so, for his own sake: but then, he is equally disqualified from advising, planning, guiding, or advocating, any doctrine, let the doctrine be ever so good!

But if he be not a fanatic—then, his principles, his declarations, his doctrines, are most suspicious! unless peradventure, he is a *simpleton*, while some crafty, designing persons, are behind the curtain, urging him forward in his imprudent, and mad, career!

Men are generally actuated by motives—*self* rules more or less in *us all*—the person who says, he has least of *self*, will generally be found to possess most of it. “As in water, face answereth unto face, so doth the heart of man to man.” When pure charity, or philanthropy, actuates men, they are never driven by it to malicious acts, to falsehoods, to misrepresentation, or to hatred, for this evident reason, because charity and philanthropy come from God, hence cannot give rise to malice, hatred, or misrepresentation, for these proceed from Satan and from Satanic motives, such as pride, ambition, love of money, revenge, &c. As well might it be expected that a pure fountain could send forth impure streams, as that charity

or philanthropy could produce malice or false testimony. The more I hear men boasting of their philanthropy, while yet exhibiting those symptoms of a Satanic Spirit, the more convinced am I that their motives are impure, that they are not actuated by charity or love, but by pride, ambition, or malice.

Know you not that Europe is looking on these States with a jealous eye? America is deemed the cradle of republicanism—the Asylum for all who venture to raise their voice against tyranny. Is there no gold in Russia, nor in Austria? Were plans (religious and philanthropic!) never devised by European Powers to divide the friends of liberty—to break up Unions—and crush that goddess (Liberty) who ever haunts the bed of Tyrants? What characters think you, would most likely be employed for such purposes? Fools? No certainly. Notorious bad men? Certainly not. It would be men of *good report*—*outwardly* righteous. Would such persons make known their plans? Certainly not. Would they declare that their object was to ruin and break up the Union? No! No! They know better than that. On the contrary, they would laugh at the very idea of the possibility of a disturbance—they would turn the apprehension into ridicule; and scoff at the very hint of so preposterous a dream! They would exclaim, *Pshaw!* This is the old story. The Union has been threatened one time by the Banks—another time by the Tariff! another time by the Indians—another time by Texas—another time by the “*bursting of a steam-boat!*” And forsooth *now* by Abolitionism! By this kind of wit, of sophistry, of bombast, they would allay all suspicion, delude their innocent and unsuspecting hear-



ers, who would mightily applaud the erudition and talent of the orator !

But who can listen to such advice as the following without suspicion, “go forward, no matter the consequences—if slavery cannot be instantly abolished without the disunion of this Nation, the sooner the better,” &c ! And this proceeding, from an imprudent, incautious, and injudicious man—from one, who not six years ago, pronounced in a foreign land, that the Union was an “*unholy alliance*”—“*a wicked, and ignominious compact*”—and, “*null and void from the beginning*” ! Can such sentiments be propagated throughout *any* Country with impunity ? If such were uttered in England respecting the King of that Nation, the speaker would soon get a halter as his reward ! And the Father of this Country, the immortal Washington, penetrating, as it were, into futurity, and well knowing how error *commences*, gave the following advice, as his last and dying admonition, “Frown *indignantly* (said he) on the *first dawning* of every attempt to alienate any portion of our Country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.” Was it, I wonder, the recollection of this admonition that called forth the abuse, (if general report be true,) so abundantly poured forth by the same champion, in “*Pennsylvania Hall*” on the memory of Washington ? But it is only justice to add that all the Trustees of that Building, with whom I conversed on the subject, one excepted, expressed their decided disapprobation of the course adopted by the Gentleman alluded to. Now the question is, shall the advice of Washington, or the doctrines inculcated by the Champions of Abolitionism, be followed ? The one is so diametrically opposed to the other, that both can-

not be regarded—If Abolitionism is to be supported, then the principles of Washington must be abandoned—Now is the time for every man to take his stand—Check the evil in the bud—“a little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump”—Now it may be stopped without blood—In a year or so, it may be impossible to say this—Again I say, let every man, woman, and child, bind round his neck the advice of Washington, “Frown *indignantly* at the first *dawning* of every attempt to alienate any portion of our Country,” and let the whole Nation shout, AMEN! Then the *Champions* of Abolitionism will soon find their level—the *true* friends of the black will all unite together, and with open hearts, and open purses, use their utmost endeavours to make him happy.

---

### CHAPTER III.

THE IMPRACTICABILITY OF THE OBJECT OF ABOLITIONISTS DEMONSTRATED—  
AND THE INEVITABLE AND INCALCULABLE EVILS WHICH THAT OBJECT, IF  
ACCOMPLISHED, WOULD PRODUCE, &c.

THE professed object of the Abolition Society is to procure the *immediate, instantaneous, and unconditional* emancipation of all the slaves in America.—And the means adopted by this Society to accomplish this object are the publication and circulation of vast numbers of papers and pamphlets, by way of enlightening the slave, and the slaveholder—but which consist, for the most part, of exhortations, and encouragement, to the slave, to disobedience, insubordination, and rebellion. This advice is coupled with the most galling denunciations and threats towards the slaveholder.

How very far, in the nature of things, these means are from accomplishing the object, every man of common reflection must perceive. Besides, it is an undeniable fact, which might have been anticipated by every man, not a hater of "caution, prudence, and judiciousness," that the condition of the slaves has, since the origin of the Anti-Slavery Society, become much more severe. Since that Society commenced its distribution of incendiary papers, and pamphlets, many of the slave-holders have prevented their slaves learning *to read*; so that if the slaves were before bound with fetters of hemp, the Abolitionists have converted the hemp into fetters of iron.—But who can blame the slave-holder for this? We, in the Northern and Eastern States, in which the white population far exceeds that of the coloured, cannot justly estimate, or form a correct opinion of the merits of the case, unless we transport ourselves down to the South.—Let us go there for a few moments and then consider the case.—Here we are then in South Carolina, where the slaves are in vast numbers: unaccustomed to guide, or take care of themselves, without either "caution, prudence, or judiciousness"! We have got our wives, our daughters, our sons, our property, all at their mercy—a quantity of papers and pamphlets are circulated among them, in which the slave-holder is portrayed as a monster of hell—a picture or plate of some act of cruelty generally heads the production—individual acts of cruelty and oppression are selected, and so related as if similar deeds were daily committed by every slave-holder in the South! What must the poor man of colour think upon reading, or seeing, this? Why he says within himself, although my master is very good to me, and

I have every thing I want, yet as this paper says all masters treat their slaves in this cruel way, the sooner I run off the better! And this paper tells me there is something called *liberty* which gives money, and houses, and pleasure in abundance; the sooner I get these good things the better! Moreover this good paper also tells me that my master has no right to keep me—that my master's property is *not* his, but it belongs to his slaves, for they have earned it—and that if I run away the white man will immediately receive, protect, and give me plenty of money, plenty of fine clothes, plenty of pleasure, *plenty* of no work! I will tell all these good things to all my black brethren—if *I* have a right to go, so have *THEY*—if my master's property is *mine*, so is it *theirs* also.—The poor deluded slave is thus set on fire, and thus he inflames the minds of all he knows.—They talk and converse, and dream of these good things—but they cannot easily run off—they become discontented—surly—unruly—idle—disobedient—and he who feeds, clothes, and takes care of them, can get little from them! Who can blame the slave-holder under such circumstances adopting every means in his power to check this spirit of rebellion, to prevent the possibility of such doctrines being inculcated amongst his slaves, which every man, except a hater of “caution, prudence, and judiciousness,” must be fully aware, would, if left unchecked, sooner or later break out into open rebellion, and place himself and his children at the mercy of ignorant men, inflamed by the hope of gain and the stimulus of lust! One or the other party would conquer.—If the coloured population became the victors (to grant the wish of the Abolitionists) awful would be the condition of both whites and



blacks—the male whites would be exposed to all the consequences of revenge and malice, for the victory could not be achieved without some resistance, and that very resistance on the part of the whites would be deemed by the blacks, a sufficient cause for retaliation; the wives and daughters of the white population would then be subjected to consequences of unbridled, and unrestrained lust, to deeds too shocking to think of, and too brutal to relate.—Think, oh think, on this, ye virtuous females, who innocently aid, and incautiously lend your voices and influence to the promotion of a cause, which, if successful, would inevitably produce these consequences.—Turn, oh turn, from such a course, and lend your powerful aid to emancipate the *mind* of both slave and slave-holder.

But setting aside all these consequences to the white, and admitting, for the sake of every possible latitude to the Abolitionist, that the white population richly deserve such results, what would be the condition of the coloured population after such a victory? Let us suppose that after a month's hard fighting, in which the soil of the south would be drenched with the blood of white and black, that the *white* population became annihilated, and not one left south of the Potomac. Behold the black placed in immediate, full, and unrestrained possession of the whole South—What think you would be the result ere one year could elapse? Does it require much penetration, or much acumen, to foresee that it would be far better for them, had they, to a man, fallen in the contest? Ignorant—unaccustomed to liberty—unacquainted with the principles of government, or the means of producing order, or of providing for futurity,—his blood still under the stimulus of success—his actions now unrestrained—all the brutal passions of man at

their highest pitch of excitement, indulging in all the luxuries of their late Master's house—what would be the inevitable consequences? First, black would fight with black, till the land would now become drenched with *black* blood—parties and associations of blacks would be formed, according to the dispositions, desires, views, temperaments, and morals of each party. Ignorant, dissipated, idle, and ambitious for superiority, party would fight with party, till scarcely a party would be left. During the scenes of blood, of carnage, of idleness, of devastation, and of debauchery, the soil becomes uncultivated, the seed not sown, if in spring,—the earth's produce not gathered, if in harvest! The stores of the former years become consumed—each man, thinks that each man, but himself, ought to work; and each man thinks that he *himself* ought now to enjoy *liberty*. The very attempt of any, to induce any to work, would be a sufficient provocation for mortal combat! Wants would now begin—still appetites must be gratified—"Caution, prudence, and judiciousness" they have either never learned, or have been taught by the great Champion of Abolitionism, *to hate!* Each day diminishes the stores, and increases the demands—and each day, fresh indications of *abolition-liberty*, manifest themselves in blood and outrage! At length, and that not many weeks after their victory, famine, with all her horrors, stares them in the face—children and infants, and mothers cry in vain for help—for nourishment.—Her ever constant companion, *Pestilence*, now attends, and thousands and thousands die of want and disease, calling down from heaven eternal curses on the heads of those who excited them to rebellion—the authors of all their sufferings—the

ABOLITIONISTS!

On the other hand, suppose that, in such a rebellion throughout the South, the *whites* were to conquer—this could not be accomplished without the destruction of vast numbers of the people of colour—nor without the loss of the lives of many whites. What then would be the condition of the surviving blacks? Common justice, and prudence, would oblige the white population to deprive the slaves of many of those privileges which they *now* enjoy, and to rivet their fetters more securely—whom would they have to thank for all this? ABOLITIONISTS! Whom have they even *now* to thank for the loss of many indulgences? The ABOLITIONISTS! And whom have thousands *now* to thank for being still in slavery? ABOLITIONISTS!

Take a view of the subject in any possible way, let the black conquer, or let him be conquered, ruin to him is the inevitable result, totally independent of the awful calamities to which the white population would be subjected. Here is a two-horned dilemma: let the Abolitionist sit upon either horn so long as he can, consistently with his profession of charity—of philanthropy, of christianity!

Leaving this part of our subject for the present, I will ask any man of common sense, and of the least reflection, whether the means adopted by Abolitionists to enlighten the slave-holder, so as to make him emancipate his slaves, are the most judicious, or the most likely to accomplish that end? I will venture to aver, without fear of contradiction, that they are so far—very far, from being likely, in the very nature of things, to accomplish the *professed* object (the emancipation of the slaves,) that no surer method could possibly be used more calculated to *increase* their sufferings, and to rivet their chains! And so convinced am

I of this, that I cannot conceive how any man of *intellect*, who has a *single eye* to this object, would for a moment sanction such means! Let us place ourselves in the situation of slave-holders, and then see the effect such conduct would have upon *ourselves*; recollecting that *by nature* all men are alike, for, “as in water face answereth to face, so doth the heart of man to man”: so says the Bible at all events, no matter what *you* may think to the contrary! Here we are then, a pair of slave-holders (not slave-traders). Our parents left slaves to us, as “*our inheritance*” (Lev. xxv. 44, 46) We are surrounded by them. The subsistence of our wives, and of our little ones, depends on their labour and exertion. We treat them kindly, and they have abundance of food and raiment. We instruct them—and pay a physician to attend them when ill.\* A party has got up in the North, whose professed object is to enlighten *us* slave-holders. Pamphlets and Papers in abundance are sent down to us. We read them—when lo! we find ourselves portrayed as Monsters! Our characters slandered. Our *legal* rights denied. Our heads branded with the epithet—“Men stealers”—“Tyrants”—“Devils incarnate”—“Objects *peculiarly* deserving the eternal wrath and vengeance of Heaven”—the world called upon to abhor and detest us, and we held up to public and everlasting infamy! But this is not all. The very persons whom the providence of God gave us—whom we feed, clothe, instruct, attend in sickness and in health, and who thus enjoy more comfort and happiness, than nine-tenths of the labouring class of white free persons in any part of Europe!—

---

\* That this is the kind of conduct pursued by thousands of slave-holders, we shall, in another part of this treatise, incontrovertibly prove.



these very persons are, in said pamphlets, taught and encouraged to look upon us as their oppressors, as the only barriers to their wealth and happiness—as having no lawful right to possess them—and that all our substance—all our property—is in fact, not *ours*, but *theirs*! Moreover, that the Law of God authorises them to run off as quick as they can, and, if practicable, with as much of *our* property as they can convey away!

