

E 448
.N62
Copy 1

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 897 658 7

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5

1870

AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

A LETTER

BY REV. JOSEPH TRACY, D.D.,

CONTAINING

MEMORANDA

CONCERNING

THE LATE APPEAL OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE NEW YORK STATE COLONIZATION
SOCIETY TO THE FRIENDS OF
AFRICAN COLONIZATION.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF FRIENDS IN NEW YORK.

NEW YORK :

PRINTED BY MACDONALD & PALMER, 733 BROADWAY.

1870.

E 948 .

.N 62

01

COLONIZATION OFFICE,

Boston, Sept. 21, 1870.

REV. DR. ORCUTT:

DEAR SIR:—I thank you for sending me the *N. Y. Tribune* of Aug. 2, containing the article addressed “To the Friends of African Colonization,” by the Executive Committee of the New York State Colonization Society. I have read that article carefully and repeatedly. Your reply to it, published in the *Tribune* on your return to the city, two or three weeks after, seems to me quite sufficient to neutralize its influence. Yet, some of the errors in the Committee’s article are of such a character, that it seems expedient to place an exposure of them on paper for future reference, if there should be occasion for it. As their order is somewhat confused and repetitious, I shall not confine myself to it, but will first notice their attack on me by name. I have hitherto neglected it; but it is renewed so persistently, and with such increasing unfairness from time to time, that perhaps some notice of it is due both to myself and to you.

You doubtless recollect the condition of the N. Y. State Colonization Society in the beginning of 1867. Many who had been among its most efficient members had become dissatisfied with its management, and silently withdrawn from all participation in its doings. This disaffection had so increased during a course of years, that, out of a Board of thirty managers, and twenty-eight other officers entitled to act as managers, “it was often difficult to obtain a quorum” at the meetings of the managers for the transaction of business, though only seven out of the fifty-eight were necessary to form a quorum. For nine years it had contributed, according to their own showing, only \$986.39 to the funds of the Parent Society. Of that amount, only \$336.84 had been paid in cash into the Treasury at Washington. Since 1863, it had deliberately refrained from attempting to collect funds for colonization. It had a Corresponding Secretary who was far away from New York on other business than that of the Society, and who had said that he did not intend ever to return to his former labors in the service of the Society. His place in the Society’s Rooms was occupied by one who, so far as I can learn, had never been elected by the Society to any

office, and who held no office provided for by their constitution. The constitution required an annual meeting in May, for the election of officers, receiving reports and other business. No annual meeting was holden that year, no officers elected, no reports received by the Society. Evidently, the Society needed reorganizing.

As a Director of the Parent Society, having been one for about a quarter of a century, I had long felt deeply the loss of the co-operation of our friends in New York, and had done what I could to bring about an arrangement by which you might labor for its restoration. I knew that if the Hon. William E. Dodge and others, who, from dissatisfaction with the management of the Society and unwillingness to be engaged in controversy, had silently, one by one, retired from active membership, would return in a body, resume their seats, and give their votes, that co-operation would be restored; for they, and those who agreed with them in the main, but still continued to be active members, were a decided majority, both in number and in weight of character. I thought that this ought to be done, even if the minority should oppose it, quarrel about it, and in the end secede from the Society. When the majority has right views and purposes, it is not only its right, but its duty, to rule.

Such was the state of affairs April 9, 1867, about a month before the annual meeting should have been holden, but was not, and there was no reason to expect that it would be. On that day, it happened to be my duty to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from you. I added, in an off-hand style, on a single page of note-paper, an exhortation to labor for the reorganization of that Society; for the return of Mr. Dodge, and others who had withdrawn, to their former activity as members, even if it should lead to a conflict with the minority whose management had driven them into retirement, and the retirement of that minority in their turn.

