

THE ABOLITIONIST.

VOL. I.]

AUGUST, 1833.

[NO. VIII.]

COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

We have received from a correspondent the following account of the meeting of a Colonization Society in Connecticut. We give it as another proof, if any were wanting, of the tendency of the American Colonization Society, to which this is an auxiliary, to foster and increase the disgraceful prejudices against the people of color, which already prevail to so melancholy an extent in our country.

On Thursday last, I attended the Annual Meeting of the Colonization Society. The address was from Hon. Eben. Young, member of Congress and President of the Society. He drew a contrast between the Anti-Slavery principles and Colonization principles. He then went on to show how easily the Colonization Society, if unopposed, would go on to rid the country in a few years of the curse of slavery.

Afterwards the Report was read—in which, among other things, it was stated, 'that the practicability of the removal to Africa of the entire colored population, had been demonstrated.' Its acceptance was moved. The Rev. Samuel J. May, rose and objected to its acceptance on the ground that it contained several very inaccurate statements, and commented upon them. It was however accepted. Soon after Mr. May brought forward the following resolution.

'Resolved, That the avowed objects of this Society, i. e. the establishment of a Colony in Liberia of suitable persons—and the evangelization of Africa, cannot be effected until an improved class of colored people shall have been raised up in our own country. They must be educated here, that they may be prepared for Africa. The fountains of knowledge and of grace should be open to all persons in our own country, especially to those whom we purpose to send out to enlighten the dark places of the earth, and disseminate the blessings of knowledge and of religion.'

Mr Judson, who has come out a zealous colonizationist, immediately proposed the following amendment—'provided the sentiments of the Abolitionists be considered by us dangerous to the peace of the country, and the preservation of the union.' Mr. May replied that he had no objection to Mr. Judson's bringing forward any resolutions he pleased. If Mr. Judson

meant to attack the principles of the Anti-Slavery Society, Mr. May said he was then ready for their defence; but that he could see no propriety in Mr. Judson's appending such an amendment to the resolution. After a good deal of debate Mr. May was permitted to speak to his resolution. He said he should speak as a colonizationist, though his connexion with the Society would cease with that meeting. He would not utter all the thoughts and feelings which pressed for utterance whenever he thought of the too long disregarded claims of our colored brethren to all the blessings of knowledge and religion. He would speak in behalf of the avowed objects of the Colonization Society, and in view of them he insisted that they could not be attained, unless a better class of emigrants could be prepared here by education.

As soon as Mr. May was seated Mr. Judson rose and declared, that neither he nor any one else, was opposed to the education of the colored people; but he and others were opposed to their being taught the principles of the Anti-Slavery Society, the first of which was, he said, that the Constitution of the United States was not to be at all regarded, &c. &c. He went on to say that the resolution was in effect asking the Col. Society to encourage the plan of teaching the colored people sentiments at war with the objects and purposes of the Society, and sentiments too of a treasonable character, &c.

Mr. May replied that the gentleman had gone out of his way to misrepresent the Anti-Slavery Society, and to pervert the meaning of the resolution—that he meant by education what we all mean by the word, when we apply it to white children; that he was willing to specify the branches of science if that would satisfy Mr. Judson; and that his simple object in bringing forward the resolution was to ascertain whether the Colonization Society meant to encourage the education and elevation of the colored population of these States.

One gentleman rose, and said he objected to the resolution, because it was bringing the Society into collision with a recent Act of the Legislature. Mr. May very properly replied that believing as he did the truth set forth in the resolution, as a member of that Society, he should feel called upon to expose the impropriety of that Law—and of the conduct of those men through whose influence it was

enacted: that if the laws of our Legislature were not wholesome, we were bound to oppose them, and labor to procure their repeal; and he for one was always ready to do so.

Another gentleman rose and said he should oppose the resolution, because he thought it squinted at the Canterbury School, and he did not wish the Colonization Society, to take part in the contest one way or the other.

Mr. May replied that it looked right at the Canterbury School; and said, Mr. President, this Society cannot help taking some part in the controversy that has been awakened concerning it. The leaders in the persecution against that School have publicly appealed to the Colonization Society as having acted in its behalf, and the Society is now called upon to say whether it approves or disapproves the things which have been done avowedly under its auspices.

The debate lasted more than an hour, and then the resolution was indefinitely postponed.

We beg our readers to reflect upon the facts which our correspondent has stated, in connexion with previous occurrences in Connecticut. Miss Crandall attempts to establish a school for colored girls at Canterbury. A town meeting is held, in which violent resolutions are passed in order to deter her from proceeding. At this meeting Andrew T. Judson Esq. acts a conspicuous part. The authorities of the town, perhaps feeling conscious that these proceedings were not quite creditable to them, address a vindication of their proceedings to the Colonization Society. Mr. Judson's name is appended to this manifesto. By the influence of Mr. Judson a law is soon after passed by the legislature of Connecticut making it a penal offence, to establish a school for colored children who are not inhabitants of the State. Mr. Judson is, in short, without dispute, the prime mover of all these atrocities.

Under these circumstances it seems to us that the branches of the American Colonization Society, but more especially a branch of it established in Connecticut, were loudly called upon to declare publicly and explicitly their opinion of the attempts in Connecticut to deprive people of color of the blessings of education. The Connecticut Society whose proceedings we have recorded, we readily acknowledge, has returned an explicit, if not a satisfactory answer, to the question which the Canterbury affair and the Connecticut law had presented to them. The Society refuses, in the first place, to entertain a resolution in which the necessity of educating the colored people here is maintained, and that there may

be no room for doubt or cavil in regard to the opinions of its members upon this subject, elects Mr. Judson, the great leader of the Connecticut crusade against education,—its agent and orator.

[For the Abolitionist.]

Messrs. Editors:

Having been present at an animated conversation between two intelligent gentlemen of New-Haven, on the subject of Slavery and the Anti-Slavery association, in which some interesting topics were discussed, I wrote down, from memory, the principle part of what I heard, and offer the notes of the dialogue to your notice, in the belief that the summary of argument, presented with all the simplicity of unpremeditated talk, may interest your readers, as it certainly did more than one bystander beside myself.

One of the gentlemen being a member of the Colonization Society, I have prefixed the letter C to his part of the debate, and designated by the letter A the share taken by the other, who is a member of an Anti-Slavery or Abolition Society.

The allusions to a local occurrence and the sentiments expressed by a distinguished private citizen of New Haven did not, as it seems to me—confine the interest of the matter to this place. The principles are of general and national importance.

Respectfully yours, &c.

A NEUTER.

New Haven, July 13, 1833.

IALOGUE

BETWEEN C, A COLONIZATIONIST, AND A, AN ABOLITIONIST, ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

C. I do not question the sincerity of your motives, but surely you and the rest of the *Anti-Slavery* ultras are doing much mischief by the intemperance of your zeal.

A. Is the sentiment just expressed by you an individual opinion of your own? Is it adopted on the view of any actual instance of evil? Or do you speak a general idea of our proceedings,—and is your particular judgment founded only on the fact that an impression unfavorable to our Society and its principles, is very extensively diffused in the community?

C. The impression is certainly very general, among sensible men, that you are wrong, and the universality of that opinion is with me

as strong presumptive proof of its correctness. You allow your feelings to hurry you along without the guidance of your reason; and only help to rivet the chains that you profess to be so anxious to remove; and you are exciting ill-will, prejudice, and jealousy among the Southern people.

A. I beg pardon for so boldly differing from you; but it seems to me that *those* persons may be most justly charged with yielding too much to their *feelings*, and disregarding the dictates of *reason*, who take up an opinion, as you have done, without examining its *foundation*, and merely because it is fashionable. If your judgment of us is correct, it would be *equally* so though it were peculiar to yourself. An unfounded opinion is a *prejudice*; and gains no valid authority from the *number* of persons who imbibe it. And, pray, whom do you call particularly sensible men?

C. It is hardly necessary to mention names, *ab uno disce omnes*—*one* will suffice,—the learned and experienced NOAH WEBSTER publicly avowed himself a disapprover of your doctrines, at the meeting house, when Professor Wright delivered his address. You know too that a majority of the most respected citizens of Connecticut agree with Dr. Webster in this opinion; and that elsewhere, the same class of men are generally on the same side.

