

E 449


.B53


Copy 2


LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00001745955







A
7
R E V I E W
OF
THE BISHOP OF OXFORD'S
COUNSEL TO THE AMERICAN CLERGY,
WITH REFERENCE TO
THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY.

ALSO
SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS
ON THE
RELATION OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO
TO THE INTERESTS OF THE COLORED CLASS.

5
BY
THE REV. PHILIP BERRY,
(Formerly of the Island of Jamaica,
A PRESBYTER OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN THE DIOCESE OF MARYLAND.

WASHINGTON:
WILLIAM M. MORRISON;
RICHMOND, DRINKER & MORRIS; BALTIMORE, JOS. ROBINSON;
PHILADELPHIA, HERMAN HOOKER; NEW YORK, STANFORD
& SWORDS; BOSTON, C. STIMPSON.

1848.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848, by the Rev. PHILIP
BERRY, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maryland.

☞ The ordinary address of the Author is, 23 Fayette Street, Baltimore.

REVIEW, ETC.

It is proposed to submit to the reader a notice of certain portions of a work by Bishop Wilberforce, — a History of the Protestant Episcopal Church,¹ — such portions as refer to the duties of American clergymen in relation to the institution of slavery. And in connection with it, we shall introduce some mention of a publication, by an American clergyman,² having reference to extraneous appeals in the same relation.

The Right Reverend author, above-named, has evinced throughout his pages such an interest in our country, as could not fail to enlist much personal regard on our part. The work to which we refer may be easily detached from its theological connection, by any mind interested in the past history of this country. Much of that past is therein compressed in a very judicious manner; and although the narrative is of direct ecclesiastical *purport*, it contains in fact a copious representation of measures and scenes, of national-historical importance, in the Anglo-Saxon settlement of this land. It is not our intention to review the work in general, our purpose in producing it

¹ "A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, by Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford." Burns: London.

² "North and South;" or Letters to the Hon. G. P. Marsh, by "A Northern Man with Southern Citizenship."*

* First published in the New York Courier and Inquirer, and afterwards in the form of a pamphlet for gratuitous circulation. 1848.

at present being no other than that of canvassing its reference to the subject of slavery — the authority, the congruity, and the likelihood of efficacy, to be reasonably associated with such a reference, in such a work, by such an author. At the same time, it is our disposition, equally as it is our duty, to do him the fullest personal justice. These objects shall be attempted in a straight-forward, unvarnished manner.

The work in question is unassuming in its literary aspect, aiming, in this particular, only at representation, and at a right direction of the historical spirit in its readers. If there be little manifestation of the best capacity of the writer, there is yet the music of tenderness in all his feelings whenever they appear. A writer of this character cannot fail of exciting among us that respect which must sorrow at the ill direction of his philanthropy and zeal.

On the Biblical doctrine of slavery, and on the question of its permission by the Christian institutes, (however politically exceptionable it may be,) and on the duties of clergymen in slave countries, as much has been said and written as ought, we think, to end controversy. The question before us at present is the authority or value of a judgment peculiarly British, on the position of *our* clergy with reference to the institution of slavery in the scenes of their spiritual oversight; that judgment, as ordinarily expressed, not differing from that of Bishop Wilberforce. However little importance may be allowed by the English to the moral philosophy of the South, yet, as we are the parties to determine the question in effect, it is with better grace that we of the South sit in judgment on the moral value of their national sentiment, and the weight of their authority, on this subject, than that they should assume that position in relation to us. We assume no greater judiciary importance, in this matter, than is forced on us. Not that we are unwilling to hearken to advice when proffered with courtesy by our neighbors. Only we claim the privilege of examining our advisers, inquiring into their competence as such, so far as this may appear from their past consistency and their present disinterestedness. And we cannot refrain from avowing, at this point, though in anticipation of the proofs we shall advance, the worthlessness of the English national sentiment, on the ques-

tion before us, so far as the government represents the nation, and the little confidence which the opinion and advice of any individual in England, may consequently expect from us with reference to the same.

Bishop Wilberforce — a worthy son of one who was as illustrious for true goodness as any public character that ever adorned humanity — has hereditary claim to the political position he occupies, which is the highest (we suppose) that can be conceded among those of corresponding sentiments. But the very consideration that such are his associations, materially diminishes his claim to be regarded as an *unprepossessed* counsellor.

Nor is the volume before us devoid of strongly apparent indication, that he is far from wanting in the rhetorical recourses of a partisan, whose scruples, that would be paramount in any other hour, are less obtrusive in the presence of an enthroned idea or fanatical purpose. Hear our author, in his preface : —

“On one other important point, a few words must here be added to the following pages. Throughout their course, the author has felt oppressed by the recurring question, how he ought to deal with those other religious bodies, by which the Protestant Episcopal Church in North America is so abundantly surrounded. To have entered into their history would, within the limits of this work, have been absolutely impossible; and yet, to confine himself to the history of one department only of the vast host which bears the Christian name, must of necessity give to his work a narrow and one-sided appearance. To escape this imperfection, he believes to have been unavoidable, and he has therefore submitted to it, writing the history, not of religion, but of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Only would he here protest against being supposed to entertain any intention of contemptuously passing by the many great deeds for Christ’s truth wrought in that western world by the members of other societies, or of pronouncing, by the way, a decisive judgment on any of the intricate questions to which the coexistence of these various bodies must give birth. He has dealt with them only as they directly affect that communion whose history he writes; and in doing so, he has endeavored to treat them honestly and fairly, although, from his limits, it must be slightly and imperfectly.”