The thought of a controversy suggested a danger. That Society holds in trust, for education in Africa, the proceeds of bequests to the amount of some \$60,000. A controversy ending in a disruption of the Society might give rise to doubts as to the rightful custody of those funds, and, in the end, for want of a clearly legal custodian, they might be claimed by residuary legatees, or revert to the heirs of testators, and thus be lost to the cause of education in Africa. I therefore added a caution against this danger.

You approved of this advice, and sent the substance of it, sometime afterwards, in a letter to Washington, with your endorsement. You acted according to it, and the managers of the State Society approved your action. Old members, who had been inactive, began to come back and resume their places. A Secretary was appointed who was

on the ground, and the reorganization was as complete as it could be made, till there should be an annual meeting for the election of officers. There had been no "quarrel," no "split." The identity of the Society under the charter had been preserved, so that the invested funds were safe. The advice, given by me and approved by you, was good, and had been executed to the letter, except that Mr Dodge, and perhaps some others of the old members, had not yet resumed their places. The difficulty was made afterwards, and by others, who speak and act as if they had been unwilling that "Dodge and others" of the old members should come back, "assert their rights, and exert their power."

In their official "Statement" they quoted my words thus:—

"Do try to reorganize the New York Society. Have a quarrel and split if necessary, undesirable as that would be. Bring Dodge and others to assert their rights and exert their power. Preserve the identity of the Society under the charter, for the sake of the invested funds. You cannot do a better thing."

They quote this as proof of a design "to get control of the trust funds" which the Society held. It was no such thing. The design was, to save that Society from losing those funds, as in its disorganised condition, above described, it was in danger of doing, and as it would do, if the "identity of the Society under the charter" should not be preserved.

In their *Tribune* article they quote as follows:—

"Do try reorganize the N. Y. Society. HAVE A QUARREL AND SPLIT, if necessary. Bring Dodge and others to assert their rights and exert their power. Preserve the identity of the Society FOR THE SAKE OF THE INVESTED FUNDS. You cannot do a better thing."

They quote this, to prove that you "wanted not only a change, but a split, in the Society." It answers that purpose much more plausibly, for the omission of the words, which I wrote and you approved, "undesirable as that would be." If those words had been retained, an honest reader might have found some difficulty in believing that you "wanted," and was seeking to obtain, what you regarded as "undesirable." Whether those words were omitted deliberately, for that reason, I do not know. If they were not, their omission shows that the authors of the article were capable of such omissions. The omission of the words, "under the charter," in the last sentence but one, perhaps somewhat diminishes the precision with which the idea is expressed, but does not alter its meaning. It still evidently refers to the legal identity, which must be preserved, to save the funds from going into the hands of heirs and residuary legatees.

There are other things that might be said, as you well know, about

that extract and their use, or rather, their abuse of it ; but I have written quite as much as I wish to about myself.

The *Tribune* article alleges, as cause of complaint :—

“*First.*—The approval of the American Society of an act of its Executive Committee, in refusing to withdraw an agency from the city of New York, conducted by its travelling Secretary in hostility to the New York State Society.”

This charge is sufficiently refuted in the “Exposition” to which you refer. I may add, however, that the last clause in this complaint contains a false accusation. As I have already shown, that agency was commenced and conducted, not “in hostility to” that Society, but to preserve its organization, secure its safety, and promote its efficiency.

As to their right to demand the withdrawing of that agency, they have changed their ground remarkably. In their “Memorial,” presented at Washington, and laid on the table by the vote of their President and fourteen other Directors out of twenty ; in their official “Statement” and semi-official “Synopsis,” they base that claim on an alleged “compact” and “pledge,” contained in certain words skilfully selected from the constitution of the American Society, adopted in December 1838 and “carefully” observed for thirty years, and on resolutions of the Board of Directors, adopted in 1851 and in 1855. The “Exposition” showed that those constitutional provisions were never applicable to such a Society as theirs is now ; were relaxed by mutual agreement made in 1842 and never rescinded ; and were wholly repealed in 1846. In their present publication they abandon that ground entirely. They say not a word about any “compact,” dating from 1838 and observed for thirty years. Nor do they refer to the resolutions of 1851. They could not conveniently do it, for they contain conditions which their Society has habitually disregarded, and intends still to disregard. Of the Resolution of 1855, they conceal the fact that it was only explanatory of those of 1851, and needs to be compared with them in order to understand it, and quote only so much of those proceedings as may be quoted plausibly for their purpose. But see the “Exposition.”