A. I grant that a majority of the well informed do not yet give us their active support, and yet do not see that I am necessarily in error.

C. The opinions of such men, surely, are entitled to great weight.

A. Not as a matter of course, nor without exception. The opinion of *no* man is of any authority on a subject that he has *not* examined. You and I will not differ in respect to the character of the excellent and venerable citizen whom you have named,—but you would be as far as I am from allowing *his* opinion (for example,) or that of any other man breathing, to guide your conduct or your thoughts in a matter which he knows *nothing* about—or knows but *superficially*. If your child is ill, there are many wise and learned men whose advice you would not take as to the medical treatment of his disease. You would not allow even such men as Dr. Webster to model your opinions on religious or political subjects—nor advise you about the docking an entail or foreclosing a mortgage.

C. On subjects in their nature abstruse,

or technical, of course I should rely on the judgment of men that are by profession acquainted with the particular subject. But slavery is a matter that we *all* can understand—and *all* men are competent to judge of the probable effect of your measures.

A. All men may, with equal truth, be said to be *competent* to make shoes or cut down trees; yet those who never learn *how*, will remain ignorant; and the opinion of a learned professor of moral philosophy as to the best mode of cobbling shoes or felling timber, may be as worthless as that of a cobbler upon a question in metaphysics. You ought to seek for a surer footing on which to rest your censure of us, than merely an unthinking clamor.

C. But it is more *probable* that so many sensible men should be right than a few who differ from them. I do not know that the members of the Anti-Slavery Society have any remarkable degree of learning or skill on the subject, to entitle them to be our instructors.

A. I will suppose that you agree with me in thinking the mere fact of *numbers* ought not to govern in a question of *opinion*; and that the few *may* be right, although in a minority. Now as to the *probability*, you must remember the French proverb, which being rendered, signifies that truth and probability are *not always* the same. The whole world of sensible and practical men, (except a few,) railed against the project of making steamboats; but the few persevered, till all acknowledged they were right.

C. The absurdity and impropriety of our meddling with a matter over which we cannot have any lawful control, strikes every mind. The southern States will only be exasperated by such impertinent interference with their domestic concerns. The northern people have, manifestly *no right* to dictate to them, and ought not to *touch* the subject.

A. Well, now having got rid of the *authority* of numbers—the infallibility of a majority and the despotism of prejudice—let us use our reason as if the question were entirely open, and every man at liberty to *think* for himself. Whether he has a right to speak what he thinks is *perhaps* a necessary preliminary question.

C. No, I will not allow that there is any such question. We all have a right, both legal and moral, to speak our thoughts, but that is no reason for talking of *our neighbors' domestic concerns*. The question of emancipa-

tion is one *exclusively* belonging to the slaveholding States, and the Constitution prohibits our interference with it. Talking about it, and scolding the slaveholders can do no possible good, and must cause irritation. In fact it *has* caused irritation.

A. The right to *speaking* our thoughts is, then, granted; and the possibility of an opinion entertained by a large number of sensible men, turning out to be a mere prejudice, is also admitted. We shall come by degrees to the real merits of the question. If you had not tacitly admitted that the many, and the wise, may be blinded by prejudice, or uninformed on a particular subject, I should have reminded you of the history of the temperance reformation, which began with a very few who were called zealots—ultras—fanatics—and so forth. The same objections were urged to their 'quixotic' efforts, (as they were called) that are now arrayed against the Abolitionists. We were told that a man's diet was a matter we had no *right* to meddle with—that it was impertinent to tell a man what he ought or ought not to drink—and that our zeal, being indiscreet, would do harm. And what is the result? The zealots and ultras persevered against a cry of disapprobation and discouragement not less loud or general, and proceeding from no less respectable individuals, till the force of truth and moral suasion has prevailed. The friends of freedom and of human rights ought to persevere *in like manner*, if their cause is just; and may look forward to eventual success.

C. But intemperance was a matter of universal interest; and it would have been fatal to the cause of that reformation if those who preached temperance had not also set an example by *practising* it too. Now *we*, at the North, cannot emancipate slaves—all we can do is to claim from others a sacrifice which will cost *us* nothing—we are utterly powerless as to all practical measures. The analogy in this respect fails.

A. You take a very contracted view of the subject; and therein consists your error—and the *common* error; and I deny the authority of all opinions that are thus made up, without looking more deeply into the matter. I do not say that we, of the Anti-Slavery association, are *very* learned, or *fully* informed—but our imperfect knowledge may be so much *better* than the absolute and total *neglect* to think on the subject, so prevalent in the community,

that we are perhaps better *prepared* to form a correct judgment, and therefore more likely to be in the right than some of those who oppose us. The opposition of the Colonization Society, may stand on other foundations. I speak *now* of the disapprobation expressed by such as are not members of either association.

C. Wherein consists the difference? How do *you* take a more enlarged or more enlightened view of the subject than others?

A. In the first place, we contend for independence of thought, speech, and action; and feeling ourselves right we go on, without being deterred by a clamor or temporary irritation among well dressed, well educated, and well disposed people. On the contrary, our opponents too often condemn us merely *because* of the clamor, without exercising their own intellect to ascertain whether the clamor is well founded.

C. I grant you the merit of *boldness* and *independence*, worthy a better, that is, a more practical cause.

A. Very well. The merit is not very common. A small proportion only of mankind has intrepidity enough to think, speak and act merely with a view to *truth and justice*. Granting us, therefore, independence, sincerity, disinterestedness, and some knowledge drawn from closer attention to the subject, we are, at all events, entitled to a *respectful hearing*.

C. I do not admit that you are; because *here* your doctrines are mere *theories*, without any possible results in practice; and in the South you must be considered as merely *intermeddlers*. On what ground then do you claim an attentive hearing?

A. As men, by your admission, (and undeniably) disinterested, independent, sincere and well informed by examination and consultation, upon a subject of *deep* interest to the citizens of *Connecticut* as well as *Maryland*—the *North* as well as the South, and the treatment of which *has practical results*, well deserving the anxious care of every patriot and every Christian.

C. Those are bold positions, and I should guess, not easily sustained.

A. Not more bold than true; which can you doubt?

C. I am entirely at a loss to imagine what *practical* results can be at stake, or how the Northern States *can* act on such a subject, or why we need feel any *further* interest in it

than such as arises from our *sympathy* with our Southern neighbors.

A. You are not singular, but *plainly* in error. That the existence of slavery and the internal slave trade in this country, and the actual condition and treatment of the slaves, are a national reproach and a national crime, no man can doubt. That a concomitant of this national shame is a *feeling of contempt* and *ill-will* very generally cherished towards the colored population, and in itself *scarcely less* unchristian, and unjustifiable; if not so obvious, is nevertheless *true*. Now upon both these matters the people of the North *can* act practically, constitutionally and legally; and moreover they *must* act, in one way or another, and by *legislation* too. Upon the conduct of the free States, (their conduct *within* the Constitution) must defend the question whether these *stains* on our national character, these *reproaches* to us as a Christian people, shall be extended, aggravated, and perpetuated, or limited, mitigated, and at some future day, abolished. It is a very mistaken view of the case to suppose its consideration belongs *exclusively* to the Southern States. It is our *right* and our *duty* to consider and discuss it, freely, fearlessly, and in despite of whatever irritation the slaveholding people may please to indulge or to affect. And this I *can* demonstrate, and *will*, if you please to listen.

C. I shall be glad to hear it. But at present I must leave you.

(To be continued.)

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

We continue our extracts from Stuart's *Three Years* in North America.

The following notices in relation to General Hampton's treatment of his slaves, ought to be generally circulated throughout our country.

