



THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. I.] WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND ISAAC KNAPP, PUBLISHERS. [NO. 20.
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.] OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE MANKIND. [SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1831.

THE LIBERATOR
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY
AT NO. 10, MERCHANTS' HALL.
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.
Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance.
No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months.
Agents allowed every sixth copy.
All letters and communications must be post paid.

AGENTS.
CHARLES WHIPPLE, *Newburyport, Mass.*
BENJAMIN GOLDMAN, *Salem.*
EDWARD J. FOSBERY, *Nantucket.*
WILLIAM VINCENT, *New-Bedford.*
JOSEPH C. LOVELLOY, *Bangor, Me.*
PHILIP A. BELL, *New-York City.*
EDWIN SCRANTON, *Rochester, N. Y.*
JOHN CASSEY, *Philadelphia, Pa.*
HENRY OGDEN, *Newark, N. J.*
WILLIAM WATKINS, *Baltimore, Md.*
BENJAMIN LUNDY, *Washington City, D. C.*
WILLIAM WORMLEY, "

THE LIBERATOR.

'All the fraudulent methods that are taken for the purpose of enslaving men must be considered as man-stealing and all the buyers and holders of slaves are partakers of the guilt of the slave-merchant. They support and encourage his infamous trade; nor can they pretend that their right to buy slaves is any other or better, than that of the seller. They are verily guilty in whose hand the slave is found.'—BROWN.

The proposed Emancipation Society in Kentucky gets along bravely. At the last accounts, forty-eight slaveholders had signified their readiness to join it; and only two more were wanting to complete the stipulated number, preparatory to organization. The project looks well on paper, and our hope grows vigorous in contemplating it; but we are not so sanguine as to believe, with Friend Lundy, that 'slavery will soon be abolished in Kentucky.' It argues a degree of mind in these individuals, who are about to declare that they possess no right of property in the rising generation, and to liberate the children at a certain age, to claim the services of slave parents in their possession. Why do they not go for the whole? Why be honest in part? By what authority do they think to hold the parents in bondage, without being guilty of robbery and man-stealing? Let their reform be total.

The editor of the Rochester Observer, in allusion to the proposed association, says:

'Whether this is the best way to rid themselves of this curse, we will not pretend to say, but we rejoice to see slaveholders themselves originating any plan of the kind, showing that their attention is called to the subject, and by inference, at least, acknowledging the injustice of holding their fellow men in bondage. This is one of those subjects, a candid examination of which will almost inevitably result in great good. As people become more enlightened, and the principles of liberty are better understood, the shackles of slavery will become loosened, and when moral principle shall be understood and its claims recognized, they must fall off.'

For the Liberator.

WALKER'S APPEAL, NO. 2.
In commenting on a week like this, so pregnant with interest, so full of matter of mighty import, there is, no doubt, wherewith to extend my remarks far beyond the limits of a newspaper. I find so much, so worthy of attention, that I must say, before proceeding farther, that I shall be obliged to skip many points I would gladly dwell upon, and confine myself to the more prominent features of the book. In continuation of the remarks with which my last letter concluded, I will quote one of Walker's periods:

'Do they not institute laws to prohibit us from marrying among the whites? I would wish, candidly, however, before the Lord, to be understood, that I would not give a pinch of snuff to be married to any white person I ever saw in all the days of my life. And I do say, that the black man, or man of color, who will leave his own color (provided he can get one who is good for anything)

and marry a white woman, to be a double slave to her, just because she is white, ought to be treated by her as he surely will be, viz: as a NEGRO!! It is not, indeed, what I care about intermarriages with the whites, which induced me to pass this subject in review; for the Lord knows that there is a day coming when they will be glad enough to get into the company of the blacks, notwithstanding we are, in this generation, levelled by them, almost on a level with the brute creation; and some of us they treat even worse than they do the brutes that perish.'

It is not my purpose to discuss the propriety of intermarriages between the two races here. I bring in the paragraph merely to show the spirit in which our black apostle wrote. He tells us that he would not 'give a pinch of snuff' for any white woman living, but revolts at the prohibitory law, conceiving it to be a manifesto of the supposed inferiority of his people. This is a proper view of the subject, nor does the pride manifested in his language lower him in my esteem.