Now, there is no Episcopalian, among those informed of passing events in the ecclesiastical world, who will affect, for an instant, ignorance of the reason that Bishop Wilberforce omitted the history of every denomination but the Episcopal. It was simply that he did not consider them as branches of the Church of Christ. Nor does he, in this flattering paragraph, even once commit himself so far as to call them *churches*, notwithstanding that some versatility as to designative resources seems to have been in exercise; for he calls them "religious bodies," — "departments of the vast host which bears the Christian name," — "members of other societies," — "various bodies." Indeed, in a remote part of the volume, where he is engaged in enforcing exclusive Episcopacy, he will allow "no faltering step swerving towards the sects around her." (p. 453). Yet he apprehends it to be expedient, that an apology be made to other denominations for not giving *their* history likewise! But — apart from *his* known exclusiveness — when an individual advertises his intention to present the history of a particular denomination of professing Christians, who in the world, of whatever sectarian shape, pretends to expect from him a history of other denominations? Who, for instance, in a professed history of the *Friends*, would look for a history of the *Baptists*, beyond such allusions as might grow out of the association or encounter of the one denomination with the other? And more, who, in writing a history of *his own* religious communion, (which, ordinarily, he is presumed to be more competent to undertake than that of another — in which latter enterprise he would be hardly ever sustained by the previous request or subsequent sanction of the members of such other society,) — who, in so doing, ever before considered an apology required for "confining himself" to his subject? Above all, when before did a High-Churchman confess, that so to confine himself "must of necessity give to his work a narrow" appearance, — or complain of having to "submit" to such "imperfection" as that of "writing the history, not of religion, but of the Protestant Episcopal Church"? A new thing indeed, for such an author to "feel oppressed by" this "recurring question"! It is true, this question is literally stated to be "how he ought to deal with other religious bodies." And certainly, if the issue had reference to

points of delicacy, where a trial of the feelings would be involved, it might well recur. But the *dealing* that is thus in question, is immediately afterwards explained to be merely whether or not he is to write a history of all the other denominations, "those other religious bodies by which the Protestant Episcopal Church in North America is so abundantly surrounded" — "the vast host which bears the Christian name"! Now all this apology, together with the compromising designation of "*intricate*," which he has conferred in a general way on the "questions to which the coexistence of these various bodies must give birth," had an aim far other than ecclesiastical or theological, properly such — albeit a moral and political aim that needed ecclesiastical instruments. This point is far from difficult of solution, particularly with the light incidentally reflected from the preceding paragraph, which claims "the use of the Church's moral influence in its" (the colored race's) "behalf." While, therefore, the Bishop of Oxford, as a Church historian, would sooner have seen other Churches to Jericho, than written their history collaterally with that of his own, yet, as if he thought to act on the principle, that

"All a rhetorician's rules
Teach nothing but to name his tools,"

he endeavors to leave it open to construction, that he acknowledges the equal Church-historical claims of the other religious bodies. He apparently hopes thus to remove a probable barrier to the recommendation of his ethical tenets (already of impressive patrimonial association¹) to the less exclusive ministry in the South, whenever converts to those tenets, within his own communion, should aim at the enlistment of other clergy, irrespective of religious creed, under the same banner. Furthermore, the chivalry of such is appealed to, on behalf of this crusade, by an allusion to "the many great deeds wrought in that western world by the members of other societies," which he graciously "entertains no intention of contemptuously passing by," — an earnest, we suppose, of the distinction

¹The late William Wilberforce was author of a religious work in high repute with all denominations of Christians.

that awaits them in some *future* history, if they will but adopt *professionally* the cause he has proposed to them.

What success this publication, invested with such characteristics, has met with, appears from the circumstance that its relation to the subject of slavery has alone prevented a reprint of it in this country. Independently however of any effect from it, it is a matter of fact — and the mention of it may be somewhat gratulatory to the Bishop — that there are, here and there in the South, clergymen who while they do not act on his recommendation to “declare” (p. 426 — he does not *say* “preach”) against slavery, and who do not avow the extent of their anti-slavery views, do nevertheless provide, when they can, against the settlement near them of such clergymen as are likely to converse influentially in defence of Southern institutions. Only they do it in an *esoteric* manner, of which the laity are unconscious. But if, as they believe, their duty really extends thus far, then unquestionably it extends even further. Nor can we reconcile with strict integrity the conjunction of a Southern official residence and enjoyment of the public confidence, with the exercise of an *unarrowed* pastoral influence against the fundamental institution of society, and that on ethical and religious grounds which likewise they *reserve*. Hear Saint Ambrose; — “Si pro otioso verbo reddimus rationem, videamus ne reddamus et pro otioso silentio” — (*De Offic. Minist.* lib. I. c. 3). There is indeed, as he adds, a “*negotiosum* silentium.” But he does not intend by this a darkly pragmatic deportment. Well might such parties ponder the plaint of Bishop Wilberforce, the allusion in which is primarily to their brethren in the North, — “it is time for martyrdom; and the mother of the saints has scarcely brought forth even one confessor” (p. 436); — again, *ad clerum* whether North or South, “there must be no timid silence as to great enormities” (p. 456); — and again, to the South, “What witness has as yet been borne by the Church in these States, against this almost universal sin? Has she fulfilled her vocation? She raises no voice against the predominant evil.” — In our private judgment, no clergyman ought to exercise his ministry in a slave State, if he considers himself to have any vocation, call it *pastoral* or *social*, over and above such as is ordinarily associated with his office in such a