'Dr. Tidyman mentions that, with kind masters, the condition of slaves is rendered as happy as a state of slavery can admit of. This is unquestionably true. Indeed I myself have seen instances of quite as strong, if not stronger attachment, on the part of a slave, than I ever saw on the part of a white man to his master; but the master may at pleasure be guilty of abuse of power to his slave; and it is quite notorious in the southern parts of America, that the greatest slave proprietors, whose interest ought to lead them to treat their slaves well, treat them worst. I could easily refer to many instances. One, however, is so well known, that there is no impropriety in mentioning it, viz. that of General H——, one of the greatest, if not the very greatest slave proprietor in the United States,

a South Carolinian, with, however, the chief part of his property situated in Louisiana. He not only maltreats his slaves, but stints them in food, overworks them, and keeps them almost naked. I have seen more than one of his overseers, whose representations gave a dreadful account of the state of slavery on his plantations, and who left his service because they would no longer assist in the cruel punishments inflicted upon his slaves; but I do not mention such a fact as this merely on such authority. General H——'s conduct towards his slaves is a matter of notoriety.'—Vol. ii. pp. 70, 71.

'General Hampton has great plantations on the banks of the river, about seventy miles from New Orleans. I could have wished that he had been present, to hear the remarks made by the passengers in the boat generally on the severe and cruel treatment with which his numerous bands of slaves are treated; and that here, where people are obliged to speak with great caution, not one individual said a word on the subject, who did not express themselves in terms of commiseration for the unfortunate creatures subjected to his tyranny.'—Vol. ii. p. 164.

'Here, [in Illinois,] I met a person who was lately an overseer on one of General H——'s plantations, and who left his situation because the treatment of the slaves was so cruel, that he would no longer be concerned in it.'—Vol. ii. p. 245.

The remaining extracts compose, we believe, everything important in Mr. Stuart's book in relation to slavery, not already given.

'I, however, [in South Carolina,] found an excellent breakfast prepared for me when I did appear, and was not a little surprised, when I sat down to partake of it, to find one female slave fanning me from the opposite side of the table with a fan of peacock feathers, while another brought me what I required at breakfast. The slaves here, as in other countries, speak a broken language peculiar to themselves,—the consequence of their total want of education,—but still many of them go to church, and are admitted to church privileges. Although the church is ten miles distant from the plantation where I stopped, many of the slaves go to it.'

'In the journey from Richmond to the neighborhood of Charleston, a very visible change in the appearance and manners of the people has taken place. Slaves become more numerous in proceeding towards the south, and the whites become comparatively languid and inactive-looking.'—Vol. ii. pp. 59, 60.

'One individual here [in Savannah] gave me an account of the treatment of the slaves, very much resembling what I had witnessed in Charleston. I was prepared to expect this from observing, that the city council of Savannah had lately passed a law, imposing a tax of 100 dollars on free persons of color

coming to that city. Can there be a more atrocious violation of the principles of liberty than is contained in such a regulation as this, which may render it impossible for a free man even to visit his father or mother at the point of death? but the prohibition is positive in Louisiana and South Carolina, which no freed man from another state dare, on any terms, enter.—Vol. ii. p. 80.

‘The laws on the subject of slavery in the State of Georgia are as tyrannical as in any of the States.

‘In case any slave or free person of color teach any other slave or free person of color, to read or to write either written or printed characters, the free person of color, or slave, is punished by fine and whipping; and a white person so offending is punished with a fine, not exceeding 500 dollars, and imprisoned in the common jail.

‘Any slave, or free person of color, or any other person, circulating papers, or bringing into this state, or aiding in any manner in bringing into the state, papers for the purposes of exciting to insurrection, conspiracy, or resistance among the slaves, or free persons of color, against their owners, or the citizens, is to be punished with death.

‘All ships coming into any port of this state, having on board any free negroes, or free persons of color, whether passengers, or in any other capacity, are subject to quarantine for forty days. This regulation is obviously intended as a prohibition of free persons of color from entering the state by sea.

‘Cutting off the ears and the pillory are punishments for slaves sanctioned by the Legislature of Georgia; but the universal punishment is whipping. Its infliction, to the extent of twenty lashes, on the bare back, is deemed in a great variety of cases of insufficient moment to claim the intervention even of a single magistrate. Any white person, a drunken patrol, an absconding felon, or a vagabond mendicant are supposed to possess discretion enough to interpret the laws, and to wield the cow-skin or cart-whip for their infraction; and should death ensue by accident, while the slave is thus receiving moderate correction, the constitution of Georgia kindly denominates the offence justifiable homicide.’—Vol. ii. pp. 85, 86.

‘My driver was a free man of color. He gave a frightful account of the treatment to which he and all the people of color, whether free or slaves, are subject in this State. He had been accustomed formerly to go every season to the State of New York during the period when, owing to the inhabitants leaving the city, business was almost at a stand; but, by an act passed a few years ago, it is declared that a free person of color leaving the State, though merely crossing the boundary, shall not be allowed to return; and as he has a wife and family, he feels himself really and

truly a prisoner in the State of South Carolina. The same law declares, that it shall not be lawful for free persons of color to come from another State into this. If they should be brought in a vessel, they are immediately confined in jail till the vessel is ready to proceed to sea,—the captain paying the expenses of their detention. It is now contrary to law that even free persons of color should be educated; they are incompetent witnesses in any case where the rights of white persons are concerned; and their trials are conducted by a justice of the peace and freeholders, without the benefit of a jury. So far as respects the slaves, they are even in a worse situation; for, though their evidence is in no case admissible against the whites, the affirmation of free persons of color, or their fellow-slaves, is received against them.’—Vol. ii. p. 72.

‘The police, considering the great number of strangers in the city and on the levee, did not seem to me to be faulty. There is a corps of mounted *gens d’armes*. In this respect, in the appearance of an armed police, Charleston and New-Orleans do not resemble the free cities of America; but the great number of blacks, and the way in which they are treated by the whites, render this precaution, I have no doubt, indispensably necessary.’—ib. p. 130.

‘One plantation was pointed out to me, the owner of which, named Mitchell, has been lately apprehended on a charge of having murdered three of his slaves some years ago.’—Vol. ii. p. 165.

‘I have no doubt from what I heard, that portions of the Missouri State may be as attractive for emigrants in almost all the particulars I have mentioned, but slavery exists in that State, and wherever it does exist in North America, it is obviously a bar to improvement, of which the States of Virginia and Kentucky afford decided proofs. Besides, I have seen enough of the slaveholding States to be very much disposed to agree in opinion with Mr. Birkbeck, “that every class of the white population is in those States more or less corrupted by idleness, extravagance, and debauchery.”’—Vol. ii. p. 243.

[From the Emancipator.]

LETTER FROM HON. WILLIAM JAY.

Bedford, Westchester Co. May 1, 1833.

SIR:—The duty and policy of immediate emancipation, although clear to us, are not so to multitudes of good people who abhor slavery, and sincerely wish its removal. They take it for granted, no matter why, or wherefore, that if the slaves were now liberated, they would instantly cut the throats, and fire the dwellings of their benefactors. Hence, these good people look upon the advocates of emancipation, as a set of dangerous fanatics, who are jeoparding the peace of the Southern States, and riveting the fetters of the slaves,

by the very attempt to break them. In their opinion, the slaves are not *yet fit for freedom*, and therefore it is necessary to wait patiently till they are. Now, unless these patient waiters can be brought over to our side, emancipation is hopeless; for, first—they form an immense majority of all among us, who are hostile to slavery; and, secondly—they are as conscientious in their opinions as we are in ours, and unless converted, will oppose and defeat all our efforts. But how are they to be converted? Only by the exhibition of TRUTH. Many a bad cause, but I suspect no good one, has triumphed through the agency of falsehood. The moral, social, and political evils of slavery are but imperfectly known and considered. These should be portrayed in strong but true colors, and it would not be difficult to prove, that however inconvenient and dangerous emancipation may be, the continuance of slavery must be infinitely more inconvenient and dangerous. On this head, statements of the future number of slaves, of their increasing intelligence and strength, and of the probable influence of abolition in the West Indies and Brazil, combined with the change of opinion on this subject throughout the world, would be useful.

An inquiry into the history of emancipation in South America and elsewhere, would tend to show the safety with which it may be accomplished.

Constitutional restrictions, independent of other considerations, forbid all other than moral interference with slavery in the Southern States. But, we have as good and perfect a right to exhort slaveholders to liberate their slaves, as we have to exhort them to practice any virtue, or avoid any vice. Nay, we have not only the right, but, under certain circumstances, it may be our duty to give such advice; and while we confine ourselves within the boundaries of right and duty, we may and ought to disregard the threats and denunciations by which we may be assailed.

