

REVIEW
OF
PAMPHLETS
ON
SLAVERY AND COLONIZATION.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE
Quarterly Christian Spectator,
FOR MARCH, 1833.

SECOND SEPARATE EDITION.

New-Haven:
PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY A. H. MALTBY.

BOSTON—PIERCE AND PARKER.

.....
Printed by Baldwin & Ellis.
.....

1833.

CAGE

E448

B12

1833

Thoughts on African Colonization ; or an Impartial Exhibition of the Doctrines, Principles, and Purposes of the American Colonization Society. Together with the Resolutions, Addresses, and Remonstrances of the Free People of Color, &c. By WM. LLOYD GARRISON. Boston: 1832.

A Letter to Thomas Clarkson, by JAMES CROPPER. And Prejudice Vincible : or the Practicability of conquering prejudice by better means than by slavery and exile ; in relation to the American Colonization Society. By C. STUART, &c. Liverpool : 1832.

The American Quarterly Review, No. XXIII, September, 1832, Article VIII. Abolition of Negro Slavery.

SLAVERY AND COLONIZATION.

A FEW months ago, we gave some account of Mr. William Lloyd Garrison's Address to the people of color, and especially of the objections urged in that document against the American Colonization Society. The present work is a reiteration of the same objections in a more expanded form, with more vehemence and abusiveness of manner, with more numerous and striking demonstrations of unusual self-respect, and with an imposing show of what the uninformed or inconsiderate reader would regard as testimony, in support of his various allegations. We do not propose, therefore, to examine all the counts of his dreadful indictment in detail; showing what is the truth in the instances in which he has propounded error; it is enough to refer the intelligent and candid reader to our former article.* All that we intend in respect to Mr. Garrison's ponderous pamphlet is, to offer a few critical remarks tending to show the character of his performance, and the danger of resting with implicit confidence on his representations of even plain matters. We have to do, in this article, with Mr. Garrison's method of reasoning; and we shall defend the institution which he has assailed, only so far as it may be defended by the exposure of some of his sophistries.

The allegations of this book against the American Colonization Society, as distinctly and formally set down, in so many sections, are the following.

I. "The American Colonization Society is pledged not to oppose the system of slavery;" or, as we read the running title of the section, it "is not hostile to slavery;" or, as it is expounded in another instance, it "is solemnly pledged not to interfere with the system of slavery, or in any manner to disturb the repose of the planters;" or, to turn to another paragraph, it "pledges itself not only to respect the system of slavery, but to frown indignantly upon those who shall dare to assail it."

II. "The American Colonization Society apologizes for slavery and slaveholders." That is—if we read aright—it "exonerates the supporters of the slave system from reprehension."

III. "The American Colonization Society recognizes slaves as property." "This recognition," says the accuser, "is not merely technical, or strictly confined to a statutable interpretation." [Pray, what is "a statutable interpretation" of a recognition?]" "I presume," he proceeds, "the advocates of the society will attempt to evade this point, by saying that it never meant to concede the moral right of the masters to possess human beings; but

* Christian Spectator, June, 1832, pp. 324—333.

the evidence against them is full and explicit. The society, if language mean any thing, does unequivocally acknowledge property in slaves to be as legitimate and sacred as any other property, of which to deprive the owners either by force or by legislation without making restitution, would be unjust and tyrannical."

IV. "The American Colonization Society increases the value of slaves." "Thus" it "is the *apologist*, the *friend*, and the *patron* of SLAVEHOLDERS and SLAVERY."

V. It "is the enemy of immediate abolition."

VI. It "is nourished by fear and selfishness." Its "governing motive is fear—undisguised, excessive fear." "The principal object avowed for the removal of the free people of color, is, their corruptive and dangerous influence over the slave population." "Throughout all the speeches, addresses, and reports in behalf of the society, it is confessed, in language strong and explicit, that an irrepressible and agonizing fear of the influence of the free people of color, over the slave population is the primary, essential, and prevalent motive for colonizing them on the coast of Africa—and not, as we are frequently urged to believe, a desire simply to meliorate their condition and civilize that continent."

VII. "The American Colonization Society aims at the utter expulsion of the blacks." Its "implacable spirit is most apparent in its determination not to cease from its labors, until our whole colored population be expelled from the country." It "expressly denies the right of the slaves to enjoy their freedom and happiness in this country."

VIII. It "is the disparager of the free blacks." "The leaders in the African colonization crusade, seem to dwell with a malignant satisfaction upon the poverty and degradation of the free people of color, and are careful never to let an opportunity pass without heaping their abuse and contempt upon them."

IX. "The American Colonization Society denies the possibility of elevating the blacks in this country." In the running title, this accusation is thus expressed, "The American Colonization Society prevents the instruction of the blacks." In the course of the illustration it is explained thus, "The society prevents the education of this class, in the most insidious and effectual manner, by constantly asserting that they must always be a degraded people in this country, and that the cultivation of their minds will avail them nothing."

X. "The American Colonization Society deceives and misleads the nation." This means, as we understand it, after a careful examination of the illustration and argument, not only that the hopes inspired by the establishment of the colony are delusive, and operate to divert the public mind from other and more efficient undertakings; but also that the society, knowingly and intentionally imposes on the public by false representations of plain matters of fact.

These are the charges. The author does not regard one of them as light or trivial. His style and language show that, in every section, he considers himself as imputing great criminality to somebody. He is not merely exposing the error of attempting to colonize Africa with free people of color from America; he is charging crime upon a great multitude of persons.

Against whom then are these charges preferred? Whom does the accuser mean by the American Colonization Society? Does he mean merely the managers and executive officers of the institution, at Washington? Does he mean those individuals only, who habitually act and vote at the annual meetings in the Capitol? Or does he use the title, "Colonization Society," to designate the great body of the friends and supporters of the African colony of Liberia? We are constrained to adopt the latter construction. We cannot but suppose that when, in this pamphlet, he accuses "the American Colonization Society," he understands himself, and wishes to be understood by his readers, as bringing charges against the self-same persons, whom in his former pamphlet he accused, in nearly the same words, under the names of "colonizationists" and "supporters of the African scheme."