community, without making it *understood* that such is the case.¹

We have depicted in some sort the apparent attitude of the Bishop of Oxford, in presenting himself to our clergy to instruct and counsel them as to their course on the slavery question. We shall next see what peculiar claims the *Church* represented by him, namely the *Church of England*, has to our special attention.

It might naturally be supposed that a Church, of which the members are continually pouring on us unqualified censure for our moral code, now that she has no longer any charge over us, had not failed to be a religious provider in times when it was her charge so to do. Let us see whether it was so!

In the Episcopal Church (which, on the present occasion, we only deal with as a society) it is a fundamental principle that the centre of organization, order, and mission, is the Episcopal office. In every age of Christendom, whenever that Church has established missions, intended to be permanent and diffusive, and not merely visitant, she has sent bishops — solely excepting that branch of it established in England, which has not cared to do so as a common thing, until of late. Contrast the period when a branch of that Church was first planted on this continent, with the period at which the Episcopate, deemed so essential on account of those ordinances of which it is the mainspring, was granted to her long entreating children in the west! The former measure was put into effect before the year 1620, while the latter was deferred until 1787 — nearly two centuries! Many circumstances too of the most romantic worth, resplendent in the history of the infant Church in Virginia, constituted a just claim for it to be the pet-daughter of any mother not unnatural in affections and deportment. Instance that chapter in her history, which weeps with pious joy over the names of Whittaker and Pocohontas. Witness the fidelity of “Old Dominion” to England’s ancient

¹ A highly esteemed minister in New England, Mr. Bushnell, says that “scarcely a missionary can be found to enter” the Southern States. We say in reply, that, let the Bishops or the congregations, in Virginia or Maryland, merely beckon to Northern and Western clergymen to go and live among them, and these are usually found to answer the summons to those States, as fast as the rail-cars can bring them.

government and Church, in the days of their utter prostration in the middle of the 17th century; also after the Restoration, when the first provision meditated, and the first one accomplished, by that State, was for the Church of England: nor was any measure omitted, by which its welfare could be advanced. Yet the Church of Virginia was not considered worth investing with a Diocesan form, and with its diocesan privileges!¹

In Maryland, the Church was associated with the State in 1692. The Clergy needed a head, and knowing how useless it would be to make application for a Bishop, "besought the Bishop of London to send them at least a Commissary" (an Ecclesiastical judge, in holy orders, but deriving from such office no augmentation of his spiritual powers). The selection made in compliance with this modest entreaty was indeed appropriate. Dr. Bray resigned the fairest professional prospects to sacrifice himself to this mission, and among his vigorous measures laid the foundation of two great missionary societies, which survive to this day, and are the only ones incorporated with the State — that for "Promoting Christian Knowledge," and that for the "Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." "What the results of such zeal might have been" (our author remarks) "if instead of being a delegated representative of a distant prelate, Dr. Bray had himself been appointed Bishop in Maryland, it is impossible to calculate. As it was, the efforts which depended wholly on his individual zeal, instead of springing ever fresh out of the system of the Church, scarcely outlived his own stay in Maryland; and this was necessarily short." It should be observed that, at this period, there were in Maryland not less than 30,000 members of that Church.

In the other Colonies likewise, the members of the established Church were not allowed the same chances of propagation that the other religious denominations had; for, without Bishops, the Episcopal Church *could* not present its various ordinances; while other Churches were

¹ To her misfortune as a daughter, has since been added as her portion, the retribution invoked by the ill conduct of the parent Church. For the secular power has, Assyrian-like, spoiled her of her glebelands, and even of her college. It was neglect in her early days that occasioned such conduct in "old Virginia."

independent of Episcopal institutions, except the Roman Catholic, which, whether it be a more wise or a more natural mother, or both, failed not in *her* spiritual provisions. What could the Church of England have cared for souls on these western shores, if she deserved from the Right Reverend author the charge, that "Only that communion which clave close to the Apostolic model was on all sides cramped and weakened — without the power of confirming the young, whilst it taught the young that there was a blessing in the very rite which it withheld from them — without the power of ordination, whilst it maintained that it was needful for a true succession of the priesthood" (p. 144). To this charge the learned prelate adds illustrations of the spiritual famine which the members of that Church in these colonies were compelled to endure, while "year after year their lamentations and entreaties crossed the Atlantic." "Letters and memorials from the colonies supply, for a whole century, a connected chain of such expostulations: yet still the mother country was deaf to their entreaties" (p. 149). We will not detain the reader over the multiplied proofs of this state of suffering in an infant Church, indicted by a parent that would neither feed it, nor leave it free to provide for itself. The representation must be too heart-sickening to any humane reader, however inimical he may be to the Episcopal Church, and however imaginary (as to others may appear) the wants of the sufferers in question. Crying as they did for many a tedious generation in the ears of a mother that would neither "visit," nor "confirm" (in her own sense of the term), nor "bless" her children in the wilderness, it is obvious to the lights of philosophy the least pretending, that, in a subjective sense at least, these were necessities of an extreme character.