The question of slavery in the District of Columbia, is totally distinct, as far as we are concerned, from that of slavery in the Southern States.

As a member of Congress, I should think myself no more authorized to legislate for the slaves of Virginia, than for the serfs of Russia. But Congress have full authority to abolish slavery in the District, and I think it their duty to do so. The public need information respecting the abominations committed at Washington, with the sanction of their representatives—abominations which will cease whenever those representatives please. If this subject is fully and ably pressed upon the attention of our electors, they may perhaps be induced to require pledges from candidates for Congress for their vote for the removal of this foul stain from our National Government.

For success in this great cause, we must

look to the blessing of God; and to obtain his blessing, we must use only such means as He approves. Of course, every exaggeration—every deviation from truth—all gratuitous and uncharitable crimination, should be scrupulously avoided. Without resorting to fiction, we may have *facts* in abundance, which will make the ears of all who hear them to tingle.

The Emancipator will, I trust, be edited with such adherence to accuracy, and in such a spirit of Christian candor, as to give no cause of regret to its friends, nor for reproach to its enemies, and I hope its facts and arguments will be such as to disprove the charge that the advocates of emancipation are weak and ignorant fanatics.

As to the Colonization Society, it is neither a wicked conspiracy on the one hand, nor a panacea for slavery on the other. Many wise and good men belong to it, and believe in its efficacy. The Society may do good in Africa; and it will rescue many free negroes from oppression, by removing them from the Slave States. As to the voluntary manumissions which it prompts or facilitates, I much doubt whether they will sensibly lessen the number of slaves; nor is it clear to me that the extinction of slavery would be hastened by the immediate removal to Africa of one half of all the slaves in the country; as the value of the remaining half would thus be greatly enhanced, and their owners would of course be less disposed to part with them than they are now.

Your obed't servant,

WILLIAM JAY.

THE PLEA OF JUSTICE.

The following article is taken from the Christian Register, in which paper it appeared a few years ago. As that paper is probably not seen by a large number of our readers, we venture to copy it. The intrinsic merit of the piece renders any commendation of it on our part unnecessary.

I remember when quite a child, being a good deal disturbed by the expression in some little book—such a thing was 'not only wicked but foolish.' What, said I, is it not a great deal worse to be wicked than foolish! The wickedness being proved, I thought it perfectly superfluous to inquire further respecting its folly. Besides the *but* appeared to me designed to introduce a sort of climax, and thus folly seemed to be placed higher in the rank of evil than wickedness, which was quite contrary to my simple view of the nature of things. No doubt I somewhat misconceived the author's aim, for I certainly do not now perceive the sort of discordancy and absurdity by which I was then not only struck but troubled, in the idea of showing an action to be 'not only wicked but foolish.' Yet something of the same feeling remains with me to the present

day. I dislike to hear questions of right and justice argued upon grounds of expediency, even though the case may be well argued, and on the right side; or to have the justice of the case referred to slightly, while interest and expediency are made the main ground of argument, which has much the same effect. As a matter of taste merely, it produces a sense of disproportion and unsuitableness, like seeing a large and heavy structure supported on a slender foundation, or the adjuncts and ornaments of a building enlarged and extended till the main building is concealed from view. But it is not as a matter of taste chiefly, that this mode of proceeding should be regarded. It is not rendering to justice her rightful homage. It is not placing things on their true foundation. However expedient an act of justice may be, yet it should be performed for the sake of justice, and not of expediency. We should desire it, and plead for it, because it is just, and not because it is expedient. It is true that the champion of the right may espouse it himself simply because it is the right, though he defends it by such arguments as he thinks will make most impression upon others. But it should be recollected, that if he accomplishes his purposes by such means, he has done nothing to extend the influence and authority of the principle of justice. Nay, by not appealing to it, by leaving it out of sight, he seems to disclaim it himself. By descending to argue the expediency of the measure he recommends, he seems to acknowledge either that the requirements of justice are doubtful, or that considerations of justice are not of themselves decisive. Nor can there be a doubt that an impression of this kind, indistinct, but not less pernicious, must often be produced, though not intended, by the kind of reasoning now referred to. If indeed arguments of expediency are used as auxiliaries, merely, to clear away those illusions of interest which cloud the understanding, and prevent it from discerning the full force of the *moral* argument, all is well. But let it plainly appear that they are considered as subordinate to that main argument, on whose strength the advocate of justice relies with perfect confidence. And this may and ought to be done by some strong and decided reference to it, even when the subject is viewed principally in the aspect of expediency, because it is supposed that the question of right has been too often examined and decided to admit of farther discussion.

We should find that there is a sense of right and justice in all men, if we only knew how to reach it. It is wronging human nature to take it for granted that motives of right and justice (which Bishop Butler calls 'the just and natural motive of action,') will have less weight than motives of interest. To induce men to act from the highest motives is doing them a benefit, to lead them to act from the

lowest an injury. The former too are the motives which they like best to have appealed to, and from which they will act with most satisfaction. What is gained in this way to the right cause is gained surely, but the relations of interest are constantly fluctuating.

The kind of argument to which I have been objecting has I think of late been too frequently adopted in speaking on the subject of slavery. In considering it as an evil and a misfortune, its iniquity seems to be overlooked; the interests of the masters, not the rights of the slaves, are urged as the reason for emancipation; interest, and not conscience, is the motive appealed to. We remonstrate with the slaveholder, not that men have no right to compel others to labor for them, but that free labor is the cheapest. Now the masters may naturally suppose that of their own interest they themselves are the best judges, since they have every opportunity for a knowledge of the facts and motives to sharpen their sagacity. But when the cause is argued on the ground of justice, it is impossible, but it must occur to them, that an indifferent spectator is as well qualified to judge of this, as those are whose opinions are necessarily liable to be warped by interest, and by custom. If then the slaves have a right to their freedom, if there is injustice in withholding it, this is the point of view in which the subject should be habitually regarded, which should never be lost sight of as the sufficient, the unanswerable argument why they should receive their freedom. And that they have this right is so obvious to the simplest apprehension, on a plain statement of the case, that to use arguments to prove it, seems almost preposterous. What right has any man to freedom which they have not? On what do we ground our own right to freedom, to the free use of our powers, to the produce of our own labor?—Common sense?—the implied will of our Creator?—the want of right in any other human being to deprive us of them? Whatever is the foundation of our own right to liberty, every negro slave has the same. For how can he have lost his original rights? By the act of violence which tore him from his native land? No one will assert it, for no one will feel that by virtue of such an act his own rights could be extinguished. By the first act of sale which transferred him to another hand,—by the mysterious efficacy of the first money which was paid for him? No one will assert it, for no one will suppose that the kidnapper could have conveyed that right which was not his. No one will assert it, for no one will say that were he in that slave's place, he should now feel his rights at all diminished. By the second or the third transfer? No one will assert it, for no one can conceive that a thousand such transfers could deprive himself of his inherent right to freedom, if he had been wrongfully dispossessed of it. The negro's

right to his liberty is then, so far, unimpaired, it is as perfect and entire as when he wandered unshackled and uncontrolled in his native Africa. But he dies a slave, and the whole generation of those who were violently deprived of the liberty to which they were born, disappears. Those who now occupy their place were born in slavery, they are the children of slaves. Now there is no pretence for saying that if the parents had really lost or given up any of their natural rights, as by a voluntary contract, or in the case of a just punishment for crime, the child would therefore be born with *his* rights at all less perfect. But this is not the present case. The parent's rights were in their full strength. Does then the circumstance of a child's being born of enslaved parents deprive him of his natural right to liberty, and make him truly and lawfully the *property* of his nominal owner? No one I think will assert it, for this reason among others, that no one will feel that if he were violently seized and carried into captivity, suppose by a party of wild Indians, his innocent children would therefore belong of *right* to the lawless kidnappers, or purchasers from them.

Each successive generation of slaves then, viewing the subject thus in its simplest elements, has the same absolute right to freedom that their progenitors had who were brought from Africa, or in other words, that any inhabitants of earth has.