Another curiosity, before leaving this matter. The “Exposition” quoted the mutual agreement of 1842, by which the constitutional provisions of 1838 were relaxed, previous to their repeal in 1846. They assert that it was quoted to prove that the Resolution of 1855 “is not binding in 1869.” It was not quoted for any such purpose ; nor does the “Exposition” even once refer to it, in any discussion concerning the resolutions of 1851 and 1855. The “Exposition” does not deserve the discredit of using the bad argument thus ascribed to it.

Their second “cause of complaint” relates to the notice taken by

the Executive Committee at Washington, of the "revolution" effected in the N. Y. State Society, at its election of officers in 1868. They complain also of the statement of the "Exposition," that, in 1869, the revolution was completed, and "eight new men" were chosen as members of the Board of Managers.

The Executive Committee had said:—

"We also understand that the Board of Managers of the New York State Society was composed substantially of new men; that there had been what might be called a revolution; that the old, long-trying great men who had been members, had been turned out, and a new set of men put in."

They say that these "allegations were without a shadow of truth. Evidence was before the annual meeting to show that they were groundless and calumnious. The American Society refused to have them struck from the report, and embodied them in its records."

The "evidence" here mentioned was a printed document, headed:—

"Officers of the New York State Colonization Society for 1865, as published in the Report of the thirty-third annual meeting, re-elected in 1866 without a single change, and holding over in 1867, there being no election that year, are as follows."

This was accompanied with the assertion these officers had all been re-elected in 1868, except a few who had died or resigned. This document is copied into their official "Statement," preceded by the following sentence:—

"A list of the officers elected in the years 1865, 1866, and 1868, is here given, which shows that the allegation in the Executive Committee's report, that there had been a revolution and a change of men in the government of the New York State Society, is without a semblance of fact."

Certainly, "a list of the officers elected in 1865, 1866, and 1868," means, according to the ordinary acceptation of words, a list of *all* the officers elected in either of those years; and, certainly, nothing less than a complete list of all the officers elected in 1868, could show that there had not "been a revolution and a change of men in the government" of that Society.

I have before me an official Circular of eight pages, issued by the N. Y. State Society about June, 1869. Its last page is headed:— "Officers of the New York State Colonization Society." This heading is followed by a list of twenty-four officers, the whole number provided for in their new constitution. I take it, therefore, to be a true and complete list of their officers elected in 1869. On this list I find, among the "Managers," the names of Ashbel Green, J. R. Kendrick, D.D., E. B. Cleghorn, J. M. Goldberg, Lorenzo D. Yates, Stephen H. Provost, M. J. Franklin, and Joseph S. Peacock, neither of which is on

the "list of the officers" elected in 1868, presented at Washington, and reprinted in the "Statement," as proof that there had been no "change of men in the government" of that Society. Yet, in their *Tribune* article, they say that in 1869, "the Society did not appoint eight new men as members of the Board. With three exceptions, the whole number of officers and managers were former members of the Board of Managers."

How is this? Did the list presented at Washington, to prove that there had been no "change of men," that the allegation of the Executive Committee concerning the election of "new men" in 1868, was false, leave out the names of at least five "new men" who were elected that year? By long and hard study, I have found out nearly how it is; and it is a very curious business.