What think you would be *our* feelings—*our* conduct on perusing such productions? Would they be calculated to make us listen, and give a ready ear to their authors? Unquestionably not—but the very reverse! Such is the nature of man, that, however well disposed he may be to listen to instruction, and to take advice, the moment he is assailed with harsh words, with opprobrious epithets, with threats of vengeance, and particularly, with what he deems likely to affect his *purse*, he shuts his ears, hardens his heart, and shuns you. The proceedings of Abolitionists, may be compared to stopping a man's ears, and then punishing him for not hearing; or knocking out his eyes, and then calling upon him to read; or lastly, like attempting to separate a block of wood, by applying to the crevice, the *base*, instead of the apex, of the wedge; against which you may strike in vain, till either you break the wedge, or spend your strength, without ever even once *entering* the crevice!

If then such would be the effect upon *us*, placed in the circumstances of the Southerner, is it right or judicious, or prudent, to assail him with abuse, accuse him of conduct to which Abolitionists have driven him, or continue to encourage and pursue a system which, so far from accomplishing the desired object,

tends only to augment the sufferings of the slave, and to produce consequences the most awful and calamitous to all concerned, both to whites and to blacks!

Again, the slave is taught, in those Abolition productions, to consider all slave-holders, *cruel tyrants!* This statement, no man, with any regard for truth, or possessing the least information or reflection, will venture to affirm. How galling, therefore, must it be, for those conscious of rectitude, to have the crimes of others attributed to them! How would the Abolitionists of this City, or of Boston, like to have it proclaimed to the world, that *all* the married men in these two cities are *cruel* and *unnatural*, husbands, masters, and parents; because there are some persons in those places, who richly deserve to be so designated? Moreover, I am convinced that there are in these, our cities, *ten* cruel and unnatural (white) parents, husbands, and masters, to *one* cruel and unnatural slaveholder in the South! What think you of that, Mr. Abolitionist? I would recommend you to “cast the *beam* out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see *clearly* to cast the *mote* out of thy brother’s eye;” and to recollect the admonition of the sacred writer, “Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, *whosoever* thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; *for thou that judgest, doest the same things.* And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that *thou shalt escape the judgment of God!*” (Rom. ii. 1–3.)

Let us now contrast the advice and commands of Christ and of his Apostles, with the advice and doctrines of Abolitionists—

The Bible teaches—

1. "Having food and raiment be therewith content."
2. "Let *every* man abide in the same calling wherein he was called."—1 Cor. vii. 20.
3. "Art thou called being a *slave*,\* care not for it."—1 Cor. vii. 21.
4. "If thou mayest (can *lawfully*) be *made* free, use it rather."—1 Cor. vii. 21.
5. "Slaves, be obedient to them that are your masters, *according to the flesh*."—Eph. vi. 5.
6. "Slaves, obey *in all things* your masters."—Col. iii. 22.
7. "Let as many slaves, *as are under the yoke*, count their own masters worthy of all honour."—1 Tim. vi. 1.
8. "Let those who have *believing* masters, not despise them."—1 Tim. vi. 2.
9. "Love them that hate you, and do good to them that despitefully use you."—Matt. v. 44.
10. "Love your enemies."—Matt. v. 44.

Abolitionism teaches—

1. Be not content with food and raiment unless you get free!
2. Let no slave abide for one moment as such, if he can get off!
3. If you are a slave *never cease* caring for it!
4. Whether thou mayest or mayest not (lawfully or unlawfully) get free!
5. Slaves, be not obedient to your masters; but leave them as quick as you can!
6. Obey your masters as little as possible, that they may be compelled to cast you off!
7. Masters are worthy of no honour or respect, but contempt and infamy!
8. There are no slave-holders *believers*:—despise them all!
9. *Hate* your masters, for they oppress you: and do *evil* to them, for they despitefully use you!
10. Your masters are your enemies, *therefore* despise them.

These few instances will show how different is the spirit which guided the sacred penmen, and that which now actuates the Abolitionists.—If there were no other evidences that Abolitionism *is not* the cause of God, the foregoing ought to be sufficient to convince every

---

\* See page 12.

man who believes in the divine origin of the Sacred Scriptures, and who is willing to submit his judgment to the authority of HIM, "whose ways are not as our ways, and whose thoughts are not as our thoughts."

I think I have now fully proved my propositions, viz., "that the principles of Abolitionism are injurious to the slaves themselves, and are contrary to the express commands of God."

We shall now accomplish to the fullest extent the professed wish of Abolitionists, and see what would be the probable result! Suppose I possessed the power of granting, at the stroke of my pen, instantaneous emancipation to all the slaves in America, and were this moment to issue the following proclamation: "To all whom it may concern, greeting! I do hereby command and order, that all slaves throughout the Union be instantly set free, and they are now free accordingly!" Let us now ascend in a balloon and take a view of TWO MILLIONS AND A HALF, of poor, ignorant, pennyless, men, women, and children, cast abroad on the world, without a home—without a guide—without "caution, prudence, or judiciousness!" Is not this exactly what you want, Mr. Abolitionist? What awful consequences must ensue! Not so much to the whites, but more particularly to the poor ignorant people of colour! Can that be called friendship, or charity, or philanthropy, which would lead to such a result? Those ignorant, poor, unprotected, people have now *liberty*! Will *liberty* cover them—feed them—protect them—stop the crying of the hungry child—or the cravings of the famished mother? What have they given for this liberty; and what have they got by it? They have given up, *peace, plenty, protection, and contentedness*! And they have got *liberty*, with starvation,



anxiety, and want ! What a glorious exchange ! What a profitable bargain ! How thankful they ought to be, to their pseudo-friends, the ABOLITIONISTS !


But come out now, Abolitionists, like men, and answer this question, “Are the slaves in the South, *now* in a proper condition for immediate emancipation ?” Are they, or are they not ? Reflect upon the above picture, and then answer like men.—Do you reply, that you think they ought to have *first* some education—some provision made for them—some arrangements to guard against possible consequences ?—If this be your answer, I congratulate you on the first symptoms of restoration to sound mental health : I now entertain hopes of your speedy recovery, and ere you have read the last page of this humble treatise, I doubt not, but you and I will perfectly agree, and I will give you a certificate of health !

There will nevertheless remain some stubborn Abolitionists, even all who “hate prudence, caution, and judiciousness,” who will still exclaim “the slaves are now fit for *instantaneous* and unconditional emancipation !” A word or two with such characters before I close this chapter. Pray from what premises do you draw your conclusions ? Is it from the present condition of those already made free, or from the emancipation of slaves in other countries. I shall examine both of these grounds. First then as to the condition of those already emancipated, which condition if it even favoured the views of Abolitionists, would not be a justifiable or parallel case, forasmuch as the free people of colour amongst us now were not suddenly, but *gradually* emancipated—and were not totally ignorant, for many of them knew how both to read and to write. Therefore with all these points

strong in favour of every thing the Abolitionist could possibly desire, we shall fearlessly investigate the result.

In the facts I am about adducing, I wish it to be clearly understood, that I do not attribute them to any natural peculiarity, or natural inferiority of coloured persons, but distinctly to the want of education, and to the peculiar and trying circumstances in which these persons are placed. If even the free persons of colour, turned out good and worthy citizens to the utmost wish of every benevolent man, it would not, as I have just stated, prove any thing in favour of Abolition; but so far from this being the case—so far, notwithstanding all the advantages of *gradual* emancipation, and a preparatory course of instruction, from the result substantiating the opinion of Abolitionists, viz. “that the slaves may, with safety to themselves, and to others, be instantaneously emancipated;” it stands an incontrovertible evidence against them—a warning that it is difficult to conceive how any man in his senses, would not be admonished by; if he be one who regards the welfare and happiness of this country, and the real good of the black! The following paragraph is taken from “the Plea for Africa,” p. 179.

“It has been asserted that, of free blacks collected in our cities and large towns, a great portion are found in abodes of wretchedness and vice, and become tenants of poor-houses and prisons. As a proof of the tendency of their condition, the following striking facts among others, ascertained a year or two since, have been mentioned: In Massachusetts, where the coloured population is small, being less than 7,000 souls, (only 1-74th part of the whole population,) ☞ about 1-6th part of the whole number of convicts in the state-prison are blacks. In Connecticut, 1-34th part of the population is coloured, and ☞ 1-3d part of the convicts. In New-York, 1-35th part are


blacks;  1-4th part of the convicts in the city state-prison are blacks. In New-Jersey, the proportion is 1-13th coloured; and of the convicts 1-3d. In Pennsylvania, 1-34th part of a population of more than a million of souls, is coloured; and more than one-third part of the convicts are black.

“I need not pursue these illustrations of the degradation of the free blacks in the non-slave-holding States. It appears from these statements, which I find in the First Annual Report of the Prison Discipline Society, that about *one quarter* part of all the expense incurred by these States for the support of their institutions for criminals is for *coloured* convicts. The bill of expense in three of these States stands thus: that is, the expense for the support of coloured convicts for the specified number of years preceding the report from which this schedule is made, is in

Massachusetts,	10	years,	-	-	-	\$17,734
Connecticut,	15	“	-	-	-	37,166
New-York,	27	“	-	-	-	109,166 in one prison.

---

\$164,066

 This sum was expended in an average of less than eighteen years, on convicts from among a population of only 54,000 coloured persons.

“Illustrations, borrowed from the criminal statistics of the South, would place this matter in a far more unfavourable light. References to the expenses for the maintenance of paupers, would give a similar result.”

According to the above statement, it appears, that in Massachusetts, there are (in proportion to the whole population) TWELVE coloured persons to *one* white, in poor-houses and prisons!

In *Connecticut*, ELEVEN Coloured, to *one* White, in Do.!

In *New-York*, EIGHT Coloured, to *one* White, in Do.!

In *New-Jersey*, FOUR Coloured, to *one* White, in Do.!

In *Pennsylvania*, ELEVEN Coloured, to *one* White, in Do.!

If the trial of 300,000 Coloured free persons, (the number now in the States,) emancipated *gradually*,

and under the most favourable circumstances possible, be not sufficient to open the eyes of the Abolitionists to the recklessness of their course, I know not what could. Can this result afford any encouragement or satisfaction? And if not, why persevere in attempting to bring about what cannot take place; and which if it could, would produce incalculable misfortunes throughout the States?

We shall now investigate the other appeal, viz., that no evils arose from the *immediate* emancipation of the slaves in Mexico—the British slaves in the West Indies, those in Chili, Buenos Ayres, Colombia, and New York. In the first place, then, give me leave to remark that as to Mexico, the slaves there were only comparatively a handful, about 20,000. Secondly, they were incorporated into the Army, as the *condition* of emancipation; so that they actually only changed from civil to martial law! And thirdly, so far from the slaves in Mexico having been set free in one day, it took them TWELVE YEARS to buy their freedom! The law, granting them this privilege, was, it is true, made in one day; but the accomplishment of it, took TWELVE YEARS! See Dr. Reese's Letters to the Hon. William Jay, p. 104. As to the English slaves in the West Indies, every one knows their emancipation was not immediate, for in fact they are not as yet literally emancipated! Besides, the British found it necessary not only to pay handsomely for them; but they find it indispensably necessary still to maintain there a considerable standing Army! And the venerable Mr. Clarkson, writing on the subject, said, "I never stated that our West Indian slaves were to be emancipated *suddenly*, but by degrees. I always, *on the other hand*, took it for granted, that they



were to have a *preparatory school*, also.” Lastly, as to the four other places, it is notorious, that the slaves were not in one single instance, immediately and unconditionally emancipated. Here are the cases so frequently referred to by Abolitionists, as a ground of justification for their project, and yet we perceive there is not one of them a case, parallel, to the condition of the Southern States; moreover, where any of them, have any resemblance to the circumstances of our country, the result shows the madness of the Abolition Scheme! There is one more *fatal* objection to the Abolition system, viz., that its whole aim is the removal of the effect, and not the cause! Now the first principle in philosophy, indeed in common sense, is, “*to remove the cause:*” and every system built upon any other principle is absurd, and must turn out useless. Abolitionism is therefore unphilosophical, absurd, fallacious, and inefficacious! That slavery is the cause of much evil, I do not pretend to deny; but then slavery itself is only an *effect*. For example, a person gets a splinter of wood into his finger—the finger inflames—the arm inflames—the whole body (as it were) inflames—delirium or lockjaw supervenes, and death closes the scene! Now the inflamed finger is the cause of the inflamed arm; and that the cause of the general fever; and that the cause of the delirium; and that the cause of death!\* What kind of empirical practice would every attempt be to remove the inflammation of the finger, of the arm, or of the body, while the cause (the splinter) still remained in the finger? The very first thing any man of science would, under such circumstances, do, would be to ex-

---

\* This is described in popular, not professional, language.



tract the splinter—the original cause of all—when once the cause had been removed, then, but not till then, would he attempt to remove the effects.

The attention of Abolitionists is directed solely to the removal of the effect—for slavery is only the effect of the African *Slave-trade*. Now if there never had been *slave-trade*, there would be now no *slavery*: and this cause—the slave-trade, still exists. ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND Africans are annually torn away by the hand of violence from their native land; and of this number, ere they reach their destination, SIXTY THOUSAND die of hard and cruel treatment. Yet to all this Abolitionists pay no attention,—they weep and wail over, and preach and brawl about, the people of colour in these States, nine-tenths of whom are slaves only in *name*, and who are far better off, far happier, far more contented—far better provided for, than nine-tenths of the white labouring population of civilized Europe.

The ingenuity of Abolitionists, I am aware, will readily find for them a plausible answer to this charge: they will reply, oh if we stop slavery here—if we break up the system in our States, if there be no market to which the slave-trader can bring his slaves, the African traffic will soon cease. Admitted, if the little “IF,” which always professes to accomplish great things, could work miracles. But pray, would breaking up the slave-trade in these States, break up the market elsewhere? Certainly not! For those 100,000 slaves now annually exported from Africa, are not brought here; but to the Brazils, Havanna, &c. &c.