Yet it is not without some reason, some final cause, that in the present instance the object of attack is designated by another name. In the address to the people of color, the simple object was to prejudice their minds invincibly against the influence of a certain class of philanthropic individuals, namely those who in any manner befriend the African colony; and therefore the orator spoke of the "doctrines, principles, and purposes of *colonizationists*." In the work now under review, the object is to prejudice the public at large, against any participation in the enterprise of colonizing Africa; and therefore the writer represents these "doctrines, principles, and purposes," as part and parcel of the American Colonization Society. The obvious scope and design of the whole book, is to make the readers feel, that they cannot support the enterprise of the American Colonization Society, without supporting, and virtually subscribing, all these opinions and principles. Here, then, is the first and leading fallacy of Mr. Garrison's indictment, a fallacy which we presume has imposed upon his mind, as we know it has imposed upon the minds of some others, more intelligent and coolheaded than he. Admitting, for the present, the perfect fairness of all the quotations in this book, admitting that the author has succeeded in fastening upon colonizationists, as he calls them, a mass of opinions and principles which deserve unqualified reprobation; what has this to do with Liberia, and the voluntary migration of colored people to the country of their ancestors? The opinions, speeches, essays, and professions of colonizationists, are one thing; and colonization itself, is another thing. The American Colonization So-

ciety has nothing to do with any man's opinions. It is no more a society for the propagation of particular doctrines respecting slavery, or respecting the capabilities, rights, and injuries of the people of color, than the Bank of the United States is a society for the propagation of particular doctrines respecting currency. Like the Bible Society, it asks no man what he believes; it sets forth no confession of faith to be subscribed by its friends. Like the Bible Society, it holds up the single definite work which it proposes to perform, and asks for nothing but co-operation. The only point of union which connects so many persons in that "combination," as Mr. Garrison calls it, is this, they all agree to co-operate in promoting the colonization of Africa, by the emigration of free people of color from America. Among them all, not one can be held responsible for the opinions, political or religious, of any other. We count it a privilege to number ourselves among the friends and supporters of African colonization. We are ready to give to the enterprise, whatever influence we can employ for its advancement. We believe that this enterprise is infallibly tending to great and good results; and we have often taken occasion to propound our opinions on this subject; but we never dreamed that in so doing, we were propounding opinions, for which all the individuals who might be found co-operating with us, were to be responsible. So others have published their speculations, in public debate or through the press; and however they may differ from us, in respect to this or that important bearing of the enterprise, whatever heresies they may hold about the rights of the people of color on this soil, or the practicability or even the desirableness of the speedy abolition of slavery, by what authority can they be hindered from speaking or writing in favor of colonization?—or who shall stand over against the society's treasury, and forbid their money to come in, if they choose to give it? We have read speeches and essays in support of this cause, which contained, as we thought, serious errors; but little did we dream that any man had a right to impute those errors to us, or that we were bound to withdraw our friendship from the society, till such men's mouths should be sealed up. Yet the very scope of Mr. Garrison's argument is, You must not favor the cause of African colonization, for in so doing, you will give the right hand of fellowship to all the erroneous principles on which that enterprise has at any time been supported; and you will become a partaker in the guilt of all the selfish and unhallowed motives, which have ever had influence with any of its friends or advocates.

If the reader would see how completely the style of argument in this book, confounds the society with every member of the society, and with every friend and fellow-worker in the enterprise, let him read the argument and citations under the first section. "The American Colonization Society," says Mr. G. "is pledged

not to oppose the system of slavery." Very true: the *Society* is pledged not to oppose slavery; and it is equally pledged not to oppose intemperance or sabbath-breaking; for by its constitution, its resources are to be exclusively directed to a particular object, and that object is not the publication of anti-slavery tracts, or the diffusion of temperance principles, or the instruction of the public mind respecting the authority of the christian sabbath, but the colonization of Africa. Yet this simple pledge, to wit, the fact that the constitution of the society, makes it exclusively a colonization society, and not an anti-slavery tract society, is a grievous offense to Mr. Garrison. Straightway he rises into a towering passion against the society, as if its members and friends, were one and all pledged, "solemnly pledged" as individuals, never to say a word in opposition to slavery. "I want no better reason than this," he exclaims, "to wage an uncompromising warfare against it. No man has a right to form an alliance with others, which prevents him from rebuking sin, or exposing the guilt of sinners." We are not aware that any such alliance has been formed. Certainly we have never become a party to such a contract. Perhaps it will relieve the mind of this uncompromising man, to be informed that by the payment of one dollar annually, he himself may become a member of the American Colonization Society, and take a part with his voice and his vote, at all its meetings for business, and still be as zealous as ever in propagating his own peculiar opinions respecting slavery and the rights of Africans.

But, the author will tell us, the pledge of the constitution is not all: have I not summoned a cloud of witnesses, to prove something more? We ask in reply, how much more do these nine pages of extracts from speeches, reviews and essays, prove? So far as they merely repeat and expound the constitution of the society, they prove nothing at all. So far as they advance beyond that line, they express simply the sentiments of individuals, and can be fairly imputed to none but their individual authors. Should it be said, that even with these limitations they prove that "colonizationists generally agree" in not opposing slavery; we may answer they prove no such thing, for it would be perfectly easy to quote from what the friends of the society have said and written, at least as many pages, expressing sentiments of settled opposition to slavery, of ardent desire for its abolition, and of inflexible resolve to aim by peaceable means at the overthrow of the system.

Here then, we repeat, is the first and leading fallacy of the pamphlet before us, a fallacy which runs through every section. It regards any body who happens to speak or write in favor of colonization, as an authorized expositor of the views of the society. It regards every exceptionable or seemingly exceptionable sentiment, which can be culled out of such speeches and essays, as if it were incorporated into the society's constitution; and its con-

stant aim is, to make the reader feel that if he befriends the cause, he gives his support to every such obnoxious sentiment.