It has been indeed the policy of the Church of England to shift such responsibility on the State with which she is united. But she is herself morally and spiritually responsible for any sins of omission which the State leads her to commit. For there can be no compulsion to them, or excuse for them, in any portion of the people of God. If the State would not comply with a recommendation or petition, that it would command or permit the Church to "feed the hungry" with spiritual provision, the Church should have done it, and willingly incurred all consequences. It was,

in fact, *her* business, by whatever contract she may have devolved it on the State.

We must not, however, leave the reader under an impression that the State never *talked* of taking measures of the nature required by the Churches in the colonies, and that she never was *about to act* — Oh, no! All was to have been accomplished in the time of Charles the Second; “but a change of ministers cut short the scheme.” Then again, “Queen Anne’s accession promised better things, and in her reign the project was heartily resumed” (p. 153). “Preparations were made, etc. . . . till” —? — “the queen’s death”! and so through the several reigns, until the year 1787. All was granted, after political events had severed the daughter Church from the authority of the parent; and then, the first blessing was not from the mother at parting, but from a comparative stranger, poor, but hospitable¹ — the Episcopal Church of Scotland. That Church had been incapacitated from so doing previously, owing to the circumstance that these colonies were parts of an English diocese, that of London. For the members of the same communion in Scotland being non-conformists in their own quarter of the British dominions, any interposition on their part — even for the performance of a manifest missionary duty — would have been regarded as rebellious.

After an examination of this historical picture, candidly exhibited by the Bishop of Oxford — not a scene relating to a brief period, be it observed, but one which comprises long tedious ages — who can marvel if we call in question the expediency of English Churchmen offering to instruct the Ministry of the American Churches, in their official duty with reference to institutions in their own country?

It is but justice to the subject to remark on the manner in which the members of the English Ecclesiastical body have arrived at their present stand-point with reference to slavery. We repeat, that, as all are aware, the English Church, *as such*, has not taken any position in that relation. But it is not less true that allusion is frequently

¹ “Such as I have, give I thee” (St. Peter) — “Lift up the hands which hang down” (St. Paul). — The Church of England, however could not lift up *her own* hands to bless other Churches without an order from the prime minister.

made to the subject, in public and elsewhere, by her members, lay and clerical, who, on the very ground of their Christian profession, assert it to be their duty to brand the system. It is however at best a veering position that English Ecclesiastics, for the most part, have occupied on the *morale* of slavery. They have simply followed the national movements. When the West India colonial interests were in the ascendant, they were, like the Aristocracy, eminently conservative on the subject of those interests. One strong ground for the position maintained, was the exposure of the interests of other proprietary classes (such as the Church and the Aristocracy) to aggression, if those of the Planters were sacrificed. Their own slave-system however being abolished, and their colonial interests being prostrated, that position became no longer of any consequence to them. They therefore joined in the popular movement. This movement was all along conducted by the spirits of Exeter Hall, who, with "horns as lambs, and speaking as dragons," were permitted to reign paramount, the Government having sold the colonies to them for a consideration.

Nor can we omit to notice the immoral developments that have attended the tyranny over their colonies by the people of England. The British people have herein proved themselves to be far from trust-worthy advisers, whether morally or politically, with regard to anti-slavery movements. It was to be expected that, having abolished slavery, they would do their utmost to procure, as a result, the development of a state of things favorable to the character of the newly ordered *regime*, and to the interests of the proprietary class. Yet it is matter of fact, that the British public and the State have, ever since the abolition of slavery, been pursuing the course best calculated to impress the world with the inexpediency of placing any confidence in their philanthropic professions. Had their object been no other than that of dissuading from anti-slavery principles, they could not well have adopted a different course towards their colonies. The agents of the Home-government, and of the national combination against the Western colonial interests, were ordinarily as unscrupulous creatures as could be found. They appear to have been commissioned to render the free system a

failure, for fear it might not contain within itself a suicidal principle. It was one of their systematic pursuits to create as much alienation as they could between the proprietary body and the newly emancipated population. The conduct of these agents, in its worst exhibitions, was commended and encouraged. And were it ever disclaimed, how could one reply but —

“Quid domini faciant, audent cum talia fures”?

To shew what the Government would do, and that, even as the greater contains the less, the character of those who administered it, included the worst qualities of their servants, it is only necessary to refer to a colonial complaint — never contradicted so far as our knowledge extends — that a fourth part of the compensation-money voted on the abolition of slavery, was never paid, either to the colonists individually, or into the colonial treasuries, which latter were the proper receptacles for it, in case of inconvenience in a second distribution. One pretext for this repudiation was the cost to the Government of maintaining its official agents for the administration of the abolition law! Yet this administration, so called, was treated as unfaithful, and was almost sure to procure censure or dismissal, for the stipendiary-justices, if they decided in favor of a white man in their comparatively private courts; their decisions being sent to the Government for approbation or censure.