A short quotation from “the Plea for Africa” will furnish the reader with still more extensive views of the horrors of the SLAVE-TRADE, to which Abolitionists, with all their philanthropy, pay no attention.

“Mr. Clarkson divides the slaves into seven classes. The most considerable class consists of kidnapped, or stolen Africans. In obtaining these, every species of injustice, treachery and cruelty are resorted to. This class, Mr. C. supposes, embraces one half of the whole number transported from Africa. The second class consists of those whose villages are set on fire and depopulated in the darkness of night, for the purpose of obtaining a portion of their inhabitants. The third class consists of those who have been convicted of crimes. The fourth, of prisoners in wars that originate from common causes, or in wars made solely for the purpose of procuring captives for slaves. The fifth, such as are slaves by birth. The sixth and seventh, such as have surrendered their liberty by reason of debt, or by other imprudences, which last, however, are comparatively few in number.

“They are sometimes brought a distance of a thousand miles; marched over land in droves, or caufles as they are called, secured from running away, by pieces of wood which yoke them together by the neck, two and two, or by other pieces fastened with staples to their arms.

“Some are carried to what are called slave-factories; others immediately to the shore, and conveyed in boats to the different ships whose captains have captured or purchased them. The men are confined on board the ship, two and two together, either by the neck, leg, or arm, with fetters of iron; and are put into apartments, the men occupying the forepart, the women the afterpart, and the children the middle. The tops of these apartments are grated for the admission of light and for ventilation when the weather is suitable for the grates to be uncovered, and are about three feet three inches in height, just sufficient space being allotted to each individual to sit in one posture, the whole stowed away like so much lumber.

“It is said that many of them whilst the ships are waiting for their full lading, and whilst they are near their native shore which they are no more to set foot upon for ever, have been so depressed, and overwhelmed with such unsupportable distress, that they have been induced to die by their own hands. Others have become deranged and perfect maniacs, or have pined away and died with despairing, broken hearts.

“In the day-time, in fair weather, they are sometimes brought on deck. They are then placed in long rows on each side of the ship, two and two together. As they are brought up from their apartments, a long chain is passed through the shackles of each couple, successively, and thus the whole row is fastened down to the deck. In this situation, they receive their food. After their coarse and meagre meal, a drum is beaten by one of the sailors, and at its sound the Negroes are all required to exercise, for their health, jumping in their chains as high as their fetters will let them; and if any refuse to exercise in this way, they are whipped until they comply. This jumping, the slave-merchants call “*dancing*.”

“The middle passage is the whole from the time the ship weighs anchor until she arrives at her destined port. On the passage, the situation of the slaves is, indeed, doubly deplorable, especially if the ship have a long passage, and is very full. A full-grown person is allowed, in the most commodious slave-ships, but sixteen inches in width, three feet three inches in height, and five feet eight inches in length. *They lie in one crowded mass on the bare planks, and by the constant motion of the ship, are often chafed until their bones are almost bare, and their limbs covered with bruises and sores.* The heat is often so great, and the air they breathe so poisoned with pestilence by the feverish exhalations of the suffering multitude, that nature can no longer sustain itself. It is no uncommon occurrence, to find, on each successive morning, some who have died during the night, in consequence of their suffering and confined situation. A large proportion of those who are shipped, die before they have crossed the ocean. Many also die soon after completing the voyage, from what is called “the seasoning;” that is, in becoming acclimated in the country to which they are carried.

“It is said that when the slave-holders first visited the western coast of Africa, the country was most delightful. The coast was covered with villages, or thickly settled towns, which swarmed with inhabitants. Simple in their manners, amiable in their dispositions, in quiet enjoyment of the profuse bounties of nature, they are represented as exceeding happy.

“They were a comparatively innocent, unoffending, contented, happy race. It was not until slave-dealers introduced among

them every thing that could please the fancy and awaken the cupidity of uncivilized men, that they were at all prone to interfere with each other's happiness. By the more than brutal cruelty of white men, quarrels were fomented, tribe was set against tribe, and each supplied with the means of mutual destruction."

'Then what is man? And what man, seeing this,  
And having human feelings, does not blush,  
And hang his head, to think himself a man?'

Besides all this, recollect that there are about FIFTY MILLIONS of Africans left exposed to the debasing influence of this hellish practice. And if the Colonization Society did nothing more than stop or check this torrent of infernal iniquity, it ought to render its friends and advocates immortal, and make those blush (*if blush they could*) who vilify and slander them.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

THE ERRORS OF THE QUARTERLY ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE, FOR APRIL, 1837, RESPECTING THE SCRIPTURAL WORDS "*Servant*" — "*Property*" — "*Buy*," &c., BRIEFLY NOTICED.

THERE is no argument more frequently used by Abolitionists than that the Scriptures prohibit the purchase, or sale of men, or holding any man as property—and as the above Magazine has no doubt contributed much, by the talent, learning, and *ingenuity*, (I don't like to say *sophistry*) of its editor (Mr. Elizur Wright, jun.,) to build up this most preposterous assertion, I shall take leave to investigate a few of the arguments adopted therein.

There is a great difference between a man going



to the Bible to find sanction for an opinion which he has *already* formed, and a man going to the Bible, for its opinion. The one first forms his own ideas of things, of what is, and what is not, right or wrong, and then goes to the Scriptures to sanction or corroborate those ideas; the other forms no opinion whatever, until he searches the sacred oracles of truth to ascertain what *they* say on the subject.

Now it appears to me evident that the editor of this periodical acted on the former principle—he first came to the conclusion, that “*to own*,” “*to buy*,” or “*to sell*,” a human being, was wrong and unscriptural; and then went to the Bible to *make* it prove that his opinions were correct. And so far has he been carried away with his preconceived opinions, and so much did he labour under the “*spell*” of Abolitionism, that he frequently confounds the act of purchasing a man, with the act of stealing a man! using synonymously the terms “purchasing” and “stealing!” Thus when he attempts to prove that purchasing a man is unscriptural, and that all slave-holders ought to be put to death, he refers to the twenty-first chapter of Exodus and sixteenth verse! (See said Magazine, page 247–249). But how does this read, “He that STEALETH a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.” It does *not* read, “he that stealeth, or selleth:” no, no! the whole and only crime condemned here was, “STEALING the man;” but retaining or not retaining him, or selling him, did not exculpate the thief!

This is one of the most unhappy passages in the whole Bible, the Abolitionists could have selected: for while it incontrovertibly sanctions “selling men,” by making “the selling” no excuse for “the stealing,” it



condemns *to death* the African traders, for their conduct, and the American Abolitionists, for theirs.\*

The editor builds nearly the whole of his arguments, which occupy 126 pages, on TWO ERRONEOUS PRINCIPLES—which principles, if I prove to be really erroneous, I need not wade through his numerous conclusions to show the fallacy of each and every one of them; “for every argument built upon a false position necessarily ends in an absurd conclusion.”

The two principles or pillars of his edifice are, 1st. That as the same word (both in Hebrew and in Greek) signifies both slave and servant, and as every slave is a servant, therefore, every servant, is a slave! This species of logic reminds me of the syllogism, that, “as, every man is an animal, and a horse is an animal, *therefore*, every man is a horse!” Is it necessary to spend time in exhibiting the folly and fallaciousness of this first principle? A child would laugh at it; yet this work is held up by Abolitionists, as of almost equal authority with the Bible itself!

One or two conclusions drawn from this first principle will, no doubt, be gratifying to the reader. In page 220, the editor proceeds thus:

“To keep the South in good spirits, we must believe not only that Abraham kept slaves, but that our *blessed Saviour was a slave-holder!* Of course *heaven must be*, on a larger scale, like one of those establishments which line the shores of the Mississippi. When they find a text which recognises *masters or servants*, they consider it triumphant.

“*First.* It will prove that every country in Christendom is a

---

\* The Abolition Champions, by means of their addresses, rob (I suppose there is no difference between “*robbing*” and “*stealing*”) the Southerner of his *legal* property! See their exhortations, &c. to the slaves.

slave region. On every farm in Great Britain there are *servants*. Every statute and every instrument of writing which obliges *tenants*, and *keepers of cattle*, &c., calls them *servants*, and their landlord or employer master. Is Great Britain a slave region? And in our own country every white apprentice is, in his indenture, called a *servant*. Is he a slave?

"*Second*. It will prove that slavery is the *only* kind of servitude which the Scriptures approve. At one "fell swoop," it would unchurch the professors at Princeton, and every master and servant in our free states. If the term *servant*, of itself, and necessarily, signifies a *slave*, it follows not only that *the kingdom of God has always been like the kingdom of the devil*, in regard to servitude and personal rights, but that voluntary and requited servitude is a modern innovation, for which there is neither precedent nor example in Holy Writ; and therefore it is at least doubtful *whether a voluntary servant, and the master who pays him wages, ought to be received into the Church!* For if inspired men always passed them by unnoticed—if those whom they instruct and recognise as believers were slaves and slavemasters exclusively, where shall we find example for admitting the voluntary servant and his master, till they qualify themselves by slavery? Thus the assumption in question leads to the conclusion, not that God tolerated slavery, *but that he tolerated nothing else.*"!!!

The above paragraph furnishes an admirable specimen of the species of *reasoning* by which Abolitionists are *deluded!*

The second principle, upon which the Editor builds his arguments, is that as the original word which signifies "*to buy*" sometimes signifies something else, therefore it *never* signifies what we mean by *buying* or *purchasing!* I am really astonished at this gentleman's forgetfulness, for to nothing else do I wish to attribute his reasoning on this subject. He will therefore pardon me in *reminding* him that just in proportion to the poverty of any language, does each word in that language represent numerous ideas; in which case the real meaning intended by the writer can be

ascertained, to a certainty, only by the concomitant circumstances, or adjoining expressions. If in our own language, which is so rich, we have numerous words, each representing many distinct ideas, is it at all surprising that such should be the case in ancient tongues? This, the Editor knows far better, in all probability, than myself; and is also aware that preconceived theories not only put *new* ideas into our heads, but oftentimes eliminate correct ones! Now when we hear of an article being bought "*with money*," these two last words put, beyond all possibility of doubt, and beyond all the possibility of sophistry, the nature of the meaning of the word "*bought*"—viz. "*To acquire the property, right, or title, to any thing, by paying a consideration, or an equivalent—to purchase; to acquire by paying a price,*" &c. [See Webster's American Dictionary]. The various passages of Scripture quoted by the Editor in page 259, in no way whatever militate against the meaning of the word "*buy*."

Now the following simple questions may be put: 1st. Did God in any one passage in the whole Bible forbid or prohibit the *purchase* of men? Not in a single instance! 2d. Did God ever give directions respecting the purchase of men, and the treatment of men so purchased? He unquestionably did. [See Gen. xvii. 13, 27. Exodus xxi. 2—7, 26, 27.] 3d. Did God recognize such as were thus purchased with money, as the *property* of their masters? Most undoubtedly. [See Exod. xx. 17. xxi. 20, 21, where the servant is actually denominated, "*HIS MONEY!*"]

Having now proved the erroneousness of the two principles upon which the Editor of this Magazine built his arguments; and having demolished the two pillars which supported his whole edifice, the argu-

ments and the edifice necessarily coming to naught, I shall end this chapter with a few remarks on a text of Scripture which Abolitionists adduce as a justification for encouraging, sheltering, and retaining, those who run away from their legal masters. This text is to be found in Deut. xxiii. 15, and reads thus, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." Did this verse stand totally unconnected with any other portion of the Scriptures; were it even completely isolated, I could not dare, in common justice, give it that interpretation which would render it in direct opposition to the whole tenor of Scripture; and which Abolitionists do, in order to shelter themselves from the condemnation justly attached to their principles. No marvel that there are thousands of men in the land who consider the Bible a mass of contradictions, when those who profess to believe in its Divine origin thus *make* it, to promote their own views, contradict itself. Compare the meaning attached to this passage by Abolitionists, with the first column on page 33 in this treatise, and then see if such meaning is not as directly opposed to the spirit and letter of the passages of Scripture contained in that column, as any two things possibly can be!

But we need only look at the passage alluded to, as it stands in the Bible, to see at once the true meaning of it; and that it, no more sanctions or authorises the conduct of Abolitionists, than the command of God to the Jews to extirpate the inhabitants of Canaan, authorises the Abolitionists to extirpate our Southern



brethren! Much of this chapter (Deut. xxiii.) is taken up with directions to the Jews respecting their future conduct towards their heathen neighbours, the Ammonite, Moabite, &c., *from whom*, (“**THINE ENEMIES,**”) if a servant escape, thou shalt not deliver him back. This command, be it observed, is not to *individuals*, but to the JEWISH NATION, which the sixteenth verse fully proves: for therein we find directions given, that the servant escaped from those heathen nations, may be permitted to dwell *among* the Jews, and in whatever place he chooses. This could not, in the nature of things, be a command to one Jewish master, in respect to the treatment of a slave that had escaped from another Jewish master: the one expression “he may dwell *among* you” (v. 16.) ends all dispute on this subject. The Abolitionists must now for ever more search for some other passage of Scripture, to contradict that which directs us to “*do unto others as we would be done by!*”

---

## CHAPTER V.

THE CONDUCT AND CHARACTER OF THE SOUTHERN SLAVE-HOLDER,  
VINDICATED.

ONE of the peculiar features in the practice of Abolition champions, is to discredit every statement proceeding from all others, except from themselves: and in this respect they resemble very much, as I stated in the preceding part of this pamphlet, the champions of Infidelity! If there be, therefore, any truth in the common adage, that “none are so suspicious as those



who are conscious that their own statements ought not to be credited," there can be no difficulty in accounting for the unbelief of those gentlemen.