We have other objections to the methods of proof adopted in this pamphlet. The author is chargeable with great unfairness in his quotations. Any reader who derives his first knowledge, or his chief knowledge of the society from this pamphlet, is naturally impressed by the frequency with which citations are given from the reports of the society. It seems as if the author were determined to have the very best authority for all his declarations. It seems as if the institution were to be condemned by the official statements of its managers, formally accepted by the members at their annual meetings. The effect of passages cited from "Second Annual Report," "Tenth Annual Report" etc., is highly important in respect to the impression which the author is aiming to produce on his readers. Now it so happened that we recognized as old acquaintances some of the sentences thus quoted, and knew that such sentences were never incorporated in any report of the managers to the society. This led us to examine a few other sentences quoted in the same manner, as from the official communications of the board of managers. One after another was searched for in vain through the body of the report referred to, and was found at last either in some speech delivered at the annual meeting, and published with the report as a part of the preliminary matter, or in some of the documents included as articles of intelligence in the appendix. And if we may judge from the multiplied instances which we have been at the trouble of examining, and which have been taken altogether at random, nearly all the quotations which seem to be from the Annual Reports, are only quotations from the matters which accompany the Annual Reports as published. Mr. Garrison may say, that in all this he had no intention to deceive; but whatever may have been his intention, the quotations are in fact unfair and deceptive. He may say, that he referred to the reports only as pamphlets known by that name, he may say that the distinction between the report and the various matters printed with it, did not occur to him as important; but no apology can rectify the actual unfairness of his quotations. And what makes the unfairness more striking and more effectual, is, he recognizes at first, again and again, the very distinction which he afterwards so generally disregards. Through the first section and a part of the second, he carefully observes this distinction, in all his quotations; but then, as if he felt the necessity of something more imposing and authoritative than extracts from speeches and appendixes, and as if he had ascertained that he was likely to find very little which would be to his purpose, in the actual communications of the managers to their constituents, he begins suddenly to accumulate quotation upon quotation from "Annual Reports" in a style as deceptive as it is impressive.

The deception may be accidental; but its effect is to mislead the uninformed and unsuspecting reader, as really as if it was designed.

In addition to this, the author palpably misconstrues the language, and misrepresents the sentiments, of those whose words he adduces in proof of his accusations. It is enough for us to bring forward such instances of this, as have happened, for particular reasons, to arrest our attention. A few examples of this kind, will suffice to show how far this pamphlet may be trusted as "an impartial exhibition" of the opinions entertained by the friends of colonization.

Among his nine pages of proofs, that the American Colonization Society is not hostile to slavery, we find the following passage cited from the *Christian Spectator*, for September, 1830.

This institution proposes to do good by a single specific course of measures. Its direct and specific purpose is *not the abolition of slavery*, [the italics are Mr. Garrison's not ours,] or the relief of pauperism, or the extension of commerce and civilization, or the enlargement of science, or the conversion of the heathen. The single object which its constitution prescribes, and to which all its efforts are necessarily directed, is, African colonization from America. It proposes only to afford facilities for the voluntary emigration of free people of color from this country to the country of their fathers. pp. 45, 46.

Now who would suppose, from the manner in which this quotation is made, and the proposition of Mr. G. which it is designed to establish—who would suppose that one leading object of the article from which the sentence is extracted, is to prove that the progress of colonization will infallibly act upon public opinion throughout the slaveholding states, in such a manner as greatly to accelerate the abolition of slavery, and its abolition not by successive instances of private manumission, but by legislation? Who would suppose that the very document from which Mr. G. derives the proof that the society makes no opposition to slavery, urges, as the grand argument in behalf of the society, the infallible tendency of its enterprise, to abolish that unchristian and accursed system? Yet such is the fact.

In another place, the following sentences are credited to the *African Repository*. They belong in fact to an "Address to the public by the managers of the Colonization Society of Connecticut," published in 1828.

It is taken for granted, that *in present circumstances, any effort to produce a general and thorough amelioration in the character and condition of the free people of color, must be to a great extent fruitless*. In every part of the United States there is a broad and impassable line of demarcation between every man who has one drop of African blood in his veins, and every other class in the community. The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices of society—prejudices which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, nor religion itself can subdue—mark the people of color, whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation inevitable and incurable. The African in this country belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society; and from that station he can never rise, be his talents, his enterprise, his virtues what they may. . . . They constitute a class by themselves—a class out of which no individual can be elevated, and below which none can be depressed. And this is the difficulty, the invariable and insuperable difficulty; in the way of every scheme for their benefit. Much can be done for them—much has been done; but still they are, and, in this country, always must be a depressed and abject race. p. 136.

We have taken away Mr. Garrison's italics and capitals, and have restored the emphasis with which the words were originally printed. Will the reader believe, that this, as it stands in the pamphlet before us, is one of the author's strongest testimonies to prove that the American Colonization Society prevents the instruction of the blacks, and denies the possibility of elevating them in this country. The position which the writer of the Address undertakes to illustrate, in the paragraph from which these sentences are culled, is that "IN PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES any effort to produce a *general* and *thorough* amelioration in the character and condition of the people of color must be, *to a great extent*, fruitless." The whole paragraph describes their condition as affected by "present circumstances." And one point, one distinct head of argument, which the address urges on the public, is the common, and with many friends of the society, favorite topic, that the success and progress of the work of colonization will change those "present circumstances," that it "will not only bless the colonists, but will react to ELEVATE THE STANDING OF THOSE WHO REMAIN BEHIND," and that from beyond the Atlantic there will come a light to beam upon the degradation of the negro in America. We leave it to every man's sense of truth and fairness whether here is not, on the part of Mr. Garrison, something of the nature of misconstruction.

We go farther. This author not only misconstrues, but he garbles, mutilates, and interpolates false explanations, to make his misconstructions more effectual. Take the following example of a quotation from the same document from which the preceding was selected.

He [the planter] looks around him and sees that the condition of the great mass of emancipated Africans is one in comparison with which the condition of his slaves is enviable;—and he is convinced that if he withdraws from his slaves his authority, his support, his protection, and leaves them to shift for themselves, he turns the most to be vagabonds, and paupers, and felons, and to find in the work-house and the penitentiary, the home which they ought to have retained on his paternal acres. p. 62.

Here the interpolated explanation entirely changes the meaning of the sentence. The writer whose words are thus applied, is not speaking of "the planter," that is, of planters generally; but is supposing a particular case, the case of a slaveholder by inheritance, who wishes to act conscientiously towards the beings whom he finds "dependent on him for protection and support and government," and who "may be made to feel the evils of slavery as strongly as any man;"—and to prevent the possibility of such a misconstruction as Mr. Garrison has forced upon his language, he subjoins to the sentence above quoted, "This is no unreal case. There may be slaves—there are slaves by thousands and tens of thousands—whose condition is that of the most abject distress; but these are the slaves of masters whose whole conduct is a constant violation of duty, and with whom the suggestion of giving freedom

to their slaves would not be harbored for a moment. The case which we have supposed, is the case of a master really desirous to benefit his slaves." The author of 'Thoughts on African Colonization has certainly some peculiar ideas of the way to make "an impartial exhibition" of other men's opinions.