Walker next, in speaking of the condition of the free blacks, affirms, that they are, one and all, the prey of white rogues, who are constantly defrauding them. As an illustration of his position he says, that when a negro dies possessed of property (a rare case), it usually falls into the hands of some white, to the detriment of the natural heirs. Having very little acquaintance with the blacks, I am unable to say how far his assertion is true; you, Mr Garrison, probably know. Granting the fact to be as Walker states it, I do not think the case of his compeers peculiar; the weak are overruled most by a considerable extent, the prey of the strong; those who think, have and will always prevail over those who merely work. It seems to me that the wrongs of which Walker complains must be attributed not to the color of his people, but to their ignorance. His next complaint relates to the common opinion that the negro is a distinct genus, inferior to the human race, and nearly allied to the simia species. Walker, in my opinion very justly, thinks this an insupportable insult, and speaks of it with the utmost indignation. Without entering into a discussion of the opinion, first broached, I believe, by Mr Jefferson, I would only say, that I think it calculated to embitter the feelings of the blacks toward us, and it may one day be, that every drop of ink wasted in its support will cost a drop of human blood.

Walker next speaks in bitter terms of such blacks as, by giving information, &c., aid the whites to keep their brethren in subjection, and thinks that but for their hindrance the slaves would ere this have been free. Here, I think, he is mistaken: it is not treason but ignorance that rivets their chains. The law makers of some of the slave states have done wisely (in some points of view) in making it highly penal to teach a slave to read. If things are to remain as they are, it is sound policy; that is, supposing it practicable to enforce such laws. Yet I think they will only put off, not prevent the catastrophe. A few years since, being in a slave state, I chanced one morning, very early, to look through the curtains of my chamber window, which opened upon a back yard. I saw a mulatto with a newspaper in his hand, surrounded by a score of colored men, who were listening, open mouthed, to a very inflammatory article the yellow man was reading. Sometimes the reader dwelt emphatically on particular passages, and I could see his auditors stamp and clench their hands! I afterwards learned that the paper, was published in New-York, and addressed to the blacks. It is but reasonable to suppose that such scenes are of common occurrence in the slave states, and it does not require the wisdom of Solomon to discern their tendency.

The following paragraph appears to me to contain the gist of Walker's argument, and to explain his motive for publishing his book:

'Remember that unless you are united, keeping your tongues within your teeth, you will be afraid to trust your secrets to each other, and thus perpetuate our miseries under the Christians!! Remember, also, to lay humble at the feet of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, with prayers and fastings. Let our agonies go on with their barbarities, and at once fill up their cup. Never make an attempt to gain our freedom or natural rights, from under the sword of oppression and murderers, until you see your way

clear—when that hour arrives and you move, be not afraid or dismayed; for be you assured that Jesus Christ the King of heaven and of earth, who is the God of justice and of armies, will surely go before you; And those enemies who have for hundreds of years stolen our rights, and kept us ignorant of Him and His divine worship, He will remove. Millions of whom are, this day, so ignorant and avaricious, that they cannot conceive how God can have an attribute of justice, and show mercy to us because if pleased Him to make us black—which color Mr Jefferson calls unfortunate!! It is not to be understood here, that I mean for us to wait until God shall take us by the hair of our heads and drag us out of subject wretchedness and slavery, nor I do mean to convey the idea for us to wait until our enemies shall make preparations, and call us to seize those preparations, take it away from them, and put every thing before us to death, in order to gain our freedom which God has given us. For you must remember that we are men as well as they. God has been pleased to give us two eyes, two hands, two feet, and some sense in our heads as well as they. They have no more right to hold us in slavery than we have to hold them; we have just as much right, in the sight of God, to hold them and their children in slavery and wretchedness, as they have to hold us, and no more.'

Here then is a clear, undeniable exhortation to insurrection. The facts stated by Walker as incentives, are facts, not suppositions, and in my opinion, his inferences are just. The question is, whether such language can conscientiously be held by a white man, having a clear view of its result, to a black.