The general policy of England towards her West India colonies has been such, that there is but one way in which it admits of explanation, in congruity with the laws of thought and association; namely, that, foreseeing she is destined to the loss of her possessions on this side of the Atlantic, she desires to render them valueless to any other possessor. This, we repeat, is the only construction that seems to be at all consistent with the intelligence or common sense of the British Government, while there is *no* construction favorable to its morality. It is remarkable that a people so comparatively moral, in other respects, as the English are, should perpetrate — not for once, or occasionally, but for a long unintermitting period, so great an amount of wanton injustice to their loyal colonists. The only conspicuous act, at all creditable to them, was that single one by which slavery was abolished through-

out their empire. On this subject, Mr. Tupper¹ has remarked;—"We, with the best intentions, have utterly blundered the whole business; we have ruined our West Indies by unprepared emancipation." With humility it is that we dissent from Mr. Tupper. We are not of opinion that the blacks were unprepared for freedom. They had, through slavery to the white man, attained a high degree of civilization, relatively speaking; and the proper period had in fact arrived for their liberation. But all the ill effects that would have belonged to prematurity, *have* followed from the most unprincipled administration of the colonies that could have been carried out. It is not the blacks that are to be blamed for the downfall of the colonies. Whatever their defects, their conduct has, under the ill influences at work, surpassed the general expectation. The success of the free system has been perversely stifled by the British Government and people.

It is fair to introduce the Bishop of Oxford's apologies for former derelictions of her duty, by the Church of which he is a chief officer:—

"On the subject to which he here especially refers, namely, the treatment of the colored race, the use of the Church's moral influence in its behalf is that which alone he would claim. And this claim he advances under an humbling source of the past deficiencies of members of his own communion. Still, it must be urged, that they were afar from the sight, and therefore from the real knowledge, of the evils of colonial life. Those evils would not have been endured, had they been daily submitted to the eyes of the laity and clergy of the English Church." (*Pref.*)

The manner in which the clergy and laity are combined, and almost identified, in the above paragraph, sustains further our view relative to the propriety of representing, in the manner we have done, the English Ecclesiastical body in certain attitudes towards this question.—As regards the substance of these apologetic sentences, we have to affirm, in reply, that ministers of that communion resided in the colonies, held slaves, and were

¹ Author of *Proverbial Philosophy*.

far better judges of the matters at issue, from "sight," and from "real knowledge," than their brethren at a distance. If indeed these were evils that ought not to have "been endured," then we need no further evidence of the extent to which they have been coincided with, by those "clergy of the English Church," to whose "eyes" they were "daily submitted." We cannot, in this connection, withhold a reference to the singular way in which clerical sentiment and public morality in the colonies was to be rectified. It was seemingly presumed that persons of any description in the mother country were good enough to be examples for the colonists. Selections for this purpose were most commonly made without reference to character — and yet, in a certain sense, with too much reference to it! — their ill-qualification for English society being apparently assumed to be indicative of their providential calling to go to the colonies, — being likewise the more ready tools for the perpetration of injustice, as was remarkably proved in the dismal period (morally and politically such) which immediately succeeded the abolition of slavery. Of this licentious class was the very first Bishop sent, only so recently as in the year 1823, to the principal colony in the British West Indies. The name of this man was used in England in attestation of the instant success of the free system. He was so far ready for the use of the government, that, in a very few weeks after the Act of Emancipation was passed, and while ruin knocked at the planter's door, he addressed a communication to the government, in which he stated, conformably with the known wishes of the government, that the result of emancipation was such as to "encourage and animate the good, and to confound and disappoint the bad." This communication was not omitted in a volume entitled "Extracts from papers printed by order of the House of Commons," which extracts, of a one-sided character, were picked and published "by authority," as notified on the title-page. And whenever inquiry is made what this man was, who thus represented in chief those Clergy of the English Church, for whom the Bishop of Oxford, with so much innocent confidence, apologizes, one can only learn that he was a libertine, and that he permitted and even encouraged libertinism among such of his clergy as would avail themselves of the connivance; and was never more

irritated than against those who protested, or preferred complaints, against such of them. We may be told by Bishop Wilberforce that *these* evils likewise “would not have been endured had they been duly submitted to the eyes of the laity and clergy of the English Church.” But it was proved in the case of this man, as in the case of others, that so long as a colonial official *sent from England* to hold his office, took his *diableries* with him, they did not disqualify him for his colonial station in the estimation of British authority.¹ Such points as these, though more fit to be buried, are here alluded to as belonging properly to the present historical argument. It may indeed be concluded from them, that it is far from being a settled point that the mission of Bishops to these States, if undertaken by the British Government at any period antecedently to the present one, would have been

¹Nor is it always essential to the philanthropists of England that vile persons sent to the colonies should remain there. For if such persons could crusade against the colonies with more effect at home than in the colonies, their greater approximation to a reprobate state would render them the more acceptable tools. This is strikingly exemplified in the case of a Dr. Palmer, once Editor of the *British Emancipator*, a London paper. He had been one of the special justices (or stipendiary magistrates) before alluded to as appointed for the administration of the Abolition-law. When, for misconduct, he was removed from his office by the Marquis of Sligo, then Governor of Jamaica, himself a hot abolitionist, the English Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Glenelg* (a professor of religion) reinstated him; which contributed to Lord S.’s resignation. The next Governor, Sir Lionel Smith, not less affected as a friend to the blacks, did not hesitate to remove this incendiary the second time. He was then employed by Mr. Sturge and others, as editor of the paper above-mentioned. At a public meeting for the purpose of concerting measures of injury to the colonists (though slavery had ceased) a native of Jamaica ascended the platform, and exposed, to his face, this Dr. Palmer, for having deserted and refused all protection and support to his own daughter, a colored girl. The gentleman who thus exposed him was Mr. William Smith, now Director of the Northern and Central Bank of England, who had proved his own real interest in the blacks, by subscribing, for their educational use, all the compensation-money he had received for his liberated slaves, though he was not a rich man. But, for all this exposure Dr. Palmer was none the worse. Nor was he regarded by his faction as a less suitable person to instruct the world in its moral duties towards colonists.