At the hazard of exhausting the reader's patience we must add one more example of our author's way of making quotations. The following passage is ascribed to the Review on African Colonization in the Christian Spectator for September, 1830.

For the existence of slavery in the United States, those, and those only, are accountable who bore a part in originating such a constitution of society. The bible contains no explicit prohibition of slavery. There is neither chapter nor verse of holy writ, which lends any countenance to the fulminating spirit of universal emancipation, of which some exhibitions may be seen in some of the newspapers. p. 63.

Now we utterly deny and abjure the authorship of such a paragraph. The fact is, that these three sentences, thus strung together, and with the meaning which they necessarily convey to the reader, whose first sight of them is in this connection, never before appeared in the Christian Spectator. It is true indeed, that each one of the three sentences which Mr. G. has thus arranged as in a connected train of thought, does actually occur in the article referred to; but they occur in such connections, and are applied in the course of the argument to such uses, as must very materially modify their meaning in the mind of every candid reader. We were speaking of slavery as a certain constitution of society, by which one man is constituted the hereditary lord of other men, and is invested with an absolute property in their labor and in that of their children; and we said that "for the *existence* of slavery in the United States, those, and those only, are accountable, who bore a part in originating such a constitution of society." The word *existence* was marked as emphatic; and our object was, as appears from the very next page, while conceding to the advocates of slavery the matter of a favorite plea in its defense, to throw upon the consciences of the present generation of citizens in the slaveholding states, the responsibility of reforming this constitution of society, or of *continuing* it, and transmitting it with all its curses to posterity. How simple and harmless a truth did we propound; how unlike the heresy which Mr. Garrison would make us utter. The constitution of Massachusetts, perhaps, contains some principles which are inconsistent with justice and the public good; for the *existence* of such a constitution, those citizens who were born under it, are not accountable; for the transmission of it to another generation, they are accountable. In just this way we argued with General Hayne, on a subsequent page.* He had said in defense of slavery, "If slavery, as it exists in this country be an evil, we of the present day found it ready made to our hands." We replied by asking him directly and personally, "Have you

* Christian Spectator, 1830, p. 522.

done all in your power to remedy the evil, and to transmit to other generations a better inheritance?" He had said, "We found we had to do with a people whose physical, moral, and intellectual habits and character, totally disqualified them for the enjoyment of the blessings of freedom." Our reply was, "What have you done—what single thing do you propose to do for the improvement of the character and habits, physical, moral, and intellectual, which at the present time totally disqualify for freedom, more than half the population of a high-minded republic?"

But to return to Mr. Garrison's quotation. We did indeed say in another paragraph, "The bible contains no explicit prohibition of slavery;" but we need not say that the stress of the sentence obviously rested on the word *explicit*. We added a still greater "concession" to the advocate of slavery, and one which we marvel that Mr. G. has not wrested to some of his purposes. "It [the bible] recognizes both in the old testament, and the new, the existence of such a constitution of society, and it lends its authority to enforce the mutual obligations resulting from that constitution." But what else said we of the relations of christianity to slavery? How far did we permit our concessions to be carried? Did we "go the whole" in defense of slavery, as in our author's manner of quotation, we seem to have done. "The advocates of slavery," we said "take it for granted, that because christianity recognizes such a state of society, and enforces the mutual duties arising therefrom, it sanctions slavery itself. This is a great and palpable error. The new testament contains no *express* prohibition of polygamy. Is polygamy therefore consistent with christianity?" "Christianity is always the antagonist principle of slavery." Is Mr. Garrison's quotation an "impartial exhibition" of our doctrine?

So of the third sentence in the above cited patchwork paragraph. We did indeed say, "There is neither chapter nor verse of holy writ, which lends any countenance to the fulminating spirit of universal emancipation, of which some exhibitions may be seen in some of the newspapers." But we said also in illustrating the opposition of christianity to slavery, "Its genius is the genius of universal emancipation. It proclaims liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound." Is Mr. G. guilty of no misrepresentation here? Or is it a crime to deny that there is chapter or verse to countenance a *fulminating* spirit of universal emancipation.

But it is not enough with this author to make unfair references, to misconstrue, to garble and pack his quotations, or to interpolate clauses, which under pretense of explanation totally pervert the meaning, he resorts to direct assertions of a very questionable—perhaps we ought rather to say—of a very unquestionable character. In making a reference to the article from which the above passages have been quoted, he says, "Vide the Christian Spectator for September, 1830, in which the reader will find an elaborate

apology for the system of slavery." Mark it reader, and admire the hardihood of the man. "An elaborate apology for the system of slavery!" Had he said an apology for slaveholding, we might have classed the assertion under the head of simple misrepresentation, and should have ascribed it to the peculiar intellectual conformation of a man, among whose good qualities precise accuracy of statement is not the most remarkable. But he speaks of an apology, not for slaveholding, not for slavery in the sense of being the master of slaves, but for the SYSTEM of slavery. And the apology spoken of, cannot be an incidental apology; it cannot be an apology contained in one or two unguarded and unfortunate admissions; it is an elaborate apology, and can therefore be none other than a direct defense of the system, a defense made of set purpose. We leave it to others to explain how or why this author ventured on an assertion so reckless.

We have taken this book in hand and made this exposure of some of its most prominent faults, not because we consider it our business particularly to look after the author, and to put him right when he goes wrong, nor because we suppose that the book, standing on its own merits, and making its own way to influence, would have needed any refutation, but because we know that the author is sustained, and his book patronized by men more deserving than he is. How far the statements and exhibitions of the book can be safely trusted as "impartial," our readers can judge from the facts which have been laid before them. It is not to be supposed, that Mr. Garrison will follow any hint of ours at parting; but if he would, we should advise him to let alone controversy, and stick to his poetry. This we say not out of any disrespect to his talents; for he writes admirable verses, and might do much in that way for the cause to which he has devoted himself—far more than he is likely to do in his present course of effort. We think that in undertaking to frame arguments, to make "impartial exhibitions," to discuss principles, he has mistaken his calling; but if he *will* go on, we have only to wish for him that he may learn much by practice and experience. When we next cross his track, may we find him exhibiting more modesty, more meekness, more candor, more wisdom, and more logic, than we can now discover in his productions. We hope, especially, that as he grows older, he may acquire more suavity of temper, and more gentleness of manner. The style which he employs—we beg his friends and advisers candidly to ponder this remark—is not the style to do good with. Satan cannot cast out satan. Such wrath and railing, such recklessness and coarseness of vituperation, as fill his writings, may inflame, but cannot enlighten, may irritate and enrage, but cannot convince. We believe that cool and patient argument may do much, even with slaveholders; we are sure that "sound and fury" can do nothing but mischief. We cannot doubt that the efforts of this writer, and his coadjutors, are disastrously delaying the arrival of that hour,

when public sentiment, in the slaveholding states, shall turn with a rapid and irresistible tide against slavery.