No one pretends to deny that there are in the South, *some* cruel, irreligious—inhuman—slave-holders—and who will have the hardihood to deny that there are also in the North, *thousands* of cruel, irreligious and inhuman, masters, husbands, and fathers! Would the latter fact be a justifiable reason for branding *all* the masters, husbands, and fathers, in the North, as a set of cruel, irreligious, inhuman monsters? Ah, but says the Abolitionist, they do not use the lash in the North.—Don't they? If not, it is only because many prefer the cudgel, which they use liberally on the head, back, and limbs of their unfortunate *white* slaves! How many think you (in this religious city of Philadelphia) white masters, and white husbands, and white fathers, are annually bound over or punished for cruelty to their *white* apprentices—white wives—and white children? And how many more are they, whose barbarity never comes to light, or whose wealth shelters them? Methinks the effects of the cruelty of a husband or of a father, would be just as sore on the back or head of a wife, or of a child, as if they were the effects of the cruelty of a slave-holder: a rose smells as sweet by any other name! You reply they cannot *sell* them here; I answer, it would be far to the advantage of many if they could.

But now to the matter of this chapter: it is constantly published and circulated by Abolitionists that so hard-hearted, brutal, and inhuman are all the slave-holders in the South, that they all desire slavery, are all inimical to freedom, and revel in their iniquity. So far from this being the case, I reply that the vast ma-

majority of them, regret the necessity of holding slaves—are anxious to have them emancipated, and would hail with delight any plan by means of which they could emancipate them, with safety to themselves, and with safety to their slaves. Let us hear the testimony of a few of them on the subject, recollecting that according to the principles of common justice, as established in all civilized nations, *it is not lawful to consider a man unworthy of credit till he is first proved to be a liar.*

Patrick Henry says,—

“I repeat it again, that it would rejoice my very soul that *every one* of my fellow beings was *emancipated*. As we ought with gratitude to admire that decree of heaven which has numbered us among the *free*, we ought to *lament and deplore* the necessity of holding our fellow men in bondage.”—*Debates in Virginia Convention.*

Zachariah Johnson says,—

“Slavery has been the foundation of that impiety and dissipation which have been so much disseminated among our countrymen. If it were *totally abolished*, it would do much good.” *Ibid.*

Judge Tucker says,—

“The introduction of slavery into this country, is, at this day, considered among its *greatest misfortunes*.” And in 1803, he said, after pronouncing slavery to be “a calamity, a reproach, and a curse,”—“those who wish to postpone emancipation, do not reflect that every day renders the task more arduous to be performed.”

General Harper says,—

“It tends, and may powerfully tend, to rid us gradually and *entirely* in the United States, of *slaves and slavery*, a great *moral and political evil*, of *increasing virulence and extent*, from which much mischief is now felt, and very great calamity in future, is justly apprehended. It speaks not only to our understandings, but to our senses; and however it may be derided

by some, or overlooked by others, who have not the ability or time, or do not give themselves the trouble to reflect on, and estimate properly, the force and extent of those great moral and physical causes, which prepare gradually, and at length bring forth the most terrible convulsions in civil society; it will not be viewed without deep and awful apprehensions by any who shall bring sound minds, and some share of political knowledge and sagacity, to the serious consideration of the subject. Such persons will give their most serious attention to any proposition which has for its object, the eradication of this terrible mischief lurking in our vitals.”—*Letter on Colonization Society.*

Darby says,—

“ Copying from Montesquieu, and not from observation of nature, climate has been called upon to account for stains on the human character, imprinted by the hand of political mistake. No country where negro slavery is established, but must bear, in part, the wounds inflicted on nature and justice. Without pursuing a train of metaphysical reasoning, we may at once draw this induction, that if slavery, like pain, is one of the laws of existence, the latter does not more certainly produce physical weakness, debility, and death, than does the former lessen the purity of virtue in the human breast.”—*History of Louisiana.*

M’Call says,—

“ It is shocking to human nature, that any race of mankind, and their posterity, should be sentenced to perpetual slavery.”  
*History of Georgia.*

General Mercer says,—

“ For, although it is believed, and is, indeed, too obvious to require proof, that the colonization of the free people of colour alone, would not only tend to civilize Africa; to abolish the slave-trade; and greatly to advance their own happiness; but to promote that also of the other classes of society, the proprietors and slaves; yet the hope of the gradual and utter abolition of slavery, in a manner consistent with the rights, interests, and happiness of society, ought never to be abandoned.”—*Report to Colonization Society.*

F. S. Key, Esq. says,—

“I hope I may be excused, if I add, that the subject which engages us, is one in which it is our right to act—as much our right to act, as it is the right of those who differ from us not to act. If we believe in the existence of a great moral and political evil amongst us, and that duty, honour, and interest, call upon us to prepare the way for its removal, we must act. All that can be required of us, is, that we act discreetly,” &c.—*Speech before Colonization Society.*

Mr. Clay says,—

“If they would repress all tendencies towards liberty and ultimate emancipation, they must do more than put down the benevolent efforts of this society. They must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason, and the love of liberty. *Our friends, who are cursed with this greatest of human evils, (slavery,) deserve our kindest attention and consideration. Their property and safety are both involved.*”—*Speech before Colonization Society.*

William H. Fitzhugh, Esq. says,—

“Slavery, in its mildest form, is an evil of the darkest character. Cruel and unnatural in its origin, no plea can be urged in justification of its continuance, but the plea of necessity; not that necessity which arises from our habits, our prejudices, or our wants; but the necessity which requires us to submit to existing evils, rather than substitute, by their removal, others of a more serious and destructive character. There is no riveted attachment to slavery, prevailing extensively, in any portion of our country. Its injurious effects on our habits, our morals, our individual wealth, and more especially on our national strength and prosperity, are universally felt, and almost universally acknowledged.”

Mr. Levasseur says,—

“Happily, there is no part of the civilized world, in which it is necessary to discuss the justice or injustice of the principle of negro slavery; at the present day, every sane man agrees that it is a monstrosity, and it would be altogether inaccurate,



to suppose that there are in the United States, more than elsewhere, individuals sufficiently senseless to seek to defend it, either by their writings or conversation. For myself, who have traversed the twenty-four states of the Union, and in the course of a year have had more than one opportunity of hearing long and keen discussions upon this subject, I declare that I never have found but a single person, who seriously defended this principle. This was a young man, whose head, sufficiently imperfect in its organization, was filled with confused and ridiculous notions relative to Roman History; and appeared to be completely ignorant of the history of his own country. It would be waste of time, to repeat here, his crude and ignorant tirade."

These are the sentiments of MEN OF EMINENT TALENTS, CITIZENS OF THE SOUTH, AND SLAVE-HOLDERS!

Lastly, the Southern Reporter says,—

"The *conscientious* slave-holder deserves a larger share of the sympathy of those who have sympathy to spare, than any other class of men, not excepting the slave himself." "One *great evil* of the system is its tendency to produce disorder and poverty in a country." "The slave-trade may be regarded as a *conspiracy* of all Europe and the commercial part of this continent, not only against Africa, but in a *more aggravated sense, against these southern regions.*"

"Almost all masters, in Virginia, assent to the proposition, that when slaves can be liberated without *danger to themselves*, and to their *own* advantage, it ought to be done. If there are few who think otherwise in Virginia, I feel assured that *there are few such any where in the south!*" [See Dr. Reese's Letters to the Hon. William Jay, p. 50—53.]

But if it be now asked why do they not liberate them, as they appear so anxious so to do? I reply that totally independent of the considerations above stated, the law of the land prohibits their so doing unless they give large security, or send them abroad. So that in fact the *Abolitionists themselves are now the actual slave-holders of thousands!* For by their calum-



niating and misrepresenting the motives of the advocates of the Colonization Society, they have prevented the influx of such means to that body as would have enabled it to relieve the slave-holder from that *bondage* under which he labours, and thus free his slaves!

Another calumny circulated is respecting the state of ignorance and irreligion in which all the slave-holders keep their slaves. This is as great a falsehood as ever was uttered by man or Devils, if we are to give any credit to the testimony of every good and pious man who lives in, or has visited, the South.

The following testimony I the more readily adduce because it is taken from the Report published by the *Abolitionists*, of the Discussion between Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. Thompson; and the truth of which I find the latter gentleman does not attempt to deny.

“RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

“The Southern Evangelical Society,” is the title of a proposed association, among the Presbyterians of the South, for the propagation of the gospel among the people of colour. The constitution originated in the synod of North Carolina, and is to go into effect as soon as adopted by the synod of Virginia, or that of South Carolina and Georgia. The voting members of the society are to be elected by the synods. Honorary members are created by the payment of 30 dollars. All members of synods united with the society are corresponding members—other corresponding members may be chosen by the voting members. Article 4th of the constitution provides that ‘there shall not exist between this society and any other society, any connexion whatever, except with a similar society in the slave-holding states.’ Several resolutions follow the constitution—one of these provides that a presbytery in a slave-holding district of the country, not united with a synod in connexion with the society, may become a member by its own act. The 5th and 6th resolutions are as follows:—

“Resolved, 5. That it be very respectfully and earnestly re-

commended to all the heads of families in connexion with our congregations, to take up and vigorously prosecute the business of seeking the salvation of the slaves in the way of maintaining and promoting family religion.

“Resolved, 6. That it be enjoined on all the presbyteries composing this synod to take order at their earliest meeting to obtain full and correct statistical information as to the number of people of colour, in the bounds of our several congregations, the number in actual attendance at our several places of worship, and the number of coloured members in our several churches, and make a full report to the synod at its next meeting, and for this purpose, that the clerk of this synod furnish a copy of this resolution to the stated clerk of each presbytery.”

“The next document carried them one state farther South, and related to South Carolina, in which that horrible Gov. M'Duffie, who seems to haunt Mr. Thompson's imagination with his threats of ‘death without benefit of clergy,’ lives, and perhaps still rules. It is taken from the same paper as the next preceding extract:—

“RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

“From an intelligent New Englander at the South:—

“To the Editor of the *New York Observer*—

“I am apprehensive that many of your readers, who feel a lively interest in the welfare of the slaves, are not correctly and fully informed as to their amount of religious instruction. From the speeches of Mr. Thompson and others, they might be led to believe that slaves in our Southern states never read a Bible, hear a gospel sermon, or partake of a gospel ordinance. It is to be hoped, however, that little credit will be given to such misrepresentations, notwithstanding the zeal and industry with which they are disseminated.

“*What has been done on a single Plantation.*

“I will now inform your readers what has been done, and is now doing, for the moral and religious improvement of the slaves on a single plantation, with which I am well acquainted, and these few facts may serve as a commentary on the unsupported

assertions of Mr. Thompson and others. And here I could wish that all who are so ready to denounce every man that is so unfortunate as to be born to a heritage of slaves, could go to that plantation, and see with their own eyes, and hear with their own ears, the things which I despair of adequately describing. Truly, I think they would be more inclined, and better qualified to use those weapons of light and love which have been so ably and justly commended to their hands.

“On this plantation there are from 150 to 200 slaves, the finest looking body that I have seen on any estate. Their master and mistress have felt for years how solemn are the responsibilities connected with such a charge; and they have not shrunk from meeting them. The means used for their spiritual good, are abundant. They enjoy the constant preaching of the gospel. A young minister of the Presbyterian church, who has received a regular collegiate and theological education, is labouring among them, and derives his entire support from the master, with the exception of a trifling sum which he receives for preaching one Sabbath in each month, for a neighbouring church. On the Sabbath and during the week you may see them filling the place of worship, from the man of gray hairs to the small child, all neatly and comfortably clothed, listening with respectful, and in many cases, eager attention to the truth as it is in Jesus, delivered in terms adapted to their capacities, and in a manner suited to their peculiar habits, feelings and circumstances;—engaging with solemnity and propriety in the solemn exercise of prayer, and mingling their melodious voices in the hymn of praise. Sitting among them are the white members of the family encouraging them by their attendance, manifesting their interest in the exercises, and their anxiety for the eternal well being of their people. Of the whole number 45 or 50 have made a profession of religion, and others are evidently deeply concerned.

“Let me now conduct you to a Bible class of 10 or 12 adults who can read, met with their Bibles to study and have explained to them the word of God. They give unequivocal demonstrations of much interest in their employment, and of an earnest desire to understand and remember what they read. From hence we will go to another room where are assembled 18 or 20

lads attending upon catechetical instruction conducted by their young master. Here you will notice many intelligent countenances, and will be struck with the promptitude and correctness of their answers.

“But the most interesting spectacle is yet before you. It is to be witnessed in the Infant School Room, nicely fitted up and supplied with the customary cards and other appurtenances. Here, every day in the week, you may find 25 or 30 children neatly clad, and wearing bright and happy faces. And as you notice their correct deportment, hear their unhesitating replies to the questions proposed, and above all, when they unite their sweet voices in their touching songs, if your heart is not affected and your eyes do not fill, you are the hardest-hearted and driest-eyed visitor that has ever been there. But who is their teacher? Their mistress, a lady whose amiable christian character, and most gifted and accomplished manners are surpassed by none. From day to day—month to month, and year to year, she has cheerfully left her splendid halls and circle of friends to visit her school room, where, standing up before those young immortals, she trains them in the way in which they should go, and leads them to Him who said, ‘suffer little children to come unto me.’

“From the Infant School Room, we will walk through a beautiful lawn half a mile, to a pleasant grove commanding a view of miles in extent. Here is a brick chapel rising for the accommodation of this interesting family—sufficiently large to receive 2 or 300 hearers. When completed, in beauty and convenience it will be surpassed by few churches in the Southern country.

“On the plantation you might see also many other things of great interest. Here a negro is the overseer. Marriages are regularly contracted. No negro is sold, except as a punishment for bad behaviour, and a dreaded one it is. None is bought save for the purpose of uniting families. Here you will hear no clanking of chains, no cracking of whips; (I have never seen a blow struck on the estate,) and here last, but not least, you will find a flourishing Temperance Society embracing almost every individual on the premises. And yet the ‘Christianity of the South is a chain-forging, a whip-platting—marriage discouraging, Bible-withholding Christianity!’