* A brother of the excellent Sir Robert Grant, who was author of the 160th hymn in the liturgy of the American Episcopal Church — a very favorite hymn with its members.

matter of congratulation ; although we are sincere in the expression of our belief that, in the new era of Archbishop Sumner and Bishop Wilberforce, bad appointments are almost morally impossible.

A further apology, from the respected prelate whose work is before us, is presented in the following passage : " To an Englishman, this silence " (that is, of the Southern Clergy) " is the more eminently matter of the deepest pain, because he will at once admit that to his own people belongs the origin of that guilt in which the Church and nation of America are now entangled. So little has our colonial empire been administered on those principles for which our Church has witnessed, that England forced on her reluctant colonists the curse and crime of slave-holding institutions. Against remonstrance and resistance from the West, England thrust upon them this clinging evil. Freely do we take the shame of having first begun this course of crime ; but the sense of this only makes us desire more earnestly that, through the blessing of that pure faith, which also she received from us, this guilt may be removed." (p. 436).

This ingenuous confession is one in which, to our regret, we cannot credit many English Churchmen with much participation. They " wipe their mouths and say, ' we have done nothing.' " Not only so, but they glorify themselves, as if their freedom from the evil was of very ancient date, and revile our slave-holders, without the admission of any qualifying or extenuating circumstances, as if it were *not* the fact that the British Government grafted the institution of slavery into our social system, and forced the slave-trade on this country, in spite of repeated opposition from the latter.

Even now, while England asperses this country on account of the engagement of some of its citizens *abroad*, or at least of some American vessels, in the slave-trade, who are they that fill those very vessels with cargoes, for the express purpose of carrying on a barter for slaves on the coast of Africa ? Who, but British merchants ? Mr. Wise, our Consul at Rio, has called the attention of the British Government most urgently to the fact, and entreated it to aid his own Government in complying with the solicitations of the former, which it is prevented from doing through the obstructions opposed by British subjects.

We hope to have shewn that neither the English Church nor the English people, nor any representative of either, has any special claim to attention from our clergy — or even that claim to it which any other quarter might pretend — with reference to the subject of slavery.

In the pamphlet on “North and South,” named on the first page, a degree of reflection and discrimination that would have been impracticable in remote *longitudes*, has been applied to a question which seems to have busied men the more as they have less understood it.

The author is a Puritan, by descent, and in all the early associations of his life, as is discernible in his very style of writing. Its pithiness and arch gravity are striking. The Bible is his only book for literary quotation, whether for wisdom or wit, whether he quotes to impress others with seriousness, or to produce a smile. The physiognomy of his literature is in keeping with the cut of the man in other respects. He is all puritan; such that almost any one who has read his pamphlet, hardly needs to have seen him to depict him satisfactorily — not omitting those shaggy eye-brows, that, if approached by a not more imposing instrument than a whisker-comb, to be tended thereby, would probably repay the presumption with stubborn inflexibility. One may fancy such a person as scarcely liable to be ever called upon to adduce further testimony of his unmixed puritan descent, were the fact in requisition. You see, and believe. Any sort of *habeas-corpus* applied to *him*, brings into court the whole race of the Puritans. He is hardly a man of letters, but of much discrimination. His pages, which are few, compress an extensive sphere of original observations. To those who, ill acquainted with their own latitude, occupy themselves in defining that of others, it imparts much to lessen that ill acquaintance, and not a little to check or rectify that occupation. We commend it to those who concern themselves with the politics of the South. To these remarks a qualification is due, in that we cannot concur in his position (quoting *memoriter*, and therefore probably not with literal exactness) — “That God is pledged to sustain this Union, I find no-where written; but that he is pledged to sustain slavery, I find written. You may therefore abolish the Union; but you cannot abolish

slavery." — The circumstance that this writer is a clergyman, combined with the topics to which he has addressed himself, have suggested this notice of his pamphlet, as being due to an argument on the relations of the Bishop of Oxford and the American Clergy.

As a Supplement to the foregoing remarks, we propose some observations on kindred points of present interest.

It is due to themselves, that the people of this nation should not lose sight of their providential agency in the regeneration, thus far, of the African race. There is reason to hope that our Colonization of portions of Africa with descendants of her own sons, will, under the blessing of God, diffuse very extensive moral effects; and that by such reaction upon that soil, we shall more than compensate the sable race for the spoils committed by our forefathers. Their reduction to slavery is but the womb of divinely cherished destinies, yet unborn. And that institution, *just so far as* it is an evil, has been but a burial, in order to a resurrection as from a fertile grave. Many are the nations that have reaped of the African's toil. And this country is as yet alone in yielding the recompense. We say *alone*—for we cannot admit the measures of Great Britain to be of that nature, inasmuch as their attendant circumstances are sources of manifest discouragement to the adoption of them by others. She is entitled to credit, as having set the example of emancipation, but not as furnishing motives to the imitation of it.