I find from the semi official "Synopsis," that, in 1868, besides the old officers on the list shown at Washington, five new vice-presidents were elected, of whom one had before been a manager, and four were "new men." These were to fill vacancies from death or resignation, with one exception. These vice-presidents were members of the Board of Managers, *ex officio*, with the right to vote. J. M. Goldberg was chosen Recording Secretary, and was manager, *ex officio*. W. M. Havermeyer, James Stokes, S. H. Provost, Ashbel Green, Rev. E. B. Cleghorn, and Dr. James Warren, all "new men," were chosen managers to fill two vacancies caused by death, two by resignation, and two many years vacant. Here are the names of eleven "new men" entitled to vote in the Board of Managers.

When we recollect that any seven of these men might form a quorum for the transaction of business, and that so many had become disaffected and "never attended, so that it was often difficult to obtain a quorum," it is evident that these eleven "new men" had the business of the Society "substantially" in their hands, as the Executive Committee had been informed. Old members, if we may rely on these documents, had not been "turned out," because vacancies from death and resignation had, in the course of "many years," become numerous enough to make room for all the "new men" needed. The "evidence" which they say was before the Directors at Washington in 1870, touches only one point in the statement of the Executive Committee which it was brought to controvert. If admitted, it proves only that old members had not been "turned out," and leaves uncontradicted the statements that the Board of Managers was composed substantially of new men; that there had been what might be called a revolution, and a new set of men put in. And yet, these were the main points which it behooved them to disprove, and to disprove which they were understood to produce that "evidence."

There are some apparent discrepancies on this subject, which it may be well to notice, though they do not affect the general conclusion. On the list of officers exhibited at Washington as "evidence," two managers are noticed as "deceased," and one "resigned," showing only three vacancies to be filled. The "Synopsis" gives the names of six, who were elected to fill vacancies on that Board; two caused by death, two by resignation, "and two many years vacant." On counting the official list given as "evidence," it is found that it contains only twenty-eight names; and as their Constitution required thirty, it seems there were two vacancies, of which it gave no notice, making five in all. Where the "Synopsis" found the sixth—*two* resigned, instead of one resigned—does not appear from anything in my possession. But as it gives the names of the six, it is hard to suppose a mistake.

The *Tribune* article denies that "eight new men" were appointed members of the Board in 1869, and says: "With three exceptions, the whole number of officers and managers were former members of the Board of Managers." As I have already shown, the Board elected in 1869 contained eight, whose names are not on the list of old members presented at Washington, and were, therefore, "new men" in the sense in which that term has all along been used in these discussions. The assertion that five of them—all but three—"were former members of the Board," must, therefore, mean that they had been elected in 1868. But, of the six named in the "Synopsis" as elected in 1868, only three—Messrs Provost, Green and Cleghorn, were re-elected in 1869. Mr. Goldberg, who was elected Recording Secretary in 1868, and thus became a member of the Board *ex officio*, makes a fourth. That there was a fifth, is not verified by anything before me. He may have been appointed sometime during the year by the Board of Managers, to fill a vacancy. But it matters little. All the eight were "new men," introduced by the "revolution," begun in 1868, and completed in 1869.

The word "revolution" never was applied more correctly than to those proceedings of 1868. A member of the Society, for the purpose of controlling the election, placed thirty dollars in the hands of a candidate for office, who was to find and bring in thirty friends to vote as the giver wished. On this ground, twenty-eight men, none of whom had ever given or subscribed a dollar to the funds of the Society, as the Constitution required in order to membership, came in, took control of the meeting, and, with less than half their number of old members, elected whom they pleased. They elected, according to the "Synopsis," eleven "new men" to office, all entitled to votes in the Board of Managers, of whom seven formed a quorum; and, from that

time, these "new men," and some old members who were re-elected by the same unlawful votes, had the business of the Society "substantially" in their hands.

The report of the Executive Committee at Washington was, therefore, "substantially" true and just; and the pretense of disproving it by "evidence" that has no bearing except on a single unimportant point of it, is eminently sophistical and futile.