But it is said that this view of the subject, though obviously just so far as it goes, leaves entirely out of sight the rights of the masters. What rights? If the slaves have an entire right to their liberty, it follows that their masters have none to detain them in slavery. And yet—let us not be hasty, but pause, and weigh this matter deliberately. A certain slaveholder does in perfectly good faith, we will suppose, believe that his slaves are his property, as much as his land, or houses, or cattle, are his property. He has become possessed of them in precisely the same way, having either inherited them as he has his lands, or purchased them with his money the fruit of his own industry and enterprise. Why then are not his negroes as truly and rightfully his property as any other thing which he possesses? Simply because these negroes, having all along retained a right to freedom, (as perfect as their master's to *his* freedom,) could never have become the property of him, from whom the present master purchased or inherited.

But many persons have a vague idea that however unjust it was originally to enslave the Africans, yet that the passage of time, or the course of events, or some peculiar combination of circumstances, has at length conferred a right of property upon the masters. To every such person it is recommended to ask himself, what process he can imagine him-

self to go through, at the end of which he would feel himself the property of another. If he can find no such process, it may be that he will arrive at the conclusion that 'man cannot be the property of man.'

Let him suppose himself captured by the Algerines, would he be troubled with any scruples about the rights of the Moor, who chanced to purchase him, or feel himself the Moor's property, or be prevented by such scruples from regaining his liberty if opportunity offered?

The case of a slaveholder has sometimes been compared to that of a purchaser of stolen goods. And as in mathematics, a truth demonstrated in small numbers may be extended with perfect certainty to any other case, how much larger soever the numbers, or how different soever the practical application, provided the numbers bear the same proportion, or relation to each other—so in morals a conclusion, fairly deduced from an acknowledged principle in one case, must be allowed to extend to every other case, in which the parties concerned bear the same relation to each other. No difference of circumstances, however great, weakens the conclusion, unless it is clearly of such a kind as to alter the relative position of the parties, in those respects to which the reasoning refers. The advantage of reasoning from parallel cases, is, that we more readily perceive the truth in a simple, than in a complicated case, and it may also happen, that we view the one with less prejudice than we do the other.

To return to our parallel case of the purchaser of stolen goods. No one doubts that the original owner may claim them again wherever he can find them, nor will the honest purchaser detain them from him when he discovers his claims, though he had previously supposed himself the lawful owner. Nor would any honest man who had inherited from his father a certain valuable lot of goods, which he knew to be stolen, hesitate about restoring them. Every slave is stolen property; and however the nominal owner came into possession, he is bound in equity to restore it to the real owner, that is to the slave himself. But it may be argued that after a piece of property which was originally fraudulently obtained, has continued in a family for many generations, long possession gives a sort of right, and the obligation to make restitution becomes continually less and less strong. This may be allowed, for a very plain reason, that it is no longer possible to restore it to the original owner. But this case is no longer parallel to that of the slaveholder. In the person of the slave, *there* is the original owner, the defrauded man is himself before us. It is not only the fruit of his ancestor's injustice that the slaveholder possesses, but a renewed robbery is committed upon every individual born upon the estate and detained in slavery.

But is it not a hard case that a man should be required to resign the chief part of his property, to annihilate almost the value of his plantation by giving up the laborers who cultivate it, that the poor widow whose chief maintenance is derived from the dozen or half dozen slaves whom she possesses, should be required to reduce herself and children to actual want, unused as she is to labor with her own hands? Who requires it?—Justice. Will you appeal from her authority? Is it not an equally hard case when a man who has supposed himself rich, is required to reduce himself to poverty by restoring to its rightful owner the estate which he discovers was obtained by fraud by the person from whom he inherited it? Yet the honest and honorable man will do this, although the law of the land should not oblige him to: the poor widow, if honest and honorable, would do the same even if she should be obliged to beg her daily bread. It is justice that makes the demand in both cases. The sacrifice may be great, but who might not envy the feelings of him who had made it?

How can the honorable mind which would disdain to make use of property for a moment, after it discovers that it belongs to another, be aware of the rights of the slaves, and yet willingly detain them another hour in bondage, or consent to be profited to the amount of even another dollar by their compelled and uncompensated labor? How is it that the master of slaves is not aware of their rights? Is it that he turns from such thoughts with feelings like those of the young man who 'went away sorrowful for he had great possessions?'

The rights of the persons held in slavery impose the most absolute obligation upon every slaveholder who can discern the obligation, at whatever sacrifice of property, or worldly interest, to liberate them, unless circumstances render this, in the most literal sense of the word, impossible. But it is not to be doubted that there are slaveholders who are good and upright men and yet do not discern their duty in this respect, nor perceive the rights of the enslaved persons, but honestly regard their slaves as property. It is not very strange that it should be so. The strongly marked line of distinction which color makes between master and slave—the actual state of degradation of the blacks,—the universality of the custom of slavery all around them—and perhaps, the total absence of any expression of doubt among their fellow citizens as to its lawfulness—the habit of regarding and speaking of the blacks not as persons, but as property, not as fellow beings, but as an inferior race of animals,—all these circumstances must tend to confirm in the mind of the slaveholders those views and opinions to which they have been accustomed from their infancy. The power of custom to produce this effect cannot be doubted by those who call to mind the many

instances in which it has produced equally extraordinary effects. To refer only to the often quoted example of the belief in witchcraft. No one supposes that those persons were guilty of murder who condemned to death innocent women on the charge of having committed this imaginary crime; and equally unjust would it be to accuse of wilful injustice all who hold their fellow creatures in slavery. It is much less easy to judge of the rectitude of persons, than of the rectitude of actions. Yet let it be remembered that the nature of justice remains the same however we may fail to discern it. Let it be remembered that *wilful* blindness on such a subject, is guilt; that he who in a case of duty stifles the dawning of conviction, is a criminal; that the slaveholder to whom it has ever occurred, either through his own reflection, or the suggestion of others, that possibly he has no right to hold his fellow creatures in bondage, and who does not pursue the thought fairly, and without regard to consequences, but drives it from him, lest by and by conscience should command him to resign his possessions—let it be remembered that he who thus refuses to know what duty requires cannot be guiltless.

WRIGHT'S SIN OF SLAVERY:

We noticed this pamphlet very briefly in our last number. We now add a few extracts. In speaking of the Colonization Society Mr. Wright uses the following severe, though, it seems to us, justifiable language. We regret that our limits will not permit us to transcribe the whole of the chapters on this subject.

'No matter how sincere, the Colonization Society is too *pusillanimous* to deserve the high station which it has assumed. It is afraid to speak the whole truth. And if the mass of American Christians are to have any thing to do in setting free two millions of oppressed men, the American Colonization Society must be given up, or it must retire into the comparative insignificance, I might say cringing sycophancy, of the object proposed in its constitution; it must leave the ground of operation against slavery clear to a society which shall use a more aggressive moral influence. What! Is that to be dignified with the name of a *moral influence*, which abstains from a correct representation of its object, lest the equanimity of those whom it would persuade should be disturbed?—lest passion should be excited, and the ground of hostility should be taken? Here is a most singular phenomenon: a society professing to exert a moral influence against slavery, and yet afraid to state facts, and when compelled to state facts, afraid to use language appropriate to them. A society which, when speaking of the most odious system of oppression, takes special care to avoid the words sin, crime, guilt, and speaks

of it as a burden, a curse, a sore 'civil.' Is such a 'moral' remedy for sin likely to effect a cure? Are the slaveholders in reality not slaveholders, but virtuous men, keeping their slaves merely under that name, *from necessity*, till it shall be practicable to enlarge them? Can this be proved of a single individual?