Nor will the present writer withhold his views of the destiny of his African brethren, in certain collateral bearings.

The extension of our territory to the South is one of the best natural guaranties for the advancement of that race — obstructive "provisos" to the contrary notwithstanding. It will attract the tide of colored population to its appropriate latitude, one which is experimentally the most favorable for its development, physically and intellectually; and thus it lays an additional foundation

for their progressive civilization, should the privilege of self-government become theirs. Truly we see little of any thing like self-government in free black communities. But we confidently account for it, in the absence of one of the two almost indispensable (as it seems to us) conditions of their advancement — namely, a Southern climate, and an ascendant white population. The idea of an ascendant white population in the same country with a black one, may appear to nullify the idea of a self-governing black population. But to speak of the self-government of a certain class of people, is not inconsistent with the supposition of their association with another class under the same rule, with equal rights. We are far from excluding the prospect of a community of blacks preserving order among themselves and diffusing their own light among others. They are a race well susceptible of the principles of organization, and have no inconsiderable capacity for communicative impress. But they are singularly defective in energy. They can govern themselves in a perpetual childhood: but beyond such a state of things they are unlikely ever to advance, unless they occupy their soil in common with the white race.

Whether the legislative adoption of a *proviso*, such as is that now before Congress, will hasten or defer the period for the extinction of slavery is doubtful. It will make but little difference either way. The tendency of it is to interfere with the course marked out as that of the apparent natural destiny, as well as with the interest, of the Anglo-Africans. Allusion has been already made to the advantage of their freedom arriving, when they shall be settled in a climate favorable for their physical and mental development. We have no hesitation in protesting against their having been ever settled in a latitude north of Charleston. Those who have observed the modifications of their features and faculties in the different latitudes, from the tropics to Canada, will probably concur in this very decided conclusion. It therefore does not evince a due consideration of, or at all events much acquaintance with, their well-being, individual and social, to arrest a course of events so promising in their results. When once the middle States have added themselves to the area of free-soil, as they anticipate doing — and as they would immediately do, could they exchange their colored slave

population for a free white one, then the question as to the preferable nature of free-labor in all respects will soon suggest itself to the line of States immediately south of those mentioned, and will gain ground as it has done in these, even until the same consequences shall there result. And such will no doubt be the case with the States still further south. On the other hand, by arresting this natural course of events, whenever the abolition of slavery takes place in those southern States which adjoin the free northern States — which event is not likely so soon to occur under these circumstances as under the other — those States can hardly escape ruin. For white laborers will not be found in adequate number, where there is a large black population. And it is found by experience, that the indigence threatened by a climate in which winter of any severity alternates with summer, does not impel the African, as might be expected, to labor the more. Slave-laws will then probably be exchanged only for poor and vagrant laws. The slave as he is, though *individually* fit for freedom, is not *socially* so in the climates now in question. And prove what you may on behalf of abstract political right, it can go for little — nor ought it to go for more — if the ruin of society is to be, too probably, the consequence of its concession.

The proper question now before society in this department of politics, is, in what way can the best practicable combination of Northern and Southern policy be developed, for the benefit of the African now on our soil, without injury to the whites occupying the same soil.

None need think of diminishing slavery by circumscribing its present area. Southern society may be considered as having the possession, or at least the command, of the newly acquired territories. To give effect to the Wilmot proviso, would require a Wilmot army — at least all the population of Pennsylvania, to settle those portions of them which are the confines of the present slave-holding States. It might *possibly* be, that such a settlement would serve as a wall — not remarkably thick either — along the new territories. Imagine however for the moment (if we may be allowed to suppose a marvel) that such a movement for such an object were to take place, — that all, or any portion of, the Pennsylvania population were to undertake a colonization of the territories, with no other view

than that of investing the soil with free settlements at once. Suppose them to have started, and to be now on the boundary between the soil of free labor and that of slavery, on their route. What would a well-wisher of civilization say to them on meeting them there? So far as we can represent such an individual, he would thus express himself; — “Cross the line by all means, but remain among us; you are the very people we want. And there are six objects which you can accomplish by so doing; — first, you will promote free labor by introducing it here; secondly, you will extend Northern influences, institutions, and habits; thirdly, you will benefit *us*, by the application of your industry to our soil, it being more efficient than that of blacks; fourthly, you will benefit *yourselves*, by placing in our reach the convenience of parting with our slaves, in disposing of whom we shall obtain the means of embarking more extensively in industrial projects and improvements, and consequently of engaging the labor of greater numbers; fifthly, you will benefit the *slave*, inasmuch as we shall send him to a more congenial climate; and lastly, the cultivation of the new territories will be commenced, by settling them at once with our colored laborers, who are more adapted to those climates than whites.” We have supposed the occasion for such an expostulation, in order to illustrate more forcibly the bearings of the position we have taken, with reference to the proviso.