“I have confined myself to a single plantation. But I might



add many interesting facts in regard to others, and the state of feeling in general, but I forbear.

Yours, &c.

A NEW-ENGLAND MAN.

“He would now connect the peculiar and local facts of the preceding statement, with the whole community of slave-holders in the same state; and show by competent and disinterested testimony the real and common state of things. The following extracts were from a letter printed in the New York Observer of July 25, 1835.

“I have resided eight years in South Carolina, and have an extensive acquaintance with the planters of the middle and low country. I have seen much of slavery, and feel competent to speak in regard to many facts connected with it.

“What your correspondent has stated of the condition of one plantation, is, in its essential points, a common case throughout the whole circle of my acquaintance.

“The negroes generally in this state are well fed, well clothed, and have the means of religious instruction. According to my best judgment, the work which a slave here is required to do, amounts to about one third the ordinary labour commonly performed by a New-England farmer. A similar comparison would hold true in regard to the labour of domestics. In the family where I reside, consisting of *nine* white persons, *seven slaves* are employed to do the work. This is a common case.

“In the village where I live there are about 400 slaves, and they generally attend church. More than one hundred of them are members of the church. Perhaps 200 are assembled every Sabbath in the Sunday Schools. In my own Sunday School are about 60, and most of them professors of religion. They are perfectly accessible and teachable. In the town of my former residence in New-England, there were 300 free blacks. No more than 8 or 10 of those were professors of religion, and not more than twice that number could generally be induced to attend church. They could not be induced to send their children to the district schools, which were always open to them, nor could they generally be hired to work. They were thievish, wretched and troublesome. I have no hesitation in saying, and I say it deliberately, it would be a great blessing to them to exchange conditions with the slaves of the village in which I now live. Their



intellectual and moral characters, and real means of improvement, would be promoted by the exchange.

“There are doubtless some masters who treat their slaves cruelly in this State, but they are exceptions to the general fact. Public opinion is in a wholesome state, and the man who does not treat his slaves kindly, is disgraced.

“Great and increasing efforts are made to instruct the slaves in religion, and elevate their characters. Missionaries are employed solely for their benefit. It is very common for ministers to preach in the forenoon to the whites, and in the afternoon of each Sabbath to the blacks. The slaves of my acquaintance are generally contented and happy. The master is reprobated who will divide families. Many thousands of slaves of this State give evidence of piety. In many churches they form the majority. Thousands of them give daily thanks to God, that they or their fathers were brought to this land of Slavery.

“And now, perhaps, I ought to add, that I am not a slaveholder, and do not intend to continue in a slave country; but wherever I may be, I intend to speak the TRUTH.

“The next document related particularly to *Virginia*,—the largest and most powerful of the slave states; but had also a general reference to the whole south, and to the whole question at issue. The sentiments it contained were entitled to extraordinary consideration, on account of the source of them. Mr. Van Renselaer was the son of one of the most wealthy and distinguished citizens of the great free state of New York. He had gone to Virginia to preach to the slaves. He had everywhere succeeded; was everywhere beloved by the slaves, and honoured by their masters. He had access to perhaps forty different plantations,—on which he from time to time preached,—and which might have been doubled, had his strength been equal to the task. In the midst of his usefulness—the storm of abolition arose. Mr. Thompson, like some baleful star, landed on our shores; organized a reckless agitation, made many at the north frantic with folly—and as many at the south furious with passion. Mr. Van Renselaer, like many others, saw a storm raging which they had no power to control; and like them withdrew from his benevolent labours. The following brief statements made by him at a great meeting of the Colonization Society of New York, exhibit his own view of the conduct and duty of the parties.

" *The Rev. Cortlandt Van Renselaer*, formerly of Albany, but who has lately resided in Virginia, addressed the meeting, and after alluding to the difference of opinion which prevailed among the friends of Colonization, touching the present condition and treatment of the coloured population in this country, proceeded to offer reasons why the people of the North should approach their brethren in the South, who held the control of the coloured population, with deference, and in a spirit of kindness and conciliation.

"These reasons were briefly as follows: 1. Because the people of the South had not consented to the original introduction of slaves into the country, but had solemnly, earnestly, and repeatedly remonstrated against it. 2. Because, having been born in the presence of slavery, and accustomed to it from their infancy, they could not be expected to view it in the same light as we view it at the North. 3. Slavery being there established by law, it was not in the power of individuals to act in regard to it as their personal feelings might dictate. The evil had not been eradicated from the state of New York all at once: it had been a gradual process, commencing with the law of 1799, and not consummated until 1827. Ought we to denounce our Southern neighbours if they refused to do the work at a blow? 4. The constitution of the United States, tolerated slavery, in its articles apportioning representation with reference to the slave population, and requiring the surrender of runaway slaves. 5. Slavery had been much mitigated of late years, and the condition of the slave population much ameliorated. Its former rigour was almost unknown, at least in Virginia, and it was lessening continually. It was not consistent with truth to represent the slaves as groaning day and night under the lash of tyrannical task-masters. And as to being kept in perfect ignorance, Mr. *V.* had seldom seen a plantation where some of the slaves could not read, and where they were not encouraged to learn. In South Carolina, where it was said the gospel was systematically denied to the slave, there were twenty thousand of them church-members in the Methodist denomination alone. He knew a small church where out of 70 communicants, 50 were in slavery. 6. There were very great difficulties connected with the work of Abolition. The relations of slavery had ramified them-

selves through all the relations of society. The slaves were comparatively very ignorant; their character degraded; and they were unqualified for immediate freedom. A blunder in such a concern as universal Abolition, would be no light matter. Mr. V. here referred to the result of experience and personal observation on the mind of the well known *Mr. Parker*, late a minister of this city, but now of New Orleans. He had left this city for the South with the feelings of an immediate Abolitionist; but he had returned with his views wholly changed. After seeing slavery and slave-holders, and that at the far South, he now declared the idea of immediate and universal Abolition to be a gross absurdity. To liberate the two and a half millions of slaves in the midst of us, would be just as wise and as humane, as it would be for the father of a numerous family of young children to take them to the front door, and there bidding them good bye, tell them they were free, and send them out into the world to provide for and govern themselves. 7. Foreign interference was, of necessity, a delicate thing, and ought ever to be attempted with the utmost caution. 8. There was a large amount of unfeigned Christian anxiety at the South to obey God and to do good to man. There were many tears and prayers continually poured out over the condition of their coloured people, and the most earnest desire to mitigate their sorrows. Were such persons to be approached with vituperation and anathemas? 9. There was no reason why all our sympathies should be confined to the coloured race and utterly withheld from our white Southern brethren. The apostle Paul exhibited no such spirit. 10. As regard to the interest of the slaves themselves dictated a cautious and prudent and forbearing course. It called for conciliation: for the fate of the slaves depended on the will of their masters, nor could the North prevent it. *The late laws against teaching slaves to read had not been passed until the Southern people found inflammatory publications circulating among the coloured people.* 11. The spirit of the gospel forbade all violence, abuse and threatening. The apostles had wished to call fire from heaven on those they considered as Christ's enemies; but the Saviour instead of approving this fiery zeal, had rebuked it. 12. These Southern people, who were represented as so grossly violating all Christian duty, had been

the subjects of gracious blessings from God in the outpourings of his Spirit. 13. When God convinced men of error, he did it in the spirit of mercy; we ought to endeavour to do the same thing in the same spirit."

The last testimony that I shall adduce on this subject is from "The Plea for Africa" [p. 160, 164] in which the writer says,

"There is certainly a pleasing and commendable spirit exhibited, after all the precautionary provisions of legislative acts, by the christian community at the South, in respect to the religious instruction of their slaves. I have before me a letter from an eminent clergyman of Virginia, a part of which I will read, since you may from such sources be better able to apprehend the true feeling of Christians at the South, and the actual condition of the slaves:

" 'To give you an idea of the feeling of the Christian community toward that unfortunate class of people which we have among us, I would refer you to the articles which appeared in the Religious Telegraph during the last year, signed, 'Zinzendorf,' and which terminated in passing a resolution in the synod of Virginia, recommending every church in the State, to set apart one of its best qualified members, whose duty it shall be to give religious instruction to the coloured people. And I am happy to state, that many enter upon this self-denying, though pleasing duty.

" 'We hope that the public mind is fast preparing for a general emancipation, and that the Christian community will not be remiss in instructing and preparing the coloured people for the colony. The redeeming spirit is amongst us, I hope, and will not rest till every slave shall be restored to the land of their fathers, and this State placed upon a footing with the other happy States of our Union, who know not the curses of slavery.'

"I have also before me a letter from Georgia, written by a distinguished gentleman to his friend, on the same subject, which reads as follows:

" 'With regard to your inquiries about the religious instruction of the Negroes of the South, I would state, that we have



much reason to be grateful for what is doing, and for what in prospect may be done. My knowledge on this subject is confined to Georgia and South Carolina; I visited Bryan county, Georgia, a few weeks since, for the exclusive purpose of seeing what was doing there for the Negroes. On one plantation I found the slaves far more improved, both as regards their temporal comforts, and their religious instruction, than I had expected to see. The number of Negroes on this plantation is, I believe, about two hundred. They live in framed houses, raised above the ground—spacious, and in every way comfortable, and calculated to promote health. The Negroes were uniformly clad in a very decent and comfortable way. There is a chapel on the place where the master meets the adults every night at the ringing of the bell. Reading a portion of Scripture, and explaining it, singing, and prayer, constitute the regular exercises of every night in the week. On the Sabbath they have different and more protracted exercises.

“A day school is taught by two young ladies—embracing all the children under twelve or fifteen years of age. The instruction in this and other schools in the county, is *oral*, of course; but it was gratifying to see how great an amount of knowledge the children had acquired in a few months. A Presbyterian minister of Philadelphia was with me, and he said, in unqualified terms, that he visited no infant schools at the North better conducted—Schools on the same plan are now established on the several other plantations in the same county. And I think I may say there is a very general interest getting up on this subject. A large portion of the wealthy planters either have already, or contemplate building churches on their premises, and employing chaplains to preach to their slaves. Several I could mention who, though they are not pious themselves, have done this already, from what they have seen of the beneficial influence of religious instruction on the slaves of other plantations. Persons at a distance may be surprised at this fact, but it is so in a number of cases that I could name, if it were necessary. Ministers of all denominations begin to awake to their duty and responsibility on this subject. Many of them are now devoting themselves *wholly* to this portion of our community; and it is to be hoped that every christian master will soon be brought to an enlightened sense of



duty. And *if we are allowed to prosecute this work without indiscreet interference on the part of our Northern brethren*, I feel assured that we shall see the Negroes *far more improved* in a short time than they are at present.

“Of the religious condition of the slaves *in South Carolina*, a clergyman in that State writes :

“I am able from authentic information to say, that of the *five hundred and eighty thousand*, which compose the entire population of this State, about *sixty-seven thousand* are members in the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian churches. *Of these communicants more than forty thousand are slaves.* The whole slave population is 315,000. It is easily seen, therefore, that of the white population about *one-seventh* are church members. It is proper these facts should come into the estimate of the religious condition and prospects of our slaves. In New-England there are *twenty thousand*, and in the free states *a hundred and twenty-thousand* blacks. I should be glad to see a comparison of *their* religious condition with that of our slaves in this one item. Do you believe that *one-twentieth* of them are communicants? And do you believe that in New-England, *as here*, there is a *larger proportion* of black than white communicants? And what is doing *there* to improve the moral condition of the blacks?”

“I might multiply proofs of a disposition prevailing extensively at the South in all the States to give to the slaves religious instruction, and all practicable religious privileges. I think the general feeling on this subject is greatly misapprehended in the non-slave-holding States. The evils of slavery are great, but they ought not to be magnified either by representing the slaves as deprived of all religious privileges, or their masters as destitute of christian benevolence and the feelings of humanity.”

## CHAPTER VI.

COLONIZATION PRINCIPLES VINDICATED—CALUMNIES REFUTED—THE GOOD COLONIZATION HAS ALREADY DONE—IS DOING—AND THE INCALCULABLE GOOD IT WILL DO, IF DULY PATRONISED.

*The Colonization Society* was formed in Washington, December 21st, 1816; and not in Virginia, as Abolitionists falsely assert. Amongst its most prominent promoters and founders, were, FINLAY—CALDWELL—and MILLS; than whom none were more excellent and pious: they were not slave-holders, as Abolitionists falsely assert.

Although the simple object of this Society is the colonization of the *free people of colour*, who *voluntarily* desire to go abroad, yet the members of it are decidedly opposed to slavery. And although *as a body* they do not attempt to interfere with the rights of the slave-holder, yet *as individuals* they have, and do exercise their utmost powers to diminish the evils of slavery—to provide, for the liberated person of colour, and to induce the slave-holder to emancipate his slaves; and all this consistent with the *legal* interest of the owner, and consistent with the laws of God. Nothing could more satisfactorily prove the truth of these statements than the two following facts, 1st, that the actual PRO-SLAVERY party denounce the Colonization Society; and 2dly, that vast numbers of slaves have been emancipated through the influence of this Society. Dr. Reese says in his work before quoted, p. 41,

“The society does not merely “*promise*” to promote Abolition, but exerts a mighty and *successful moral influence in actually abolishing slavery. And here I will not refer to the truth, which he who runs may read, that in Kentucky, Delaware, Maryland,*

and even *Virginia* itself, it is now openly avowed that '*colonization doctrines have sealed the death warrant of slavery!*' Hence the pro-slavery party have declared that '*colonization and emancipation are synonymous terms, and that the approach of the former must be resisted!*' At a meeting of the same party in *Charleston*, the following toast was given, 'May the infernal regions soon be *colonized* with the officers of the Colonization Society!' And while labouring with your misguided associates in the North, to hold up the Colonization Society, as hypocritical in its professions to exert a *moral influence* towards the voluntary and utter abolition of slavery, you are leagued with 'all the advocates of the negro's perpetual bondage, who are the bitter uncompromising enemies of the society.' The Rev. J. M. Danforth states on his own personal knowledge, that in South Carolina, 'the society, and every thing connected with it, are held in *extreme abhorrence* by our leading men, our politicians and wealthy planters. It is so *unpopular* an institution, that very few name it publicly,—it is regarded here as a *north-ern scheme* to wrest from us our *slaves*.' In your anti-colonization efforts then, you are associated in action with the very men, whose character as slave-holders is so odious, that you deprecate their connexion with the colonization cause, as an unpardonable sin. Let me conjure you, sir, no longer to be 'jostled by the trafficker in human flesh,' in your crusade against the society or its benevolent objects, but abandon the 'bad eminence' to which your 'want of information' has unhappily raised you."