We come now to the second of the documents, on which we propose to comment in this article. This is a pamphlet of twenty-four pages, by two zealous and leading friends of abolition in England. James Cropper's letter to Thomas Clarkson, is a letter of exposition on account of Mr. Clarkson's testimony in favor of the enterprise of the American Colonization Society, and it refers the venerable philanthropist, for ample and irresistible conviction of his errors, to "friend Charles Stuart's" arguments, which are appended under the title of "Prejudice Vincible, etc." Captain Stuart is a man almost as passionate as Mr. Garrison, but he has a much better idea of the nature of an argument. His information, however, respecting the nature of the Colonization Society, and the tendency of its efforts, is altogether inadequate, being derived, mostly from the "impartial exhibitions" which we have just been contemplating. Indeed Capt. Stuart's essay is little else than an abstract of Mr. Garrison's "Thoughts on Colonization," with some additions and modifications.

The limits within which we are at present confined, forbid us to go over the whole ground of debate with Capt. Stuart. He touches upon every topic connected with the subject; and he shows that in respect to every one of the bearings and tendencies of African colonization, he has been led into error. Some of these topics we shall omit; and the others we shall touch only *currente calamo*. For example, he speaks with much stress about what he calls 'the cruel and criminal prejudice against the free colored people, and the dreadful persecutions to which it subjects them;' and he alledges that colonization grows out of this prejudice, and tends only to strengthen it. Respecting that point, we have offered some considerations on a former occasion;* and we must now simply refer the reader to the hints then thrown out. He also speaks of the "moral wretchedness of Africa," and scouts the idea of removing that by colonization. We shall say nothing of that subject; for to argue that point would divert us from our more immediate object.

After a few introductory observations, Capt. Stuart opens his attack by displaying in three parallel columns, his views of the evils which need a remedy, of the remedy needed, and of the remedy proposed by the American Colonization Society. Of this tri-columnar statement, we copy those particulars on which we think it worth while for us to comment.

The Evils which need a remedy.

Remedy needed.

Remedy proposed by the Am. Col. Society.

1. The brutal and degrading personal slavery of upwards of two million of slaves.

The immediate abolition, by a well digested legislative enactment in each

The sending to Africa under circumstances as favorable as in their power,

The evils which need a remedy. United States.	Remedy needed	Remedy proposed by the Am. Col. Society
	slave state and in congress, of the brutal, criminal, and ruinous system of negro slavery, and the immediate substitution in its place, of a law worthy of a great, free, and enlightened country.	of as many of the enslaved and unoffending negroes as their own masters may please to emancipate for that purpose.
3. The African slave trade continued.	The immediate and universal abolition of its only source and support, negro slavery.	The settlement of a free colored colony, under circumstances as favorable as in their power, upon the coast of Africa.
5. The ruinous condition of the slave States.	The conversion of their slave laborers into free laborers,—of their unwilling into willing hands.	The removal from the United States as quickly as possible of a vast proportion of all its laboring strength.
6. The terrors of the slave-masters.	Undissembling repentance, and fruits meet for repentance; and for this purpose the continual setting before them of their sin; and morally speaking, giving them no peace in their iniquity.	Removing, as condescendingly as possible, as many of the objects of their terrors as they wish to get rid of, that they may keep the remainder as long as they please, without fear. pp. 8, 9.

The evils to be remedied are well enough defined, excepting the last. The "terrors," or as we would rather say, the dangers which need to be removed, are not peculiar to "the slave-masters." It is not the proprietors of slaves alone that live in continual danger and alarm, under the present system at the south. The entire population of those regions in which slavery abounds, live, as it were, on the sides of a volcano, that ever and anon heaves under them. When the midnight bell rings the alarm in Charleston or Savannah, and the drums beat to arms in the streets, does the man who owns no slaves feel safer in his bed, than the man who owns a thousand? Not at all. The terror of the planter is not so much the dread that his own slaves will murder him, or fire his dwelling, as it is the dread of a general convulsion; and that dread, the dread of seeing sudden conflagration lighted up around them, far and near, is the common terror of the entire population.

But let us notice the remedies which Capt. Stuart proposes to employ for the removal of these great evils. The remedy for the slavery which exists in the United States, is 'the immediate abolition of slavery by a legislative enactment, in each slave state and in congress, and the immediate substitution of a law, worthy of a great, free, and enlightened people.' Reader, notice the admirable simplicity of the proposal. The remedy for slavery is, that slavery should cease. How simple and yet how effectual. Certainly this looks like philosophy. A fire is raging in a crowded street. Men are hurrying to and fro, and forming lines to bring water from distant reservoirs. "Stop!" cries a looker on, of speculative habits, "the remedy for this spreading evil is perfectly obvious; you have

only to arrest, immediately, the combination of oxygen with yonder combustible substances, and all will be well. "This is no half-way plan, no far-fetched contrivance; it is simple, and strikes at the very root of the mischief. How beautiful is the simplicity of truth. How charming is divine philosophy." Ah! Mr. Philosopher, you talk learnedly; no doubt the way to stop a fire is to make it cease burning; but there is a practical difficulty about your proposal. You propose a result, but say nothing about the process. The question with a working man who desires to do something towards the extinction of the fire, is *how*? Your remedy is extinction; but our question of *how*, you leave unanswered. How is this combination of oxygen with combustible substances *to be* arrested? Answer us that, Mr. Philosopher, and you tell us something to the purpose. So we answer Capt. Stuart. No doubt the immediate abolition of slavery by a well digested legislative enactment in each slave state and in congress, would put an end to slavery; but pray tell us how this immediate abolition is to be brought about; tell us how these well digested enactments, by a dozen legislative bodies, are to be immediately obtained.