Perhaps I ought, in justice to say, that, since reading the "Tribune" article, and re-examining the "Synopsis," I have been able to discover, in the official "Statement," and even in the list of old officers re-elected and its appendages, virtual admissions of the elections of "new men" in 1868; though I have not been able to reconcile those admissions with the purpose for which that list was made and presented, or with the inferences which it was claimed to sustain, or with some other statements in the "Statement."

But, if there were vacancies, had not the Society a right to fill them? Certainly; and would naturally fill them with old members of the Society, known to be interested in its objects. But it should have been done at a lawful meeting, lawfully conducted, and by the votes of men who had a right to vote, and those only. Such was not the election in 1868, as has been shown.

The *Tribune* article says, that the "Exposition" "mentions the election of the Rev. Dr. Pinney, Corresponding Secretary, in a manner that can be regarded in no other light than an assault." I regret that they did not quote the words, and point out wherein the assault consisted. But, perhaps, I ought to excuse them, as the attempt would have taxed their ingenuity severely, and the charge against the "Exposition" was needed, as an apology for an enumeration of the many and valuable services which Dr. Pinney has rendered to the cause of Colonization.

They deny that they ever before heard that the building of the Seth Grosvenor "was remonstrated against, or disapproved by the American Society." They add:—"It would have been a gratuitous assumption of supervision over the New York State Society to have done so."

I am informed that the American Society did disapprove, and express its disapproval; and I presume that the correspondence of the two Societies, if thoroughly examined, would show it. At least, I presume their own records would show that they formally applied to the American Society for its co-operation; and that the Executive Committee of the American Society decided that it was "inexpedient to enter into the enterprise." As for a "gratuitous assumption of supervision," they should consult the resolutions of the Directors of the Parent So-

ciety in 1851, which they have quoted abundantly in their former publications, though they now abstain from touching them, as if they were pieces of very hot iron. They will there find that it was their duty, as an auxiliary, to obtain the consent and "co-operation" of the Parent Society, before engaging in any such enterprise. Their own records will show that they asked for that co-operation, and did not obtain it. They will find, too, that the surplus funds of auxiliaries, after defraying their own domestic expenses, were due to the Parent Society, to be paid into its treasury, or expended in "co-operation with" its Executive Committee; so that the Parent Society had some right of "supervision" over such matters, and would have had, even if its co-operation had not been requested.

They say again, speaking of the "Exposition":—

"The pamphlet contains a very sophistical and exceedingly lame attempt to show that some twenty-six thousand dollars, acknowledged in the African Repository as received from the New York State Society from February 1859 [a misprint for 1849] to 1863, were not received."

It contains no attempt whatever, "lame" or sound, to show that. On the contrary, it shows when, where and how those several amounts, \$26,213.74, were received. An assertion, so diametrically opposite to the fact, is not justifiable, even as a rhetorical trick, or a pettifogging artifice. The facts are the Travelling Secretary had said:—

"The amount the Parent Society has received in cash from the New York State Colonization Society since 1849—nearly twenty years—is less than \$12,000; and the entire amount claimed by the State Society as a basis of representation, has not averaged \$1000 a year for the last fifteen years or more."

The second clause plainly refers to amounts not "received *in cash*" by the Parent Society, but expended by the State Society in such ways, that, under certain resolutions of the Directors, they might be claimed as a basis of representation. The "Statement" of the State Society omits the words "claimed by the State Society as a basis of representation," and thereby makes the passage read as if the whole referred to amounts received by the Parent Society "in cash."