"The following manumissions are the legitimate result of the '*moral influence*' of the Colonization Society.

"\*It would be endless to enumerate the cases of this kind that have occurred. Some of them must be recorded, that the acts and the names of the parties, where known, may have the applause to which they are entitled, and, what is of more consequence, that they may serve as stimuli to others, to follow the noble example.

"A lady, near *Charleston*, Va. liberated all her slaves, *ten* in number, to be sent to *Liberia*; and moreover purchased *two*,

---

\* Mathew Carey, Esq.

whose families were among her slaves. For the one she gave \$450, and for the other \$350.

“The late William Fitzhugh bequeathed their freedom to *all his slaves*, after a certain fixed period, and ordered that their expenses should be paid to whatsoever place they should think proper to go. And, ‘as an encouragement to them to emigrate to the American colony on the coast of Africa, where,’ adds *the will*, ‘*I believe their happiness will be more permanently secured, I desire not only that the expenses of their emigration be paid, but that the sum of fifty dollars be paid to each one so emigrating, on his or her arrival in Africa.*’

“David Shriver, of Frederick co. Maryland, ordered by his will, that all his slaves, *thirty* in number, should be emancipated, and that proper provision should be made for the comfortable support of the infirm and aged, and for the instruction of the young in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and in some art or trade, by which they might acquire the means of support.

“Col. Smith, an old revolutionary officer, of Sussex county, Va. ordered in his will, that all his slaves, *seventy or eighty* in number, should be emancipated; and bequeathed above \$5000 to defray the expense of transporting them to Liberia.

“Patsey Morris, of Louisa co., Va. directed by will, that all her slaves, *sixteen* in number, should be emancipated, and left \$500 to fit them out, and defray the expense of their passage.

“The schooner *Randolph*, which sailed from Georgetown, South Carolina, had on board *twenty-six slaves*, liberated by a benevolent individual near Cheraw.

“Of 105 emigrants, who sailed in the brig *Doris*, from Baltimore and Norfolk, *sixty-two* were emancipated on condition of being conveyed to Liberia.

“Sampson David, late a member of the legislature of Tennessee, provided by will, that all his slaves, *twenty-two* in number, who are mostly young, should be liberated in 1840, or sooner, at his wife’s decease, if she died before that period.

“Herbert B. Elder, of Petersburg, Va. bequeathed their freedom to all his slaves, *twenty* in number, with directions that they should be conveyed to Liberia, by the first opportunity.

“A gentleman in Georgia, has recently left *forty-nine* slaves free, on condition of their removal to Liberia.

“ Mrs. Elizabeth Morris, of Bourbon co., Va. provided by will for the emancipation of her slaves, about *forty* in number.

“ David Patterson, of Orange co., North Carolina, freed *eleven* slaves, to be sent to Liberia.

“ Rev. Fletcher Andrew gave freedom to *twenty*, who constituted most of his property, for the same purpose.

“ Nathaniel Crenshaw, near Richmond, liberated *sixty* slaves, with a view to have them sent to Liberia.

“ Rev. Robert Cox, Suffolk co., Va. provided by his will for the emancipation of all his slaves, upwards of *thirty*, and left several hundred dollars to pay their passage to Liberia.

“ Joseph Leonard Smith, of Frederick co., Md. liberated *twelve* slaves, who sailed from Baltimore for Liberia.

“ Of 107 coloured persons who sailed in the *Carolinian*, from Norfolk for Liberia, *forty-five* were emancipated on condition of being sent there.

“ In the brig *Criterion*, which sailed from Norfolk for Liberia, on the 2d August, 1831, there were *forty-six* persons who had been liberated, *on condition of proceeding to Liberia*; 18 by Mrs. Greenfield, near Natchez; 8 by Mr. Williams, of Elizabeth city, N. C.; 7 by Gen. Jacocks, of Perquimans, Ohio; 4 by Thomas Davis, Montgomery co. Miss.; 2 by two other individuals; and 5 by some of the Quakers in North Carolina. Of those liberated slaves, 2 only were above 40 years of age, 22 were under 35, and 22 under 20.

“ A gentleman in N. C., last year, gave freedom to all his slaves, 14 in number, and provided 20 dollars each, to pay their passage to Liberia.

“ Mrs. J. of Mercer co., Kentucky, and her two sons, one a clergyman, and the other a physician, lately offered the Colonization Society, *sixty* slaves, to be conveyed to Liberia.

“ Henry Robertson, of Hampton, Va., bequeathed their freedom to *seven* slaves, and fifty dollars to each, to aid in their removal to Liberia.

“ William Fletcher, of Perquimans, N. C., ordered by will, that his slaves, *twelve* in number, should be hired out for a year after his death, to earn wherewith to pay for their conveyance to Liberia.

“ A gentleman in Kentucky, lately wrote to the secretary of



the society, 'I will willingly give up *twelve* or *fifteen* of my coloured people at this time; and so on *gradually*, till the whole, about *sixty*, are given up, if means for their passage can be afforded.'

"On board the *Harriet*, from Norfolk, of one hundred and sixty emigrants, between *forty* and *fifty* had been slaves, emancipated on condition of being sent to Africa.

"In addition to these instances, several others might be added, particularly that of Richard Bibb, Esq., of Kentucky, who proposes to send *sixty* slaves to Liberia—two gentlemen in Missouri, who desire to send *eleven* slaves—a lady in Kentucky offers *forty*—the Rev. John C. Burress, of Alabama, intends preparing *all his slaves* for Colonization—the Rev. William L. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, manumitted 11 slaves, who sailed a few weeks ago from New-Orleans.

"In this work of benevolence, the Society of Friends, as in so many other cases, have nobly distinguished themselves, and assumed a prominent attitude. They have, in North Carolina, liberated no less than 652 *slaves*, whom they had under their care, besides, as says my authority, an unknown number of children, husbands and wives, connected with them by consanguinity, and of whom, part went to Canada, part to Liberia, part to Hayti, and a portion to Ohio. In the performance of these acts of benevolence, they expended \$12,759. They had remaining under their care, in December, 1830, 402 slaves, for whom similar arrangements were to be made.

"It holds out every encouragement to the Colonization Society, that the applications for the transportation of free negroes, and slaves proposed to be emancipated on condition of removal to Liberia, *far exceed its means*. There are, in North Carolina *and the adjacent states*, from *three to four thousand* of both descriptions, ready to embark, were the society in a situation to send them away.

"R. S. Finlay, Esq., at a late anniversary says,—

"I know that much pains have been taken to *calumniate* our brethren of the south, by representing them to be the advocates of perpetual despotism. From an *extensive and familiar acquaintance* with their views and sentiments, formed upon actual

observation, I know this not to be the fact. I have publicly discussed this subject *everywhere in the southern states*, from the eastern shore of *Maryland to the Gulf of Mexico*, in the presence of hundreds of slaves at a time, and with the general approbation of the audience to which my addresses were delivered,—and have uniformly represented it as affording the best and only safe means of *gradually and entirely abolishing slavery*. Indeed, so well is the moral influence of the operations of this society understood in the extreme south, that *all the advocates of perpetual slavery are bitterly opposed to it, and none are its advocates, but the friends of gradual, peaceful, and ultimate entire emancipation!*” 16th Report.

“In a letter, dated Nov. 4, 1831, Mr. Clarkson says,

“For myself, I freely confess, that of all the things which have occurred in our favour since the year 1787, when the abolition of the slave trade was first seriously proposed, that which is now going on in the United States, under the auspices of the American Colonization Society, is most important. It surpasses anything which has yet occurred. *No sooner had the colony been founded at Cape Montserado, than there appeared a disposition among the owners of slaves in the United States to give them freedom voluntarily, without one farthing of compensation, and to allow them to be sent to the land of their ancestors.* This is to me truly astonishing! a total change of heart in the planters, so that many thousands of slaves may be redeemed without any cost of their redemption! Can this almost universal feeling have taken place without the intervention of the Spirit of God!”

“*Within one year it is said that more than 2000 slaves have been offered the Colonization Society from five different States, with the desire expressed on the part of both master and slave, for a passage to Liberia. As Colonization gains ground, the freedom of untold thousands, it is to be hoped, will be secured, and Africa gladdened yet more and more with the light of civilization and christianity.*”

Abolitionists assert, with a degree of confidence that not unfrequently makes an unreflecting audience receive that for unquestionable truth, which has not a shadow

of truth in it, that the Colonization Society has done nothing as yet in the cause of the afflicted man of colour ! However satisfactorily the preceding instances expose the fallacy of this accusation ; yet that which this Society has done, and is doing, is not confined to these cases ; but extends to still further, and more important operations, which may be divided into two distinct heads. First, the happiness and comfort bestowed on those who have gone to Liberia ; and secondly, the considerable check already given to the African slave-trade, by its *total suppression along the whole coast of Liberia*.

I shall prove the first of these statements by documents drawn up and signed by the coloured inhabitants of Liberia, who themselves had once been slaves, which is, it is presumed, the very best possible evidence that could be adduced.

At a PUBLIC MEETING, held pursuant to notice, in MONROVIA (*Liberia*) on Wednesday, Sept. 29th, 1836, J. C. Barbour, Esq., in the chair, the following resolutions were proposed and carried unanimously—

1. “ On motion of the Rev. J. Revey,

“ *Resolved*, That this meeting entertain the warmest gratitude for what the Colonization Society have done for the people of colour, and for us particularly, and that we regard the scheme as entitled to the highest confidence of every man of colour.

2. “ On motion of S. Benedict, Esq.,

“ *Resolved*, That we return our grateful acknowledgments to \* \* \* \*, \* \* \* \*, Esqrs., and other early and devoted friends of colonization ; names for which we shall ever cherish the highest esteem ; that we hear with regret, *from misrepresentation or want of accurate information*, they have abandoned the noble scheme ; and that we hope the day is not far distant in which they will again reunite their energies to advance the high and benevolent object.

3. “ On motion of Mr. H. Teage,

“ *Resolved*, That this meeting regard the colonizing institution

as one of the highest, holiest, and most benevolent enterprises of the present day; that as a plan for the amelioration of the coloured race it takes the precedence of all that have been presented to the attention of the modern world; that in its operations it is peaceful and safe; in its tendencies, beneficial and advantageous; that it is entitled to the highest veneration and unbounded confidence of every man of colour; that what it has already accomplished demands our devout thanks and gratitude to those noble and disinterested philanthropists that compose it, as being, under God, the greatest earthly benefactors of a despised and depressed portion of the human family.

“The hour being late, on motion of Rev. B. R. Wilson,

“*Resolved*, That the meeting adjourn until to-morrow, 10 o'clock, A. M., to the First Baptist Meeting-house.

“*Thursday, 10th.*—Met according to adjournment.

4. “On motion of James Brown, Esq.—*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to those ladies of the United States, particularly to those of New-York, Philadelphia, and Richmond, for their disinterested efforts to educate the children of this colony; and that they be assured that, in no department of the colony, do the effects of colonization shine more conspicuously than in the schools supported by their benevolence.

5. “On motion of Doctor J. W. Prout,—*Resolved*, That this meeting entertain grateful remembrance of General Robert G. Harper of Baltimore, an early and devoted friend of colonization; also of the name of the late Daniel Murray, Esq. of Baltimore, and that we regard the Colonization Society and its friends as powerfully efficient in elevating the man of colour.

“Whereas it has been widely and maliciously circulated, in the United States of America, that the inhabitants of this colony are unhappy in their situation, and anxious to return:

6. “On motion of Rev. B. R. Wilson,—*Resolved*, That the report is false and malicious, and originated only in a design to injure the colony, by calling off the support and sympathy of its friends: that, so far from a desire to return, we would regard such an event as the greatest calamity that could befall us.

7. “On motion of Rev. G. R. McGill,—*Resolved*, That the name of Rev. R. R. Gurley never be forgotten.



8. "On motion of S. Benedict, Esq.,—*Resolved*, That we entertain lively feelings of gratitude towards H. R. Sheldon, Esq. for his munificent donation towards the erection of a high school in this colony.

9. "On motion of Mr. Uriah Tyner,—*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting are due to the members of the Colonization Society, for their unwearied zeal to promote the interest of this community.

10. "On motion of Mr. Lewis Ciples,—*Resolved*, That this meeting entertain the highest respect for the memory of the late Thomas S. Grimkey, of South Carolina, for his persevering efforts in behalf of the Colonization Society.

11. "On motion of Rev. Amos Herring,—*Resolved*, That this meeting entertain the deepest gratitude for the members of the Colonization Society, for the organization and continuation of an enterprise, so noble and praiseworthy as that of restoring to the blessings of liberty, hundreds and thousands of the sore oppressed and long neglected sons of Africa; that we believe it the only institution that can, under existing circumstances, succeed in elevating the coloured population; and that advancement in agriculture, mechanism, and science, will enable us speedily to aspire to a rank with other nations of the earth.

12. "On motion of Mr. H. B. Matthews,—*Success to the wheels of colonization; may they roll over every opposer, and roll on, until all the oppressed sons of Africa shall be rolled home!*

13. "On motion of Mr. David Moore,—*Resolved*, That we recollect, with peculiar satisfaction, the active part which the benevolent, in the state of Mississippi, have taken in the welfare of this colony.