The remedy proposed for the African slave-trade is liable to a similar objection. No man can doubt that "the immediate and universal abolition of negro slavery" would be an immediate and effectual abolition of the slave-trade. But the unfortunate circumstance of the case is that the *immediate* and *universal* abolition of slavery is out of the question. A neighbor of ours has a piece of land which is overflowed by every tide. He is inquiring how the evil may be remedied. One man proposes to build a dike of sufficient height to shut out the waters. Another steps in and tells him that to build a dike will be a very expensive and hazardous undertaking, and with infinite gravity assures him that the remedy actually needed, and the only truly philosophical and sufficient remedy, is an enlargement of the moon's orbit. "For," says this learned Theban, "it is a well known fact that the only cause of tides is the attraction of gravitation between the waters of the ocean and the moon; and it is one of the great and unchangeable laws of nature that the attraction of gravitation between any two masses of matter is inversely as the square of their distance. Thus the farther off the moon is from the earth, the less will be its power to attract the waters of the ocean, and the less will be the height of the highest tide. What then can be plainer than that the only rational and infallible remedy for the difficulty in respect to this piece of meadow, is an immediate enlargement of the orbit of the moon's revolution round the earth." We are very far from intimating, by this comparison, that the universal abolition of slavery is as absolutely and as far beyond the reach of human effort, as a change in the moon's orbit; but when we consider the vast extent of the earth's surface, over which negro slavery is spread, and the diversified and unconnected governments under which it exists,—

when we think what changes must be wrought, not only in the United States and Great Britain, but in the countries subject to the Spanish, French, Dutch, Danish, Brazilian, and we know not how many other scepters, before slavery can be abolished,—we have no hesitation in saying, that any man who gravely proposes the *immediate* and *universal* abolition of negro slavery, as the first and only thing to be done for the termination of the African slave-trade, deserves a place in the academy of philosophers on the flying island.

So of the remedy proposed for the ruinous condition of the slave-holding States, we entertain no doubt that “the conversion of their slave laborers into free laborers,” would be worth more to those states than all “the wealth of Ormus or of Ind.” The problem is, to effect this conversion. How shall we make the people of South Carolina willing to give freedom to their bondmen?

Under the last head, it will be noticed that the author recommends as a remedy for the dangers of the south, not only, “undissembling repentance, and fruits meet for repentance,” but also, and in order to this, “the continual setting before them of their sin, and, morally speaking, giving them no peace in their iniquity.” This looks like proposing to use means that may bring about, by and by, a result which cannot be *immediately* accomplished. The only question, then, between us and the men of Capt. Stuart’s school is, What are the means by which our fellow citizens of the south may be most certainly and most speedily led to the voluntary abolition of slavery among them? We believe in the efficacy of discussion, to enlighten and reform public opinion, even on the subject of slavery in a slaveholding state; but how shall the discussion be started? and how shall it be carried on? and how shall it be made to reach and pervade the community that is to be affected by it, a community irritable and inflammable on every subject, and in respect to this subject, fixed and ferocious in the determination that there shall be no discussion within their territories? Doubtless our author thinks that all this is the easiest and plainest thing in the world. If so, we propose to the gallant Captain an experiment, the undertaking of which will at least demonstrate his courage and sincerity, and the performance of which will test the soundness of his opinion. Let him come over and show us in person, how the thing is to be done. Let him pass through the southern states, an apostle of immediate and universal emancipation. Let him travel from plantation to plantation, and from city to city, to carry on this discussion with the slave-holders; distributing along his course tracts, prints, broad sheets, that shall illustrate to the mind and to the eye the cruelties of slavery; and preaching as he goes, the sacred inalienable and universal rights of man. Let him in his proper person, undertake to call to repentance the slave-holders of the south, those “felons in heart and in deed,” as he denominates them, whose crime—a crime repeated every day and every hour—is only inferior “to intentional and

malignant murder." Let him deal with these offenders face to face, "continually setting before them their sin," in his own style and fashion, and "giving them no peace in their iniquity." If the Captain will undertake this mission, we pledge ourselves to give him every facility in our power. We will subscribe to his support. We, as colonizationists, and with all the popularity which our famous apologies for slavery have secured for us, will give him a letter of introduction to our southern friends. And if he does not find the undertaking more forlorn than it would be to lead a forlorn hope at the storming of Gibraltar; if he does not find that he might as safely have undertaken to preach the accountability of monarchs, and the sovereignty of the people, in the public squares of Vienna, or have gone as wisely to Constantinople with Mary Fisher, to persuade the Grand Seigneur to turn quaker; if he does not find, ere the first week of his mission is accomplished, that he is casting his pearls before swine; if he does not find them turning again to rend him, fiercer, stronger, less to be reasoned with than the very bulls of Bashan,—we will acknowledge that he has the best of the argument.

What then is the bearing of African colonization on the abolition of slavery? Capt. Stuart's account of this is honest doubtless; but, in our view, it is obviously very much the result of misapprehension, and, to use a favorite word of his own, of prejudice. He says that the remedy proposed by the American Colonization Society for "the brutal and degrading personal slavery of upwards of two millions" is "the sending to Africa under circumstances as favorable as in their power, as many of the enslaved an unoffending negroes, as their own masters may please to emancipate for that purpose;" and he asks, "What kind of remedy will it be to the brutal enslavement of two millions, increasing at the rate of fifty thousand annually, that annually a few hundreds, (or thousands if it should ever be) have their slavery commuted into transportation?" We answer, No man, in his senses ever thought that the simple transportation of a few hundreds or thousands annually, could be, considered alone and disconnected from the relations and tendencies of the work, a remedy for slavery. The Captain talks about "sending to Africa," and "removal," and transportation," as if sending these men to Africa, removing them out of the United States, transporting them beyond the seas, were a fair and full description of the society's undertaking. But colonizing them in Africa, is a much more comprehensive expression, than merely sending them to Africa. African colonization, and not simple transportation, is the thing which the society proposes as its work; and that is the thing, the bearing of which on the abolition of slavery, is called in question.