If they had seen fit to deny the fairness of thus singling out the payments made "in cash" to the Parent Society, when the State Society had expended larger amounts by which the Parent Society had been benefitted, and which it had acknowledged, they might have made out a plausible argument, and the Secretary would have needed to show the propriety of the discrimination which he had made. But they choose to pursue a different course. They choose to say that his "allegation" was "simply untrue." They thus made it a question

of veracity, and bound themselves to prove that the amount received by the Parent Society from them, "in cash," and "since 1849," was not "less than \$12,000." To prove this, they quote acknowledgements of amounts received from the State Society since 1848, not since 1849. In not one of these acknowledgements is it said that the amount was "received in cash;" and, therefore, not one of them is admissible as evidence. In a large proportion of them, it is expressly stated that it was received otherwise than "in cash." The "Exposition" showed in what other way than "in cash" many of those amounts were received; and that the remainder of them, which may, or may not, have been "received in cash since 1849," amounted to only \$9116.13, being \$2883.87 "less than \$12,000." They now represent the "Exposition" as denying that those sums had been received at all, and assert that they all were "raised by the New York State Society and its officers, and paid to the American Society at Washington, or for its account at New York and Liberia." This, if perfectly correct, would not sustain their assertion that the Secretary's "allegation" was "simply untrue." But it is not perfectly correct. Two, at least, of the amounts were not paid "in cash" anywhere, but in orders for goods at Monrovia. Others were not paid to meet any liabilities of the Parent Society, as the phrase, "on its account," seems to imply; but were expended in the business of the State Society, and then reported to the Parent Society, and acknowledged in the Repository.

The facts concerning one of these items are so curious and instructive, as to demand particular notice.

The "Exposition" said, of \$1800 raised by Gerard Hallock, for the Rogers' slaves:—

"The money was handed to Rev. J. B. Pinney, May 10, to be paid to Mr. McLain, and was paid over the same day. It was never the property of the State Society, nor in its treasury, nor at its disposal."

This they deny. They say:—

"It was paid to the treasurer of the State Society, and by him through Dr Pinney transmitted to the American Society."

If this were true, it would not affect the conclusion. It would only show that the amount received by the Parent Society, in cash, since 1849, was only \$1083.87 "less than \$12,000," instead of being \$2883.87 less; and the Secretary's "allegation" would still be shown to be true. But was that money ever "paid to the Treasurer of the State Society?" Was it ever "by him transmitted" as alleged? Happily, the facts are ascertainable.

Mr Hallock began his efforts by an appeal in the "Journal of Commerce," of May 2, 1850. In the "Journal" of the next morning he announced six donations of \$100 each. May 4, \$900 had been

given ; May 6, \$1000 ; May 7, \$1100 ; May 9, \$1300 ; May 10, \$1500. May 11, he announced that the whole \$1800 had been raised, and paid over the day before. He annexed copies of two receipts. The first read :—“New York, May 10, 1850.—Received of Gerard Hallock, for the use of the American Colonization Society, eighteen hundred dollars,” &c. It was signed “J. B. Pinney, Cor. Sec., &c., &c.” Observe, he received the money, not from the Treasurer of the State Society, but from Gerard Hallock ; and not *for* the State Society, but for the American. The other receipt reads :—“New York, May 10, 1850.—Received of Rev. J. B. Pinney, Secretary of the New York State Colonization Society, eighteen hundred dollars, contributed by eighteen persons in New York,” &c. It is signed, “Wm. McLain, Sec. & Treas., A. C. S.” In all this, there is no reference to the Treasurer of the State Society, as there should and would have been, if the money had ever been in his hands. The documents show that it never was in his hands, but passed directly from the hands of Gerard Hallock to those of J. B. Pinney, and from his to those of William McLain. Besides this, the circumstances show that it was paid over without any vote of the Board of Managers, without which the Treasurer had no right to pay out any of the funds of the Society.