'Patrons of the Colonization Society! you form a body sufficiently powerful to wage a successful war with this popular prejudice. You may procure the repeal of every oppressive law, if you please; you may open the door to fair competition in all the arts of life before the colored race, and persuade them to enter, if you please; you may bring them all under the blessed influence of divine truth, if you please. Do that; at least, attempt it, before you claim benevolence as the motive of your colonizing scheme. Till you have made the attempt, whatever may be said of the African skin, it has never been used to conceal hypocrisy, so loathsome and putrifying as yours, if haply, you yourselves are not the victims of a miserable delusion. It grieves me to the heart to bring charges of this kind, which I have reason to believe will be appropriated to themselves—and too justly—by many, whom, in other things, I respect and love. But facts are stubborn, and the principles of God's word, are unbending. Even if an angel from heaven were to embark on the principles which the Colonization Society has avowed, in regard to the free blacks, he would sink.

'Let us not be told that the colored men go *voluntarily* to Liberia. There is not Jesuitism enough in the world to conceal such a *lie* from any, but the willingly blind. The plain fact is this, and every colored man, at least, knows it well, the white community, under the name of 'The Colonization Society,' merely receive the volunteer emigrants—no compulsion—all fair; but mark, the same community, without this *name*, sanction the oppressive laws, utter the public sentiment, and point the finger of scorn, which, together, amount to a bitter persecution, and *compel* the poor blacks to *volunteer*. What a convenient thing is a name, which can be put on and off at pleasure. Here is my neighbor, a simple, good-natured man, dwelling securely by me. I heartily despise him, and would gladly have him out of the way; but how to do it, is the thing. The problem may be thus solved. In every-day life, I am Mr. Prejudice. Under this name, I tell lies about my neighbor, and make sport of him at the taverns and grog-shops; I abuse and mortify him on all occasions; I throw down his fences, filch away his cattle, and refuse redress, till his life is a burden to him. But, on the Fourth of July, and some other great occasions, I am Mr. Generosity. I go to my neighbor with my new name, and my best Sunday suit, and say to him, 'You know Mr. Prejudice is very

powerful in these parts; he cannot be resisted; you had better emigrate, and if you will do so, I will *generously* bear the expense. If, in the simplicity of his heart, my neighbor mistakes me for a different man from his old enemy, my success is almost certain. If he does not, perseverance in this double dealing will wear out the most mulish pertinacity.

'That similar duplicity is justly chargeable upon the Colonization Society, is evident from the fact, that it not only does not condemn, but it hails with pleasure, those oppressive enactments which are designed to banish the colored race. Is the conclusiveness of this argument doubted? Take an illustration. In the recesses of yonder grated and gloomy pile, there is a spacious room, hung round with nameless furniture, into which curiosity is not permitted to pry. By the light of a single taper, you see the pale, half naked prisoner; the monkish executioner, fiendishly busy; the instruments of torture—the trickling blood—the quivering lip—the very anguish of the soul. But what has that man in black to do with the scene, who sits sedately by, and as he sees limb after limb stretched upon the rack, and screw after screw applied, and turned, and tightened to the bone, says to the executioners, 'Take courage, brethren, we shall get the confession soon,' and to the prisoner, 'Only confess now, and you will for ever bless God for his mercy on your soul!'

'Say you, this flight to the inquisition is a flight of fancy! Then let it go for that; but, after all, in sober sense, how can the Society approve, or how can it even *fail to condemn* that prejudice and oppression which render its interference necessary? Let the organs of the Society, at length, answer this question. Surely, it has been asked by friends, and asked by them in vain, till, in many cases, they have waked up in the ranks of the Society's decided enemies. To put the case in the most favorable light, by the supposition that the sin of the legislators is, by the Society's scheme, overruled for good, has the Society any right to *rejoice* at the sin? Does not the divine justice condemn the sinner, and does not the divine compassion weep over him, even while the divine wisdom brings good out of his evil? On the example of the Society, when we do evil from which good may be extracted, we have a right to calculate on the approbation of all those angels of mercy, at least, whose business it may be to bring glory to God out of the wickedness of men.

'On these grounds, it is concluded that the Society's plan is adjusted to the wicked prejudices of the community against the people of color, and, of course, that its action cherishes these prejudices to the injury of innocent men.'

It is delightful to peruse such manly and generous sentiments as those which follow:—

‘But there remains another charge. The Colonization Society basely slanders the whole body of the free people of color. It makes them a degraded, vicious, incurably besotted class, who not only never can rise, but never can be *raised*, and are properly to be got rid of as a nuisance. How would the welkin have rung with peals of indignation if such a charge had been uttered against any class of our *white* fellow citizens? Even if it had been *true*, how would it have been represented as abusive and unchristian? But no candid man needs to be told that against the free men of color the charge is false, and calumnious as it is cruel. There is, as might be expected of necessarily poor and ignorant men, goaded by prejudice and persecution, much vice among them. They do not belong to that class of refined and innocent victims of oppression, which abound in novels, it may be; neither is their depravity sufficiently dignified to suit the lovers of romance; but it is an ill-looking, every-day, matter-of-fact thing. They need the same moral discipline which is needed by any other portion of the community. But amidst all their faults there are redeeming qualities, which must put to shame every white man who has not lost the power to blush. No field in the world is richer in instances of stern moral courage, unbending decision of character, exact integrity, unassailable fidelity, self-sacrificing patriotism, ardent thirst for knowledge, disinterested benevolence, and unfeigned piety, than the history of our free colored brethren. Multitudes of them have risen spontaneously from the lowest depths of slavery, have bought their freedom by years of toil, have risen amidst unmeasurable reproach and obloquy to an eminence that has extorted the admiration of their oppressors. Others have braved death for liberty, have been hunted from mountain to mountain, have been ferreted from city to city, by monsters attracted by the price set upon their heads, till at length they have foiled all the advantages of their pursuers, and have planted themselves as quiet and industrious citizens of our northern republics. Some of them have borne away the palm of genius, by their own unaided endeavors. As a class, they have moved steadily forward, till they have consummated a UNION, whose voice, by its dignity and manful energy, has arrested the attention, and called forth the admiration of the wise and good in both hemispheres.’

CONVENTION OF COLORED PEOPLE.

We have not yet seen any report of the proceedings of this convention. We have, however, received an address issued by it, addressed to the Free Colored Inhabitants of the United States. It is a paper which will interest those to whom it is addressed, and all their true friends. A report of the Committee

on African Colonization, accompanies the address. Both the address and the report speak of the Colonization Society with strong and just reprobation.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AT AMHERST COLLEGE.

We have lately received the following interesting communication from this institution. It gives us the highest gratification to find good principles gaining ground so rapidly among the young men of our country.

To the Editor of the Abolitionist.

Amherst College, July 25, 1833.

Sir:—It affords us pleasure to inform you, that an Auxiliary to the New England Anti-Slavery Society, has recently been formed in this Institution. The number of its members, though at present comparatively small, is increasing. All other circumstances connected with the progress of the Society thus far, have been peculiarly auspicious and animating. If a thorough understanding of the cause we plead—deep-felt sympathies for the suffering slave—a perfect unity of feeling and effort—and ‘a mind to work’ may constitute strength—then we are strong. We have adopted a constitution fundamentally the same with that of the Parent Society. The noble cause of Immediate Emancipation—advocated by your Society, has been rapidly gaining ground in this College for a few months past. Three of our number listened to the recent public debate in Boston, between Messrs. Wright and Finley. Previously they had been zealous defenders of the *principles* of African Colonization—and by education were strongly prejudiced in their favor; but by that discussion they were led to an examination of the *principles* of the two Societies, which resulted in the firm persuasion that the cause of ‘*immediate* abolition’ was the cause of God and humanity—and that the advocates of *gradual* emancipation were but dallying with the sin of slavery—while the influence of their measures was to render more hopeless the condition of the slave. Among other resolutions submitted at our last meeting were the following:

1. Resolved, That the *principles* of the New England Anti-Slavery Society harmonize with the plainest precepts of Patriotism, Philanthropy and Religion.
2. Resolved, That we cordially approve the plan adopted by the New England Anti-

Slavery Society to establish an Institution for the instruction of colored youth—and as a Society, pledge ourselves to raise for so benevolent an object, such sums as our means, from time to time will admit—and also to exert ourselves to elevate and enlighten the colored population of our own vicinity, as well as abroad.

3. Resolved, That we view with unqualified disapprobation and utter abhorrence the barbarous treatment of Miss Crandall, and that she is justly entitled to the prayers and sympathies of the Christian community while suffering persecution for her laudable and Christian efforts to instruct the ignorant and oppressed.