We have often expressed our views of this subject, more or less in detail;* and in Capt. Stuart's argumentation, we discover noth-

* Christian Spectator, 1830, pp. 477—479.

ing to change or modify our opinions. Arguments derived from the alleged motives of colonizationists, whether they come from Stuart or from Garrison, weigh nothing at all with us. The question is, what will be the results of the work? Not, what are the motives imputed to its supporters? If the building up of a civilized and christian state in Africa, by the emigration of people of color from America, tends in fact to the abolition of slavery, all the expectations to the contrary which may be entertained by the friends of slavery, cannot reverse that which is as sure as the relation of cause and effect. We have to do with tendencies, not with intentions. Capt. Stuart's only argument on this subject, not derived from the supposed motives of those who favor the society, is this: Every slave emancipated and removed, increases the market value of those that remain; and thus, by making it more the interest of the slaveholder to hold fast his property, increases the mighty difficulty in the way of abolition. But what is this argument worth? It supposes that slave labor will actually be removed from the market faster than free labor can come in to meet the demand thus created—a supposition which, both Stuart and Garrison would most earnestly protest, can never be realized. The argument is, to us, as if some man should object to the scheme of the Temperance Society, the scheme of total abstinence, that it tends to reduce the price of ardent spirits, and thus to promote intemperance; because the more subscribers there are to this scheme, the less will be the demand for spirits; and the less the demand the less will be the market value of the article, and the easier will it be for the idle and the dissipated, to obtain the means of intoxication. To such an argument, if it should be thought worth answering, the answer would be; first, that there is no danger that the cause will advance with so rapid and sudden a movement as to produce, even for the shortest time, any considerable disproportion between the demand and the supply; and secondly, that even should such an effect be incidentally and temporarily produced, the moral influence of the Temperance Society, the nature and inevitable tendency of its scheme, is to the suppression of intemperance. And this is the answer we should give to the argument in question, respecting the tendency of colonization.

The actual tendencies of the enterprise of planting colored colonies in Africa from America, are, so far as the abolition of slavery is concerned, the following. Our limits will permit us to exhibit but little more than a naked summary.

1. It secures in many instances the emancipation of slaves by individuals, and thus brings the power of example to bear on public sentiment. This is not conjecture; it is proved by the induction of particulars. The friends of the Colonization Society, in their arguments on this subject, can read off a catalogue of instances, in which emancipation has already resulted from the progress of this work. We know that on the other hand it is said, that the

arguments and statements of colonizationists prevent emancipation. But the proper proof of this assertion would be, to bring forward the particular facts. Tell us of the individuals who have, as a matter of fact, been effectually hindered from setting their slaves at large, by what they have read in the *African Repository*, or by what they have heard from the agents of the society. We say then that, unless the testimony of facts can deceive us, colonization is bringing the power of example to bear on public sentiment at the south, in regard to slavery. Each single instance of emancipation is indeed a small matter when compared with the continued slavery of two millions; but every such instance, occurring in the midst of a slaveholding community, is a strong appeal to the natural sentiments of benevolence and justice in all who witness it.

2. This work, as it advances, tends to improve the character and elevate the condition of the free people of color, and thus to take away one standing and very influential argument against both individual emancipation and general abolition. This, to an unprejudiced mind, is one of the most obvious tendencies of African colonization. As we said on a former occasion,* so we say again, with the assurance that whoever may deny it, none will disbelieve it, 'Not Hayti has done more to make the negro character respected by mankind, and to afford the means of making the negro conscious of his manhood, than Liberia has already accomplished. The name of Lot Cary is worth more than the name of Boyer or Petion. It has done, it is doing, more to rescue the African character from degradation, than could be done by a thousand volumes of reproaches against prejudice.' And thus it has done and is doing, more to accelerate the abolition of slavery, than could be done by a ship load of such pamphlets and speeches as some that we might mention. Elevate the character of the free people of color—let it be seen that they are men indeed—let the degrading associations which follow them, be broken up by the actual improvement of their character as a people; and negro slavery must rapidly wither and die.

3. African colonization, so far as it is successful, will bring free labor into the fairest and most extended competition with slave labor, and will thus make the universal abolition of slavery inevitable. Doubtless the cultivation of tropical countries by the labor of free and civilized men, must at some time or other bring about this result, whether our colony is to prosper or to fail. We know what changes have taken place in Mexico and the South American republics. We know what changes are threatened and promised in the West Indies. But at the same time we are confident, that the most rapid and most effectual way to bring free labor into fair competition with slave labor, and thus to drive the products of the latter out of every market, is to establish on the soil of Africa, a free and civilized commonwealth, whose institutions shall all be fashioned

* *Christian Spectator*, 1832. pp. 325, 326.

after American models, and whose population shall be pervaded and impelled by the spirit of American enterprize. This is the work which the American Colonization Society is prosecuting with all its resources. The friends of slavery may dream that this work is to secure and perpetuate that miserable system; but if any of them do thus imagine, they err as widely in that, as they do in supposing that the repeal of the protective tariff will relieve them of their embarrassments. The free-trade principles, for which they are now contending, are the principles which will, by and by, bring all slaveholders to the alternative of universal emancipation or universal bankruptcy.

4. The prosecution of this work is already introducing into the slaveholding states, inquiry and discussion respecting the evils of the existing structure of society there, and the possibility of its abolition. The great body of the friends of the Colonization Society at the south, no less than at the north, regard the scheme of that institution as something that will ultimately, in some way, deliver the country from the curse of slavery. All who oppose the society there, oppose it on the same ground; they look upon it as being, in its tendency and in the hopes of its supporters, an anti-slavery project. Thus in those very regions over which the system of slavery sheds all its blasting influences, there is constituted a party, the members of which are recognized by their opposers, and more or less distinctly by themselves, as hostile to slavery; and as looking for an opportunity to move for its abolition. In this way it was that when the occasion presented itself, a few months ago, the legislature of Virginia became the scene of earnest and public discussion on this long interdicted theme; and to the astonishment of the nation it appeared, that the party opposed to slavery was only not a majority. Had colonization never been thought of—had the scheme of the American Colonization Society never been undertaken,—who believes that projects for the abolition of slavery would have been so soon, if ever, discussed in the legislature of Virginia? Without that preparation of the public mind which the Colonization Society, in the calm and peaceful prosecution of its labors, has indirectly accomplished, insurrection and massacre, with all the fear and horror which they occasion, would have led only to new cruelties of legislation and of practice. There is no oppression so unrelenting or desperate as when the oppressor fears his subjects; and the unanimous feeling of Virginia would have been—erroneous indeed, but not on that account the less irresistible or inflexible—a feeling like that of him who holds a wolf by the ears;—it is dangerous to keep him, but more dangerous to let him loose, and therefore the more furious the struggles of the prisoner, the fiercer and closer will be the despairing grasp that holds him.