14. "On motion of Major L. R. Johnson,—*Resolved*, That this meeting cherish the most grateful remembrance of the name of the late Rev. R. Finley, of New Jersey, the founder and indefatigable patron of this colony.

15. "On motion of J. J. Roberts, Esq.,—*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to the friends of this colony in England.

"On motion of Mr. Dixon B. Brown,—*Resolved*, That the resolutions of this meeting be published in the Liberia Herald."



The second statement which I have made respecting what the Colonization Society has done towards checking the *slave-trade*, cannot better be substantiated than by the following paragraph taken from the Colonization Herald of Sept. 5th, 1835.

“The success of the Colonization Society, may indeed be said to be little short of miraculous—for in the brief space of thirteen years, *with funds whose aggregate amount scarcely equals the individual outlay of Sir Walter Raleigh in Virginia*, they have banished the slaver from nearly 200 miles of coast, and rescued hundreds of his hapless victims—they have settled nearly 4000 emigrants (one half of them emancipated for the purpose,)—they have established schools, churches, temperance societies, and a newspaper :—agriculture, the mechanic arts, and a legitimate commerce, employing nearly twenty sail of coasting vessels, have sprung up, while the activity of their foreign commerce is attested by our own marine lists.

“That the despised Colonizationists have effected all this, is beyond the reach of cavil—it is now a part of the history of our enterprising country. And while our opponents have been gravely debating the possibility of establishing *one* colony, a little constellation has risen—star by star—and shed its light along the dreary coast, giving promise of new ‘United States’ in due season. May not these benevolent founders of Liberia be well satisfied with their experiment? Need I blush to acknowledge that these results have dispelled all my doubts? And may not the statesman safely assume that if a feeble society, assailed from its very formation with ridicule and reproach, has been able to found and sustain a young state, the patriotism, the philanthropy, and the piety of this great nation can accomplish the noble work of justice to them, and mercy to both? Nor is it among the least cheering of the results achieved by this noiseless and unpretending system of *practical benevolence* to the black man, that it has won its way to the love, and confidence, and gratitude of benevolent proprietors—so that the society has, from its very commencement, been distressed by offers of emancipation—*distressed*, because its funds have not enabled it to re-

lieve a tithe of the cases presented. There are at this moment, between one and two thousand applicants for the privilege of Colonization, and thousands more are in a state of training for the same purpose. Each year's developement of the ample resources of the colonies for securing the welfare of the colonists, and of their importance to the commerce and manufactures of this country, will increase the tide of emigration, until, with due aid from the national treasury, the stream shall exceed the annual increase, and then a rapid decrease in the existing total of coloured population will ensue. This I know will be denied—but I appeal to facts as the best data for my conclusions. Let us then remember that by official returns, the emigration from the United Kingdom was 76,000 last year. And have not our poor blacks quite as many reasons for seeking an asylum in that growing realm—so emphatically their own—from the increasing severity of Southern laws, and the horrors of Northern mobs? Will not this be the more extensively felt, as these African States open up new channels to profitable industry, until the emigration shall reach 56,000 per annum—which was the average yearly increase of the whole coloured population during the ten years from 1820 to 1830? And when we recollect that they would, under our system, be wafted thither free of expense to themselves, there is every reason to believe their numbers would soon equal the British emigration, which is in most cases at the proper cost of the parties themselves. If only that point was reached, an access of 20,000 per annum would accrue beyond the present natural increase, and thus create an actual diminution in our coloured population—augmented too, by the circumstance that the emigrants would generally be of the young, the active, and the procreating class—while the relative disproportion of the races would be rapidly felt through the great increase of the whites.

“I am well aware that it has been most gratuitously and absurdly asserted, ‘that our whole marine is insufficient to convey to Africa this annual increase!’” And yet 42,000 tons of shipping, only making two trips each year, and allowing each emigrant six times the space allowed on board the slavers—or one ton and a half each—would accommodate the whole! What then shall we say to those who assert that the annual wealth of

this great nation, with a surplus of ten millions annually, is unable to carry *to* Africa, *one-third* as many of the offspring of oppression, as a band of pirates and outlaws each year drag away in chains *from* her shores! A late writer in Blackwood's Magazine, asserts that no less than 200,000 slaves were shipped in 1831—Walsh that 50,000 were landed at Rio Janeiro alone, in 1828. We may, then, without difficulty, colonize 100,000 annually—a number that would in thirty years transfer our whole coloured population to Africa, by an outlay of three millions of dollars yearly,—a sum which the weekly contribution of three cents by one-seventh of our people, would supply; or, if voted as a measure of justice for the many wrongs received at our hands by poor Africa and her children, would afford a safe mode of depleting our overburdened treasury."

To the above may be added the testimony of Mr. J. F. C. Finlay, who, writing from Millsburg, in the colony of Liberia, to the Rev. Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, under date of 6th December, 1834, says,—

"The colony of Liberia has done at least five times as much towards abolishing the slave-trade on this coast, as *the whole of the United States.*"

As to the objections which have been raised against the climate of Liberia, and the ill-health which the settlers first suffered, I am only astonished how any one *in America* could allow such futile arguments to influence them! It is an undeniable fact that the first inhabitants of all new countries suffer much from ill-health, and that just *in proportion to the fertility of the soil*; which is evidently attributable to the impregnation of the air and water with the gases arising from the quantity of decomposing vegetable matter with which the ground is covered, and which renders the land, after due cultivation, most productive. Do Americans forget the fact in respect to the now flourishing

State of Louisiana? The colony of Iberville was begun to be settled in 1699, and in the ensuing thirteen years, 2500 colonists were landed there, out of whom only 400 whites and 20 negroes remained at the end of that time. On the Island of Orleans, where a settlement was begun in 1717, the early settlers died by hundreds; and both settlements were given up once or twice, by those who began them, and commenced anew by other hands.

It was so with Jamestown: it was so with Plymouth, although in a northern climate. They were both desolated by sickness, and the mortality was far greater than it has ever been in Liberia. Five hundred emigrants at one time landed in Jamestown, in Virginia, and in less than five months their numbers were reduced to sixty. Disaster and defeat seemed to embitter all the struggles of the Pilgrim fathers at Plymouth. More than half their number died the first winter.

The following testimonies of several highly respectable gentlemen, Physicians and others, as published in the "Plea for Africa," (p. 233,) are so satisfactory that to say one word more in refutation of the Abolition misstatements, would be an insult to an enlightened community.

1st. "Dr. Shane, of Cincinnati, went with a company of emigrants to Liberia in 1832, sailing from New-Orleans; and, among other things, writes, 'I see not in Liberia as fine and splendid mansions as in the United States; nor as extensive and richly stocked farms as the well-tilled lands of Ohio; but I see a fine and very fertile country, inviting its poor and oppressed sons to thrust in their sickles and gather up its fullness. I here see many who left the United States in straitened circumstances, living with all the comforts of life around them; enjoying a respectable and useful station in society, and wondering that their brethren in the United States, who have it in their



power, do not flee to this asylum of happiness and liberty, where they can enjoy all the unalienable rights of man. \* \* I do not think an unprejudiced person can visit here without becoming an ardent and sincere friend of colonization. I can attribute the apathy and indifference on which it is looked by many, as arising from ignorance on the subject alone, and would that every free coloured man in the United States could get a glimpse of his brethren, their situation and prospects. \* \* \* Let but the coloured man come and see for himself, and the tear of gratitude will beam in his eye, as he looks forward to the not far distant day, when Liberia shall take her stand among the nations of the world, and proclaim abroad an empire founded by benevolence, offering a home to the poor, oppressed, and weary. Nothing but a want of knowledge of Liberia, prevents thousands of honest, industrious free blacks from rushing to this heaven-blessed land, where liberty and religion, with all their blessings, are enjoyed.'

2d. "Captain Kennedy, who visited Liberia in 1831, says, 'with impressions unfavourable to the scheme of the Colonization Society, I commenced my inquiries.' The colonists 'considered that they had started into a *new existence*. \* \* They felt themselves *proud in their attitude*.' He further says, 'many of the settlers appear to be rapidly acquiring property; and I have no doubt they are doing better for themselves and for their children, in Liberia, than they could do in any other part of the world.'

3d. "Captain Nicholson of the United States' Navy, gave as favourable a report. Captain Abels says, 'My expectations were more than realized. I saw no intemperance, nor did I hear a profane word uttered by any one. I know of no place where the Sabbath seems to be more respected than in Monrovia.'

4th. "A distinguished British naval officer, who passed three years on the African coast, published a favourable notice of the colony, in the *Amulet* for 1832, in which he bears this testimony:—'The complete success of this colony is a proof that the Negroes are, by proper care and attention, as susceptible of the habits of industry, and the improvements of social life, as any other race of human beings; and that the amelioration of



the condition of the black people on the coast of Africa, by means of such colonies, is not chimerical. *Wherever the influence of the colony extends, the slave-trade has been abandoned by the natives, and the peaceable pursuits of legitimate commerce established in its place.* They not only live on terms of harmony and good will together, but the colonists are looked upon with a certain degree of respect by those of their own colour; and the force of their example is likely to have a strong effect in inducing the people about them to adopt it. A few colonies of this kind, scattered along the coast, would be of infinite value in improving the natives.' Governor Meehlin has said, 'As to the morals of the colonists, I consider them much better than those of the people of the United States; i. e. you may take an equal number of the inhabitants from any section of the Union, and you will find more drunkenness, more profane swearers and Sabbath-breakers, than in Liberia. You rarely hear an oath, and as to riots and breaches of the peace, I recollect but one instance, and that of a trifling nature, that has come under my notice since I assumed the government of the colony.' Captain Sherman has said, 'There is a greater proportion of moral and religious characters in Monrovia than in the city of Philadelphia.' "

Lastly, Dr. George T. Todsén, Colonial Physician, writes thus,—

"Being requested to express my opinion of the climate of Liberia, and particularly as to its influence and action upon such persons of colour as are born, and have lived for years in the United States, previous to their arrival in the colony; I have no hesitation in saying that, after a residence in the colony of nearly five years, as Colonial Physician, I am convinced there is nothing there that, with ordinary prudence, the necessities and comforts of life, and care and medical attendance, can endanger the lives of emigrants of colour, in a greater degree, than would be done by their removal to almost any other foreign country, even the most healthy. I shall here state a few facts which the records of the colony will amply confirm. In 1830, in November, I embarked on board of the 'Volador,' with eighty-five emigrants, children included. We arrived at Cape Mesurado in

January, 1831, and on the 1st of February, 1833, two years after our arrival, I went round, inspected the company, and found, to my great satisfaction, that but three children and two adults had died. During that interval, eleven children were born among that expedition; so that the whole company had increased to the number of ninety-one, six more than left the United States. The same success attended the succeeding expeditions, until June, when I was seized with a violent attack of fever, from which although I partially recovered, it returned at short intervals, and reduced me to such a state of debility, that I became unable to pursue and discharge my arduous and exhausting duties. I dwell upon this circumstance, because it was one of those important events which produced less favourable results in the subsequent bills of mortality in Liberia, and created an apprehension in the minds of the friends to Colonization, that there is something in the climate of that country inevitably destructive to emigrants of colour from the United States. This impression has had a most injurious effect on the advancement and prosperity of the colony. But I feel most happy in my conviction that it is without the least foundation.

“I have read in ‘a Narrative of an Expedition into the interior of Africa, by Macgregor Laird and R. A. K. Oldfield, surviving officers of the English expedition, to the Niger’—a pretended description of the motives for the establishment, &c. &c., of the colony of Liberia, of its condition as ascertained by them during a three days’ visit to its shore.

“I will briefly state that I was at Caldwell, in the colony, when this expedition touched there. No sooner had the iron steamboat *Quorra*, dropt her anchor in the river St. Paul, than Lieut. Allen, R. N., Mr. Lander, and Dr. Briggs, paid me a visit, and invited me on board. Although very ill and unable to walk, I accepted their invitation. They were exceedingly kind and attentive to me; were with me during the greater part of the time they remained in the colony, (three days,) and we conversed freely as fellow-labourers in the African cause. They did not conceal the unhappy dissensions that existed among the members of their expedition. There were two parties; Lieut. Allen, R. N., Mr. Lander, and Dr. Briggs, belonging to the one; and Mr. Laird and Capt. Harris to the other. I had little or no

intercourse with the latter individuals, who were represented to me, particularly Laird, as having embarked in the expedition solely from mercenary motives. As regards his charges and statements about the real motives of the Colonization Society, they are too absurd to notice. His stuff about the sterility of the soil of Liberia, thousands can answer; besides, I am pretty certain he never put his foot on terra firma while there. Every friend to science and humanity must lament the premature death of by far the most able and respectable members of that expedition; and no one can be surprised that a man, actuated solely by the love of gain, should seize on calumny and detraction, on any subject originating or connected with America or Americans, and to be presented to English readers, as a never-failing means of success. GEO. T. TODSEN."

I shall conclude these testimonies with the following extract from the Colonization Herald of March 1838, which was written by a gentleman of most unquestionable veracity, and who resided for some time in Liberia.

"It is now SIXTEEN YEARS since the first settlement in Liberia was established, on Cape Mesurado. In 1821 the American Colonization Society purchased a part of the Island of Sherboro, distant about 120 miles from Cape Mesurado, and during that year and the following a vigorous, but ineffectual effort was made to plant a colony there. The treachery of the natives, the insalubrity of the climate, and a series of melancholy disasters finally compelled its abandonment, and the society directed its attention to the more eligible scite mentioned above; where, in 1822, after a protracted negotiation, a purchase was made, and a feeble band of emigrants took possession.