The above resolutions were accompanied by interesting remarks, and unanimously adopted.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY IN ONEIDA INSTITUTE.

The same mail which brought us the account of the formation of an Anti-Slavery Society in Amherst College, also conveyed to us the cheering news of the formation of a similar association in Oneida Institute. The following is an extract from our correspondent's letter:—

'An Anti-Slavery Society has been formed in this Institution, of a respectable number. The second Article of our constitution is as follows: "The object of this Society shall be to endeavor by all means sanctioned by Law, Humanity, and Religion, to effect the *immediate* abolition of slavery in the United States without expatriation: to improve the character and condition of the free people of color; to inform and correct public opinion in relation to their situation and rights; and obtain for them civil and political rights and privileges, equal with those of the whites.'

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.

The last arrivals received from Great Britain announce the passage of the following resolutions in the House of Commons. The total abolition of slavery in the British Colonies is now no longer doubtful. That this measure will have a powerful tendency to overthrow the system in the Southern States, does not admit of a question. The glorious result which the labors of British Abolitionists have thus secured, ought to inspire every

enemy of slavery in America, with renewed zeal and vigor.

1. That immediate and effectual measures be taken for the entire abolition of slavery throughout the colonies, under such provisions for regulating the condition of the negroes as may combine their welfare with the interests of the proprietors.

2. That it is expedient that all children born after the passing of any act, or who shall be under the age of six years at the time of the passing of any act of Parliament for this purpose, be declared free; subject, nevertheless, to such temporary restrictions as may be deemed necessary for their support and maintenance.

3. That all persons now slaves shall be registered as apprenticed laborers, and acquire thereby all rights and privileges of freemen; subject to the restriction of laboring under conditions and for a time to be fixed by Parliament, for their present owners.

4. That, towards the compensation of the proprietors, His Majesty is enabled to grant to them a sum not exceeding £20,000,000 sterling, to be appropriated as Parliament shall direct.

5. That His Majesty be enabled to defray any such expense as he may incur in establishing an efficient stipendiary magistracy in the colonies, and in aiding the local Legislatures in providing upon liberal and comprehensive principles for the religious and moral education of the negro population to be emancipated.

THREE MONTHS IN JAMAICA.

We have recently received a little tract published in England, entitled 'Three Months in Jamaica in 1832, comprising a residence of Seven Weeks on a Sugar Plantation—By Henry Whiteley.' This tract deserves great attention. The author, from the testimonials appended to the narrative, appears to be 'a highly respectable young man, of unimpeachable integrity as a man and as a christian.' He evidently gives an 'unvarnished tale,' of what fell under his own observation, in a situation which gave him peculiar opportunities for seeing all the unveiled horrors of the slave system. No man, we venture to say, whose feelings have not been hardened by the practice of oppression, can read Mr. Whiteley's unpretending pages, without coming to the conclusion that slavery ought to be abolished. He gives several cases of punishments which he saw inflicted—we extract the 12th and 13th.

'12th. The first of these two cases was that of a married woman, the mother of several

children. She was brought up to the overseer's door one morning; and one of the drivers who came with her accused her of having stolen a fowl. Some feathers, said to have been found in her hut, were exhibited as evidence of her guilt. The overseer asked her if she would pay for the fowl. She said something in reply which I did not clearly understand. The question was repeated, and a similar reply again given. The overseer then said, 'Put her down.' On this the woman set up a shriek, and rent the air with her cries of terror. Her countenance grew quite ghastly, and her lips became pale and livid. I was close to her, and particularly noticed her remarkable aspect and expression of countenance. The overseer swore fearfully, and repeated his order—'Put her down!' The woman then craved permission to tie some covering round her nakedness, which she was allowed to do. She was then extended on the ground, and held down by two negroes. Her gown and shift were literally torn from her back, and, thus brutally exposed, she was subjected to the cart-whip. The punishment inflicted on this poor creature, was inhumanly severe. She was a woman somewhat plump in her person, and the whip being wielded with great vigor, every stroke cut deep into the flesh. She writhed and twisted her body violently under the infliction—moaning loudly, but uttering no exclamation in words, except once when she cried out, entreating that her nakedness (her parts of shame) might not be indecently exposed,—appearing to suffer, from matronly modesty, even more acutely on account of her indecent exposure than the cruel laceration of her body. But the overseer only noticed her appeal by a brutal reply (too gross to be repeated), and the flogging continued. Disgusted as I was, I witnessed the whole to a close. I numbered the lashes stroke by stroke, and counted *fifty*,—thus exceeding by eleven the number allowed by the Colonial law to be inflicted at the arbitrary will of the master or manager. This was the only occasion on which I saw the legal number of 39 lashes exceeded, but I never knew the overseer or head book-keeper give less than 39. This poor victim was shockingly lacerated. When permitted to rise, she again shrieked violently. The overseer swore roughly, and threatened, if she was not quiet, to put her down again. He then ordered her to be taken to the hot-house or hospital, and put in the stocks. She was to be confined in the stocks for several nights, while she worked in the yard during the day at light work. She was too severely mangled to be able to go to the field for some days. This flogging took place on the 27th of September.

13th. The flogging of an old man, about 60 years of age, is the last case I shall mention. He was the third driver upon the estate,—there being five altogether, whose sole em-

ployment was literally *driving*, or coercing by the whip, the negro population to labor. With this old man I had had some conversation, and felt particularly interested in him, for his silvery locks and something in his aspect reminded me powerfully of my aged father, whom I had left in England. He had been upon the estate a great number of years. He told me that not one of the negroes belonging to the gang he wrought in when he first came to New Ground was now alive. He came up to the overseer's door at shell-blow one day, and gave in, as is the practice, on a tally or bit of notched stick, his account of the half day's work of the gang he superintended. The overseer was dissatisfied—said it was insufficient—and ordered him to get a flogging. The old man said, 'Well, Busha, me could have done no better, had you been standing by.' Then, groaning deeply, he laid down his staff and whip, unloosed his clothes, and lay quietly down to be flogged without being held. One of the other drivers, who had been called forward, appeared very reluctant to perform the office; but, on the overseer swearing a rough oath or two, he proceeded to inflict the usual punishment of 39 lashes. The old man, looking up in the overseer's face imploringly, cried out after every stroke for several minutes—'Busha! Busha! Busha!' but seeing no signs of relenting, he ceased to call on him, expressing his feelings only by groans. I was deeply affected by the sight, and felt at the moment that these groans were an awful appeal to the judgment seat of Him who heareth the cry of the oppressed. When the punishment was over, and the poor man arose, the other drivers looked at each other and shook their heads, but uttered not a word. They dared not.'

SCHOOL FOR COLORED CHILDREN.

We, with several other gentlemen, visited, during the past month, a primary school for colored children in Boston, kept by Miss Paul. We were highly gratified. This school does great credit to the instructress. The children appeared very cheerful, and were remarkably orderly. They seemed to be effectually governed, obeying a word or sign of their teacher with great readiness. It is, however, her kindness which directs them, much more than force, to which we believe she seldom if ever resorts. We heard the children go through some of their exercises, in which it did not seem to us they appeared at all inferior to white children. They also sung two or three times, to the high gratification of their visitors. It struck us, though we are no great judge of singing, that their performance was quite equal, if not rather superior to any that we had ever heard at schools of white children.

EMANCIPATION CONCERT.

The following information is extracted from the Religious Intelligencer of May 4, published at New-Haven, Conn. It affords one among many proofs of the increasing interest which is felt in our colored population.

'A monthly concert of prayer has been established in this city, to be holden on the evening of the last Monday of each month, in behalf of the millions of our fellow men who are kept in slavery. At the last meeting which was attended by Christians of different names and different colors, but of one mind and one spirit, the following resolution was adopted.

Resolved, That with reference to the emancipation of the enslaved in this and other lands, and also the improvement and salvation of the people of color in the United States and the world; that 'all our expectation is from God;' that while we engage in efforts to promote these great and important ends, we would invite the followers of Christ, every where, to unite with us in a concert of prayer to Almighty God on the last Monday evening of each month, to plead for the oppressed and neglected people of color—that His arm would bring about their emancipation, improvement and salvation.