The very authority to which they refer as proof, contradicts their claim. They claim in their “Statement,” as acknowledged in the Repository, “Feb., June, July, \$7300.” Turning to “Feb.,” we read : “From the New York State Col. Soc., \$4000.” In “July,” we read : “Appropriation by the New York State Col. Soc.—\$1500.” And so, always, when money received from the State Society is acknowledged, it is acknowledged as received *from that Society*. The \$1800 in question was acknowledged in “June,” not as received from the State Society, but as received from eighteen donors, who are named. They themselves recognize this distinction in their official “Statement ;” for, immediately after their list of “moneys received from the Treasurer” of their Society, they subjoin a list of “legacies and donations” from various sources in the State of New York, not passing through their treasury. This \$1800 clearly belonged in this second list, and not in their first. The acknowledgement concludes with the words—“To the credit of the N. Y. Society ;” which would have been utterly inappropriate, if the money had been received from the treasury of Society ; but was perfectly appropriate when the money was paid by others, who desired that it should count to their “credit,” as a “basis of representation.”

One more proof. The N. Y. State Society, that year, published its receipts in the African Repository, about quarterly. In the Repository for August there is a list, headed—“Donations received at

the office of the Colonization Society of the State of New York, from May 1, to July 15, 1850." If this \$1800 was ever in their treasury it ought to appear on this list, as received May 10, the day on which Mr Hallock paid it to Mr Pinney, and he to Mr McLain. But it is not there. No sum is acknowledged as received that day. There is, May 8, "A Friend, \$10.00." The next is May 12, "Rev. G. Mather, \$10.00." And so the acknowledgements go on in regular order, through May and June, to July 10, "Buffalo—Jesse Ketchum, \$10.00;" and they are footed up, "\$221.10." Plainly, up to July 10, this \$1800 had not been received into their treasury. After that footing up we read:—"May 8—For Rogers' slaves, from eighteen donors, before reported, \$1800;" and then, "Total, \$2021.10." But this entry is not true. May 8, the money had not been raised. May 9, \$500 was wanting, and \$300 on the morning of May 10, the day on which the business was completed. It is not an entry made by the Treasurer at the time of the transaction, but a report made about two months afterwards by somebody who had no trustworthy memory of the facts.

The mode of payment was really as follows:—Mr. Hallock, May 10, gave Mr. Pinney his own check for the \$1,500 which he had in his hands that morning, and three checks of other persons, of \$100 each, for the three additional donations received that day. Mr. Pinney paid over those four checks to Mr. McLain that same day, May 10; and Mr. McLain deposited them, May 14, in the "Bank of Washington," where the deposit of those four checks is on record to this day.

Their assertion, therefore, that this money "was paid to the treasurer of the State Society, and by him through Dr Pinney, transmitted to the American Society," is conclusively shown to be contrary to the facts; and the statement which they expressly deny, viz., that the money was collected by Mr Hallock, handed by him to Mr Pinney, who paid it over to Mr McLain, and that it was never in the treasury of that Society, or at its disposal, is strictly true in every particular.

I notice their declaration that "the American Society has dissolved all possible friendly relations with the New York State Society, and compelled it to prosecute its work in such manner as it may deem the most judicious." After this declaration, I presume it will no longer claim to be "auxiliary to the American Colonization Society," as its Constitution declares that it "shall be." I do not find that their Executive Committee has power to annul that clause in their Constitution. Nor am I sure that the Society will ratify that annulment. If it should, I do not know how such a radical change in the essential character of the Society might affect its legal identity, and thus its

competency to hold its "invested funds." This they would do well to consider.

If they think that "the most judicious" manner in which that Society can "prosecute its work," is by such attacks on the American Society as they have been making for more than a year past, I think they misjudge. I think it would be more "judicious" for them to found their claims to public approbation and support on the merits of their own work, and not on the alleged demerits of others.

There are other matters for criticism in their *Tribune* article, but I have written quite enough for me. I have written some three times as much as I intended when I began, being tempted along by the inclination to give one point after another a thorough treatment. I wished to have such an exposition of certain matters in my letter-book, for future reference. If you find it worth keeping on file for a similar purpose, I shall be twice paid for the labor.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH TRACY.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 897 658 7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 897 658 7

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5