"As my object at present is not to trace the progress of the colony through its various fortunes, I shall reserve for another article an account of the early trials and difficulties, as well as the manly daring and heroic achievements with which its history is fraught, and come at once to the bright picture of its present condition and prospects. Liberia (stretching along 300

miles of the coast, and extending from 10 to 40 miles inland) now numbers FOUR separate colonies, viz :

“MONROVIA, established by the American Colonization Society, including the towns of *Monrovia*, *New Georgia*, *Caldwell*, *Millsburgh*, and *Marshall*—

“BASSA COVE, established by the United Colonization Societies of New York and Pennsylvania. This colony includes *Bassa Cove* and *Edina*. The latter village was founded by the American Colonization Society, and lately ceded to the United Societies—

“GREENVILLE, established by the Mississippi and Louisiana Colonization Societies, at *Sinou*—

“MARYLAND, established by the Maryland Colonization Society at *Cape Palmos*.

“In the NINE VILLAGES enumerated above, there is a population of about 5000—all of course coloured persons—of which THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED are emigrants from this country, and the remainder natives of Africa, mostly youth, who have come into the colonies to learn ‘Merica fash,’ and make themselves ‘white men,’ by conforming to the habits of civilization, and becoming subject to our laws.

“The commerce of the colonies, though in its infancy, is already extensive. From \$80,000 to 125,000 is exported annually, in camwood, ivory, palm oil, and hides; and an equal or greater amount of the manufactures and productions of Europe and America are brought into the colonies in return. Monrovia, which is the largest town and principal seaport, carries on a considerable coasting trade, by means of small vessels built and owned by her own citizens. Not less than 12 or 15 of these, averaging from 10 to 30 tons burden, manned and navigated by the colonists, are constantly engaged in a profitable trade along seven hundred miles of the coast.

“The harbour of Monrovia is seldom clear of foreign vessels; more than SEVENTY of which, from the United States, England, France, Sweden, Portugal and Denmark, touch there annually.

“BASSA COVE and CAPE PALMAS have both good harbours, and possess great advantages for commerce. Already their waters are gladdened by the frequent presence of traders from other countries, and in a few years, when the hand of enterprise shall



have developed the rich mines of wealth which nature has so abundantly provided there, these growing towns will become the centres of an extensive and important business.

“SINOU, too, possesses an excellent harbour, and is the natural outlet of a vast tract of rich and productive country. Under the fostering hand of its enterprising founders, it must soon become an important link in the great maritime chain of Americo-African establishments. The productions of the country, which may be raised in any quantity for exportation, are *coffee, cotton, sugar, rice, indigo, palm oil*, together with the *gums, dye-woods, ivory, &c.*, which are collected from the forests.

“The state of morals in the colonies is emphatically of a high order. Sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, profanity, and quarrelling are vices almost unknown in Liberia. A temperance society formed in 1834 numbered in a few weeks after its organization 500 members; at that time more than one-fifth of the whole population.

“At BASSA COVE and CAPE PALMAS, the sale and use of ardent spirits are forbidden by law. In the other colonies the ban of public opinion so effectually prohibits dram drinking that no respectable person would dare indulge an appetite so disreputable.

“There are EIGHTEEN CHURCHES in Liberia, viz. at Monrovia 4, New Georgia 2, Caldwell 2, Millsburgh 2, Edina 2, Bassa Cove 3, Marshall 1, Cape Palmas 2. Of these, 8 are Baptist, 3 Presbyterian, and 1 Episcopalian.

“As there are FORTY CLERGYMEN in the colonies, all the churches are not only regularly supplied with preaching, but religious meetings are weekly held in many of the native villages.

“Seven hundred of the colonists, or one-fifth of the whole population, are professed Christians, in good standing with the several churches with which they are connected. As might be expected, where so large a proportion of the people is pious, the general tone of society is religious. No where is the Sabbath more strictly observed, or the places of worship better attended. Sunday schools and Bible classes are established generally in the churches, into which, in many cases, the native children are gathered with those of the colonists.

“There are ten week-day schools in all the settlements, supported generally by education and missionary societies in this



country. The teachers in most cases are coloured persons. A laudable thirst for knowledge pervades the community, and a great desire is expressed for an academic institution, toward the support of which they would contribute liberally; though as yet they are scarcely able to establish one single handed.

"In some places, as at BASSA COVE, literary societies are formed for mutual improvement, much on the plan of village lyceums in this country.

"At Bassa Cove and Monrovia there are public libraries for the use of the people. The one at the former place numbers 1200 or 1500 volumes.

"A monthly newspaper is published at Monrovia. The articles in this paper afford good testimony of the general intelligence of the people, and reflect great credit upon the talented editor, a coloured man.

"There are at present 25 or 30 white persons connected with the various missionary and education societies, or attached to the colonies as physicians, &c. The government of Liberia is essentially republican. All the officers, except the Governor, (who is appointed by the Colonization Society) being chosen by the people. Elections are held annually in every village, and are conducted with great propriety and decorum. A vice-governor, legislative councillors, a high sheriff, constables, &c., are some of the officers elected annually. The militia is well organized and efficient. The officers and men exhibit a degree of enthusiasm in the performance of their duty seldom witnessed elsewhere; and on field days their neat and orderly appearance, their thorough discipline, and the promptness and precision of their evolutions, command the admiration of every observer.

"There are a number of volunteer corps, regularly uniformed and equipped. These of course are the elite of the Liberia militia; and indeed many of them would lose nothing by a comparison with our own city guards. T. B."

#### CONCLUSION OF THIS CHAPTER.

We have before shown that although the only object of the Colonization Society is to restore the free man of colour to the land of his fathers, yet that

the accomplishment of this very object necessarily involves the removal of the actual cause of slavery itself, and of all its horrors, viz. *the African slave-trade*. In this respect alone, if it did no more, it as far exceeds in utility, the Abolition Scheme, as the light of the sun exceeds that of a taper. Moreover this one fact, and this alone, ought to secure for it the patronage of every friend of humanity ; and would no doubt long since have done so, and have procured for it ample funds from the good people of this country and of England, had its objects not been misrepresented, particularly in the latter place, where there is no one sufficiently acquainted with the merits of the case to refute and put to silence those who were, and are employed, by the Anti-Slavery Society, for the express purpose of vilifying and calumniating, before a British public, some of the greatest benefactors this country ever had. It is well known how that indefatigable and disinterested friend of the coloured man, Elliott Cresson, Esq., after he went to England, at his own expense, for the express purpose of promoting this cause in that country, was vilified, calumniated, and misrepresented by American Abolition Agents !

Let any man take a map of Africa in his hand, and ask himself the question, what Powers on earth could effectually stop a trade carried on along a coast of at least seven thousand miles, including the various bays and inlets, &c. ? Could the combined naval forces of Europe and America accomplish it, not even taking into consideration the enormous annual expense of such an enterprise ? The very idea is preposterously absurd ! We all recollect the difficulty encountered last winter in attempting to guard the Canadian frontier of only a few hundred miles !

Are fifty millions of Africans to be left exposed to the demoralising influence, and the unspeakable horrors of the *slave-trade*? And are we to talk of *humanity* and allow ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND miserable human beings to be annually dragged from their native land—from their homes—from their parents—from their friends—and be subjected to the horrors described in pages 41, 42? What means, what power, what system, except the Colonization Society, can check this climax of human barbarity? And by what means are the glorious truths of divine revelation to be disseminated amongst upwards of fifty millions of our fellow creatures except by the pure word of God, the Bible, which black man hands to black man, African hands to African—and so on, till *this* man of sin be consumed by the brightness of the Gospel, and the Ethiopian be enabled to lift up his hand to the living God?

The Colonization Society has, as already shown, done much in this work—and all that it has not done is justly attributable to the effects of the misrepresentations of the Abolition Champions, who are, in this sense, not only the slave-holders of thousands of slaves, but the PROTECTORS of the African Slave-trade!

## CHAPTER VII.

### COLONIZATION AND ABOLITIONISM

#### CONTRASTED!

##### THE COLONIZATION OPERATIONS,

###### 1.

Are directed to the removal of the cause of slavery, viz : *the African slave-trade*. See chap. vi.

###### 2.

Hence are strictly philosophic, correct, and consistent with common sense. See p. 39.

###### 3.

Are consistent with the injunctions and commands of God. See chapter vi.

###### 4.

Have *already* removed much of the cause and effects of slavery. See chapter vi.

###### 5.

Are sanctioned and patronised by most of the enlightened, the best, and most religious men in the country. See chapter v.

###### 6.

Have caused the emancipation of vast numbers, and that consistently with the laws of God. See chapters v. and vi.

##### ABOLITION OPERATIONS,

###### 1.

Are directed to the removal of *effects!* See p. 40.

###### 2.

Hence are unphilosophical, absurd, fallacious, and ineffacious! See p. 39.

###### 3.

Are in direct violation of the laws of God! See p. 33.

###### 4.

Have not affected in the slightest possible degree the cause of slavery, except by *protecting* the African slave-trade! See preceding page.

###### 5.

Are patronised and sanctioned by none, except by the innocent and unsuspecting dupes of brawling orators, and interested agents! See p. 20.

###### 6.

Have caused the freedom of not one, except in a way directly opposed to the will of Heaven! See p. 33.

7.

Have ameliorated the condition of thousands of people of colour. See preceding chapter.

8.

Keepeth not one in bondage. See preceding chapter.

9.

Exhort all slaves to obey the commands of God, and encourage none who violate them.

10.

Allay the prejudices of the slaveholder.

11.

Produce patience, and contentedness among the slaves.

12.

Act in every possible way, consistent with the laws of God and man, and with the safety of both slave and slaveholder, in removing the evils of slavery.

7.

Have increased the sufferings of thousands of slaves! See preceding chapter.\*

8.

Keepeth thousands in bondage! See chapter vi.

9.

Exhort all slaves to run off from their masters, and thus to disobey the commands of God! See p. 33.

10.

Aggravate his prejudices and drive him, in self-defence, to the adoption of greater restraints!

11.

Produce discontent and disobedience among them! See p. 33.

12.

Act in every possible way in violation of the laws of God and man, and inconsistent with the safety of either slave or slaveholder!

---

\* *Letter from W. Rawle, Esq. (formerly President of the Anti-Slavery Society) to ———, Esq.*

“ My dear Sir—

“ The conduct and proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Society have not met with my entire approbation. The members appear to me to be actuated by a blind and injudicious zeal, productive of measures, the effect of which will be to awaken alarm, create a determined opposition among the slaveholders, and delay the progress of conscientious emancipation.

“ That day—the day of general emancipation—will, I trust and believe, hereafter arrive: but I fear it will be delayed by the institution of societies so warm and so imprudent.

“ June 27, 1834.”



*The opinion of Henry Clay, Esq.—March, 1837.*

“I regret extremely the agitation of the question of immediate abolition. Without impugning the motives of those who are concerned in it—indeed with great respect for some of them, I must say in all sincerity, that I do believe it is attended with unmixed mischief. It does no good, but harm to the slave; it engenders bad feelings and prejudices between different parts of the Union, and it injures the very cause which it professes to espouse. Instead of advancing, I believe that it has thrown back to an indefinite time the cause of gradual emancipation—the only mode of getting rid of slavery that has been ever thought to be safe, prudent or wise in any of the States in which slavery now exists.

“Hoping that you will excuse the delay which has occurred in my transmission of an answer to your letter, I am gentlemen,

With great respect, your ob’t servant,

HENRY CLAY.”

## APPENDIX.

## A.

THE unexpected length to which this pamphlet has extended prevents the Author introducing here, as he had contemplated in page 11, an article on the difference of opinion among mankind in all parts and ages of the world, without divine revelation, on that which is really good and really evil. See article "MORALITY," in "*The Christian's Defensive Dictionary*," by the Author.

## B.

Extract of an Address of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq., from "THE LONDON PATRIOT," of August, 1833; and republished in "THE COLONIZATION HERALD" of this City, May 16th, 1838.

"I know that there is much declamation about the sacredness of the compact which was formed between the free and the slave states, on the adoption of the national constitution. A sacred compact, forsooth! I pronounce it the most bloody and heaven-daring arrangement ever made by man, for the continuance and protection of a system of the most atrocious villany ever exhibited on earth. Yes—I recognize the compact, but with feelings of shame and indignation; and it will be held in everlasting infamy by the friends of justice and humanity throughout the world. It was a contract framed at the sacrifice of the bodies and souls of millions of our race, for the sake of achieving a political epoch—an unblushing and monstrous coalition to do evil that good might come. Such a compact was, in the nature of things, and according to the law of God,

null and void from the beginning. No body of men ever had the right to guarantee the holding of human beings in bondage. Who or what were the framers of the American government, that they should dare to confirm and authorise such a high handed villany—such a flagrant robbery of the inalienable rights of man—such a glaring violation of all the precepts and injunctions of the Gospel—such a savage war upon the sixth part of their own population? They were men like ourselves—as fallible, as sinful, as weak as ourselves. By the infamous bargain which they made between themselves, they virtually dethroned the Most High God, and trampled beneath their feet their own solemn and heaven-attested declaration, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They had no lawful power to bind themselves, or their posterity, for one hour—for one moment—by such an unholy alliance. It was not valid then—it is not valid now. Still they persist in maintaining it—and still do their successors, the people of New England, and of the twelve free states, persist in maintaining it. A sacred compact! a sacred compact! What is wicked and ignominious?

(Signed) WM. LLOYD GARRISON,  
Agent for the New-England Anti-Slavery Society.

---

### CONCLUSION.

As it is not improbable that the partisans of Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, following the example he set them last week in Pennsylvania Hall, (page 19), will ask what right has this "*foreign adventurer*" to interfere in this question? The simple reply of the Author is, that as he will yield precedency to no man on earth, in subjection and faithfulness to the laws of that country in which it pleases the providence of God to place him, so he considers it his duty to serve it to the utmost of his power, in obedience to the command of "HIM who is higher than the highest." Rom. xiii. 1.














MAY '69



N. MANCHESTER,  
INDIANA

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 757 8