Repeating the assertion, that you cannot hem in slavery — and adding to it this further assertion, that you would not hasten its progress to an extinction, if you *could* hem it in — it is worth while to point to the prospective result of the passage of the proviso. It will probably be this; — While it will not prevent extensive slave settlements in the new territories, the fact of its being illegal will have the effect of lessening the encouragement to emigration thither; and thus, there will be slavery, slavery, slavery, at *both* ends of the vast area in question — both that which it is desired to free, and that which it is an object to preserve freed, from it.

Slavery can be gradually abolished with advantage, only by the extension of the area of freedom *from the north directly southward*, through the natural course of self-working events, as they now bear. The only artificial

intervention, should be that of giving an impulse to this natural bearing. This may be effected by sending the colored people south as soon as you can, whether they be bond or free. To the latter there is indeed an untoward obstacle just now; for, owing to the present relations, as to sentiment, between the North and the South, free colored people are discouraged from living in most parts of the South, and from some states are excluded by law. But in the event of a *combined* project for a *common* end, founded on a consideration of the destiny and interest of the *blacks* — even if the collateral interests were to be left to take their own course, and to abide their time — in such an event, the unlimited movements of the free colored man, would be a necessary and not difficult article.

It should be marked that, in speaking of the substitution of a white population for a black one in some States, such arrangement has reference chiefly to the climate, in which the latter are inefficient as *free* members of society. Besides which, it may be observed, that in the warm climates, which suit these, the repugnance of *caste* is not as great — a providential circumstance, where they are the only laborers to be obtained. And the circumstance is occasioned by the superiority of the branches of this race in the latter climes to those in the former. In the capacity of *laborers*, the freed West-Indians have not had fair play. The people of England, who set them free, have allowed them but a poor chance to prove their tendencies; that people having been too much bent on their *anti-colonial* crusade, to attend to the real interests of the emancipated population. Not that they ceased to talk about them. They constantly had this class in their mouths — but only as men of straw, whose interest was fabulously set forth against that of the colonial proprietors, in the manufacture of public sentiment and national measures. In persecuting the proprietors almost from off the face of the earth, they have deprived the blacks of the means of rising in that scale in which the state of slavery gave them their first lift. Their influence on the evolution of the free system has been most untoward.

The apparent destiny of the English West India islands is, that they will either sink to the condition of Hayti, under the government of Great Britain; or, if they are to have a chance of prosperity, be confederated under

an administrative colonization or African society, or become annexed to the United States. In the last mentioned case, they would have, of course, their own state governments derived from their own mixed suffrage, as at present, or as they may choose to alter it; for they cannot now or henceforward, be otherwise peaceably governed. In the midst of any prospects of this nature that we indulge in, we must not omit, as pre-eminently above all others, the benefits that are in store for Africa, through the emancipated family in the West Indies, which we trust will one day be pliant to the influences of our "Colonization" or other African societies that may then be in existence.

Thus will God's dispensation of the lot of the enslaved African be made manifest, and justified before men. We have remarked on the benefit to African civilization from servitude to the white man; by which we mean, that association with the white man, which slavery alone could bring about and sustain, in the originally degraded condition of the African. But while this dispensation has been for the benefit of one race, it has been to the stagnation, and even to the backward movement of the other. But is it slavery, *in itself*, that has produced this effect on that white population which is supported by the institution? It is contended to be so, on account of the state of inactivity observable in the slaveholding countries of the Western hemisphere. It is commonly supposed that this inactivity is occasioned by a state of dependence on slaves. But it may be asked whether, in those older countries that are not deficient in energy, people above the menial order work more for themselves than people in our Southern States? They do it in a far less degree. The influence in question is demonstrably not that of slavery *per se*. If the colored population of the South were all free, there would be the same lassitude of purpose, and dilatoriness in action, the same mental inactivity, in the ordinary Southerner. It is owing to the circumstance that those on whom he depends for service, are characterized by these qualities.¹ In the West Indies,

¹ Consequently, *no* country in which the labor is performed mainly by blacks — though they may be the most suitable laborers, according to its latitude — can grow like one in which it is otherwise.

it has the effect of producing constant excitement of feeling, without mental activity. In our Southern States, owing to superior *domestic* influences, this excitement is not very extensively characteristic. The slave-owner quietly makes up his mind that he cannot push anything, and that therefore he will not be pushed himself. He thus acquires a habit of indifference to the state of things around him, and will rarely bestir himself to effort on any behalf whatever. The state of things in such countries being consequently retrograde, it must sooner or later reach its termination. For it is the law of history, that nations which do not advance, shall one day cease.

The less interfered with is our own slavery by extraneous influences, the less danger there is of prematurity. The South must have its time, however tardy it may seem, as in the case of almost every matter, political or private. It will yet do what is for the good of every class, at the time recommended by the apparent schemes of Providence. But let no man, or body of men from without, think that by thwarting the interests of the South, they can hasten that period. Could they effect anything, it would be but an artificial prematurity. How well is the position of those, who in feeling, though *not* in *vocation*, are concerned in the course of events in the South, defined by Governor Coolidge, in his last message to the Legislature of Vermont; — “Humbly following, not running before, the indications of the designs of the Infinite Mind herein, they may trustfully abide the issues.”

Brattleboro' Springs, Vermont,
November, 1848.