The meeting also voted that a copy of the Resolution be presented to the Editor of the Religious Intelligencer, for publication, accompanied with a request to the publishers of other religious papers to give it an insertion in their columns.

Will not the children of God, every where, unite in this great enterprise? We know of no subject of deeper interest, than the universal abolition of slavery; and we know of no way to accomplish it, but to ask counsel of God. At the throne of grace all parties can meet. The friends of immediate emancipation who can think of no plan to accomplish their wishes, may ask the Lord to interpose, and rejoice that He reigns.'

INTELLIGENCE FROM LIBERIA.

Extracts of a Letters from Dr. Mechlin.

LIBERIA, March 7, 1833.

DEAR SIR:—I am still in this land of probation, laboring in the cause of African Colonization, and am happy to find that my efforts have not been entirely unsuccessful. 'Tis true the materials to be operated upon have not been of the best kind, and to this cause our slim progress is mainly attributed. Could we have a greater proportion of intelligent and enterprising people of color sent out, every thing would soon assume a different appearance; and our agriculture, which is now in a languishing condition, would advance *pari passu* with our commercial prosperity.

Your friend, the Rev. J. B. Pinney, is still here and in excellent health; how long he

will continue so I cannot say; the fever must and will have him ere many days have elapsed. It was his intention to have left this immediately for the interior, but yielding to the solicitations of Dr. Hall and myself, he has consented to remain some time longer, in order to undergo the severe process of acclimation. He is, I think, well calculated for the work he has undertaken—perhaps a little too confiding in the integrity of our natives; this, however, a little intercourse will soon correct; as those on the coast have just so much of civilization as to become the most accomplished rogues the world can produce.'

* * * * *

'This season has been unusually unhealthy. * * * *We had, at one time, upwards of FOUR HUNDRED invalids on our list: of these, by far the greater number (say two-thirds) were at Caldwell, and the remainder scattered over the town of Monrovia, in such shelters as could be procured. Under these circumstances, it was impossible that any one physician could give the requisite attendance. Dr. Hall made the attempt, but was soon attacked with fever, induced by the great fatigue and exposure which he underwent. From this attack he can scarcely be considered convalescent: and the consequent prostration is so great, that I have advised him to return to the United States in the vessel that conveys this; there being but little probability of his recovering sufficient strength and health to be of any service, without a temporary residence in a more healthy climate; and to remain here during the rainy season, would, I am convinced, be to sacrifice his life. He has, therefore, although reluctantly, yielded to my solicitations; and should his life be spared, you may expect to see him at Washington shortly after the receipt of this. His departure will, of course, throw the whole of the medical duties on me, and these I cannot discharge, although I have every disposition to afford all the aid and assistance in my power. I have already, since the departure of Dr. Todsens, been twice confined to my bed with severe indisposition, occasioned by fatigue and exposure to the sun and night air, during my attendance on the sick; and there is every probability, should the necessity for my services continue, that I shall have repeated attacks; but as this is unavoidable, I will continue in the course I am pursuing, and willingly abide the result.'*

COLONIZATION CORRESPONDENCE.

A Correspondence between sundry citizens of New York, viz: *Arthur Tappan, George Bourne, William Goodell, Joshua Leavitt, Lewis Tappan, S. P. Hines, Henry R. Piercy, C. W. Dennison, L. D. Dewey, Theodore D. Weld, C. G. Finney, and G. R. Barker, and R. R. Gurley, Secretary of the American Colonization Society* has lately appeared in an Extra Emancipator.

The reply of the New York gentlemen to Mr. Gurley, contains a powerful, and we may say unanswerable confutation of the principles of the American Colonization Society. We should be glad to publish it, if our limits would permit.

NEW ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

We have received several new anti-slavery publications. We have time and space barely to mention their names.

An Address to the citizens of Philadelphia, on the subject of Slavery. Delivered in the hall of the Franklin Institute, on the 4th of 7th month, (July,) A. D. 1833. By EDWIN P. ATLEE, M. D. of Philadelphia. Published by particular request.

The sound principles advocated in this address are highly favorable to the author, and can scarcely fail to produce good effects.

Four Sermons, preached in the chapel of the Western Reserve College, (Ohio) on Lord's days, November 18th and 25th, and December 2nd and 9th, 1832. By BERTHA GREEN, Professor of Sacred Literature, in the College.

We have just received these valuable discourses, we hope to notice them more fully in a future number.

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AT ASSONET.

The following is an extract of a letter from Arnold Buffum to the Corresponding Secretary of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society, dated July 16 :

'In my last from Taunton I mentioned that it was proposed to form an Anti-Slavery Society at Assonet. I returned there and gave them an address on Friday evening of last week, written expressly for the occasion, containing a historical narration of the rise and progress of the anti-slavery cause, showing its result in an imperishable monument of 350,000 persons of color delivered from personal bondage. I then showed them how the increase of free persons of color alarmed the legislature of Virginia and the slaveholders in general, and led to the formation of the Colonization scheme. I gave them the history, character and principles of that scheme, and exhibited the deception practised by the agents of the slaveholders, and invited them to organise a Society to resist the progress of these deceptions, and to promote the anti-slavery cause. I then read our constitution, and took a vote whether they would proceed to form a Society. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Three clergymen all in the place were present, and all spoke in favor of forming a Society, and all put down their names as members. Our constitution, so altered as to adapt it to an auxiliary society, was unanimously adopted. Dea. Burt was chosen Chairman, and Rev. Wm. Coe Secretary; a number of names were given and a Committee appointed to solicit further subscriptions to the constitution, and the meeting was adjourned one week to meet for the choice of officers. I saw the Committee the next morning; they said they should have a very respectable Society, and they think they will send a delegate to Philadelphia, to assist at the formation of the National Society.'

'THE HUMMING BIRD.'

The following lines form the motto of an English periodical work, with the above title.

As the small Bird, that fluttering roves
Among Jamaica's tam'ring groves,
A feathered busy bee,
In note scarce rising to a song,
Incessant, hums the whole day long,
In slavery's Island, free!

So shall 'A still small voice' be heard,
Though humble as the Humming Bird,
In Britain's groves of oak;
And to the peasant from the King,
In every ear shall ceaseless sing,
'Free Afric from her yoke!'

COLLECTIONS MADE BY ARNOLD BUFFUM

FOR THE NEW-ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At Malden	2 50
Baptist meeting in New-Bedford	15 50
African do. do.	11 75
Baptist Meeting in Newport	4 68
Bristol	00 91
Taunton	5 00
Providence	5 75
Pawtucket	3 70
Woonsocket	1 50
Slaterville	1 35
Uxbridge	17 16
Grafton	7 80
Leicester	3 00
Worcester	1 37
Ware	00 71
Belchertown	1 52
Springfield	00 75
Sunderland	2 50
Greenfield	00 76
Brattleboro'	2 30
Walpole, N. H.	4 00
Keene	7 00
Newport, R. I.	1 75
Taunton	9 00
Dorchester	9 00
Lowell	15 30
Andover	2 69
Newburyport	5 00
Lowell	4 50
Rev. Mr. Himes' church, Boston	14 00
Lynn	6 57
Woburn	7 00
Fall River	5 75
African Church, New-Bedford	4 27
Christian do. do.	10 25
Emerson's do., Boston	22 45
West Bridgewater	1 80
North do.	1 75
West Randolph	3 80
Brighton	3 90
Congregational Church, New-Bedford	4 40
Danvers, Sewall's church	7 00
Lynn	1 25
Discussion at Salem	20 12
William Ladd	5 00
Beverly	4 70
Tabernacle, Salem	6 50
3d African Church, Philadelphia	22 70
Dea. Dean, New-Haven	2 00
Total,	\$308 90

The Treasurer of the N. E. Anti-Slavery Society acknowledges the receipt of the following in July :

From Charles Stuart, Esq. of Liverpool. Eng.	15 00
Annual assessments from members	9 00
Amount of collections at Masonic Hall and Boylston Hall	54 57
Total	\$78 57

JAMES C. ODIORNE, Treasurer.