We entertain no doubt that the discussion thus commenced will gradually become more free and thorough, and will appeal more directly to the great law that acknowledges the inalienable

and universal rights of man, and will at the same time find its way still farther south, till it pervades and awakens every State from the Potomac to the gulph of Mexico. This is inevitable; the discussion of such a subject, involving such hopes and fears and interests, when once it has been opened, can never be suppressed. Nor is this all. Such a system as slavery cannot long withstand the power of free and full discussion. The hour in which the debate on slavery commenced in the capitol at Richmond, may be considered as having sealed the death-warrant of the system, not only for Virginia, but for the nation. And now it may be said that whatever is to be hereafter the success of the Colonization Society in the prosecution of its own appropriate enterprise, this great result is ultimately sure. Not that it has nothing more to do by its indirect influence in accelerating this result; certainly the greater the success which shall attend the colonization of Africa, the greater will be the progress of public opinion towards this consummation. But let the society be dissolved, let the pirates of the African seas wreak on Liberia their cherished wrath; let Montserado be made again a mart for the slave-trade; let the spot now adorned with christian churches become again the scene of devil-worship; let the smiling villages on the St. Paul's be made desolate, and the now cultivated soil be overspread again with the vegetation of the wilderness; still it will be true that the indirect influence of the American Colonization Society, has secured the ultimate abolition of slavery.

The treatise in the *American Quarterly Review*, referred to at the head of this article, is an illustration of what we have been saying. It shows that the discussion is to proceed; that those interested in the perpetuation of slavery are constrained to come down from that high attitude of pride and defiance which they have been wont to maintain, and begin to feel the necessity of defending their cause by argument. "We have heretofore doubted," says this writer, "the propriety of too frequently agitating, especially in a public manner, the questions of abolition, in consequence of [we suppose he means, on account of] the injurious effects which might be produced on the slave population. But the Virginia legislature, in its zeal for discussion, boldly set aside all prudential considerations of this kind, and openly and publicly debated the subject before the whole world. The seal has now been broken, the example has been set from a high quarter; we shall therefore waive all considerations of a prudential character which have heretofore restrained us, and boldly grapple with the abolitionists on this great question." The seal is broken indeed. A new order of things has already begun, when a slaveholding politician finds himself constrained to write seventy-five pages, of closely printed argument, against the abolition of slavery.

We shall not attempt the task of replying to this writer. That

has been already done, as we perceive, and ably done, by another writer in the same work,* a writer whose powerful and accomplished mind we are happy to see again employed on this so deeply interesting subject. We shall take an early opportunity, however, to examine somewhat at length the various processes by which slavery might be abolished; and to inquire what would be the probable fate of the colored population and of the southern country, if slavery should be abolished, and the emancipated blacks be left to shift for themselves in competition with an intelligent, enterprising, laborious, and growing population of another race.

Meanwhile we suggest, for the consideration of our readers at the south, a few inquiries addressed to their consciences as christians. We beg them to read with candor, and to remember that we do not dictate nor denounce, but only *inquire*.

1. Is it not your duty to be continually promoting in your sphere of influence, inquiry and discussion respecting the practicability and duty of abolishing slavery? This may demand much prudence and meekness, and much courage; but now that the subject is fairly out for universal examination and debate, now that it is no longer at the option of the southern community whether such discussion shall be permitted, ought you not to inform yourself respecting the facts and principles that have a bearing on the controversy? and as you have opportunity and influence, ought you not to lead your neighbors to similar inquiries? so that, as you and they are called to act on this great interest, you and they may act, not under the influence of prejudice and passion, but *CALMLY* and with all the light which philosophy and history have thrown upon the subject.

2. Is it not your duty to befriend the free blacks by all the kind offices in your power? You look upon them as a dangerous class; will they be more dangerous, think you, if christian philanthropy, remembering that God hath made of one blood all nations of men, searches them out in their degradation, and diligently seeks to do them good? You say they are indolent, thriftless, and vicious; can you do nothing to give them employment, to encourage the beginnings of their industry, and to train their children to better habits? Can you do nothing to waken their minds and to inspire them with new ideas and motives, by telling them of what benevolence has proposed for their benefit, and of that father-land of theirs beyond the sea, which offers them a refuge for themselves, and a broad and fair inheritance for their children?

3. Is it not your duty to insist on the instruction of the colored population bond and free? Startle not—nor reject the inquiry till you have pondered it well. “Our danger,” said a slaveholder† to the writer of this article, not many months ago, “is not from the

* American Quarterly Review, No. XXIV. p. 379.

† A slaveholder—or, at least, one whose sympathies are all with the slaveholders of the South.

intelligence of these people, but from their ignorance." What can be more undeniable, what can be plainer than that it is ignorance which creates such fanatics as Nat Turner, and ignorance, dark and brutal ignorance, which fits their fellow slaves to be their dupes and victims? Who does not believe that if the negroes understood, as a little intelligence would make them understand, their own imbecility and the colossal vastness of the power which is pledged to hold them in subjection, the frequency and the danger of conspiracies and insurrections, would be greatly diminished? Who does not believe that if the negroes, instead of being abandoned to the influence of such preachers as rise up among themselves, with a pretended inspiration, were thoroughly instructed in the principles of the gospel by competent christian teachers, they would be far less dangerous than they now are? Besides, the question whether the negroes shall have knowledge, is no longer submitted to your choice or to the choice of your fellow citizens. Many of them are learning self taught, or by mutual instruction, learning every day; learning to read and to write, learning every thing which your legislators think they ought not to learn. No laws, no police, no standing army can utterly hinder them from learning. You may still decide, however, whether they shall all be taught, or whether here and there an individual acquiring knowledge by his own efforts shall, in that way, acquire a dangerous power over his degraded brethren. And it is still for you to say, whether they shall learn in spite of you, and as they learn, curse you for having taken away from them the key of knowledge; or whether the tie of gratitude and veneration that binds the learner to his teacher, shall bind them to you. We leave the question then with your sense of duty to yourselves and to the wretched beings among whom, and over whom, God has placed you, Ought you not to insist on the instruction of the colored population, bond and free.

On the answer which is given to such questions as these, great interests are depending. Danger there may be in agitating the subject of reform and abolition; but there is more danger, infinitely more, in sitting still, and saying, Peace, peace, while the bondage and ignorance and hideous degradation of two millions of human beings are becoming the bondage, the ignorance, the degradation of three millions, and of four, and of millions accumulating upon millions, in successive generations. Danger there may be in every attempt to remedy such evils; but in the evils themselves there is a deadlier danger, and is it not the height of cowardice to incur the greater for the sake of avoiding the less?