'Grant your opinions to be just,' a slave owner once said to me, 'if you talk so to the slaves, they will be cutting their masters' throats.' 'And in God's name,' I replied, 'why should they not cut their masters' throats?' I am, however, no preacher of reform. If the blacks can come to a sense of their wrongs, and a resolution to redress them, through their own instrumentality or that of others, I shall rejoice. They are my fellow creatures and countrymen as well as their masters. It would indeed grieve me to hear that one of my southern brethren had died by the hands of his slaves: it is still more grievous to think that he holds a score of my black brethren in degrading thralldom. Of two evils I prefer the least, and it is better that one man should lose his life than that a score should lose their liberty. Yet I do not conceive it my duty, nor have I any vocation to set myself up as a redresser of wrongs, or an oculist for the mentally blind. For those good men who think otherwise, who seek the greater good of the greater number, to their own danger and prejudice, I respect and esteem, but cannot imitate them. When, as in the present instance, my opinion is asked, it shall be freely given, but I do not think myself bound to advance it unasked.

Walker then speaks of the advertisements of slaves to be sold, runaways, &c., so constantly found in the southern papers. He speaks of husbands torn from their wives, babes from their mothers, and remarks that in the same columns the Mussulmans are reproved for their barbarity to the Greeks. I have often seen such inconsistencies as he mentions, but they are too melancholy to evoke a smile. The Greeks in the Ottoman empire pay tribute and are subject to vexatious exactions, but they are not slaves, unless taken in rebellion. Even then they recover their freedom at the end of seven years. The severities inflicted on them by their Mahometan lords are cakes and gingerbread in comparison with those practised by Christian masters on their slaves. But our slaves are black, and that, it seems, destroys their claim to sympathy. Strange that the dark pigment, which is his coloring matter, should render a negro's skin as callous as the shell of a lobster, and infect the veins of his very heart so as to render him incapable of social affections. I suppose this must be a common opinion of the slave owners, or we should hear less of the abominations of which Walker speaks. To be serious, I would advise southern editors to exclude the advertisements above mentioned, and their accompanying engravings from their papers, lest some of them should find their way to Europe and prove our declaration of independence hypocritical.

'The man who would not fight under our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, in the glorious and heavenly name of freedom and of God—to be delivered from the most wretched, abject and servile slavery that ever a people was afflicted with since the found-

ation of the world to the present day—ought to be kept, with all his children or family, in slavery, or in chains, to be batched by his cruel enemies.'

Well done, David Walker! I like your spirit, for it will work out the salvation of your brethren. Verily, David Walker was a man! Then follows a comparison of the slavery of other lands with our own, and an examination of Mr Jefferson's opinion. Next comes much declamation and a sweeping denunciation of the whites as 'unjust, jealous, unmerciful, avaricious and blood-thirsty beings.' Surely a black has a right to think so. Thus ends the first of the four articles into which the 'Appeal' is divided. As a specimen of Walker's style, and his attitudes himself to declamation, I beg you to print the following:

'Are we men!—I ask you, O my brethren! are we men? Did our Creator make us to be slaves to dust and ashes like ourselves? Are they not dying wrongs as well as we? Have they not to make their appearance before the tribunal of Heaven; to answer for the deeds done in the body, as well as we? Have we any other Master but Jesus Christ alone? Is he not their master as well as ours?—What right then, have we to obey and call any other Master, but Himself? How we could be so submissive to a gang of men, whom we cannot tell whether they are as good as ourselves or not, I never could conceive. However this is shut up with the Lord, and we cannot precisely tell—but I declare, we judge men by their works.'

Here let us pause and reflect. What is to be the end of the American system of oppression? Will it, can it last for ever? And if it does not, how is it to be terminated—by the consent of the whites, or by the hands of the blacks? The question involves no less than the fate of all that portion of our country which lies south of the Potomac. Three ways occur to me by which the slaves may possibly be emancipated without bloodshed, viz. by colonizing them elsewhere, by gradual abolition, or by free labor becoming more profitable than that of thralls. I will, if you wish it, consider these things in another place, not here. As to the prospect of their liberation by some means or other, I consider it certain. There are now about as many colored persons within the limits of the union as there were whites at the commencement of our revolution, and it seems to me impossible that they can be prevented from discovering their wrongs. All the laws that can be made cannot wholly exclude the rudiments of learning from among them. The name of Walker alone is a terror to the south, and it is probable there are or will be more men like him. Negroes have showed their mental capacity in St Domingo, where, thirty-two years ago, they were as much or more debased than they now are in the United States. That example of bloodshed and misery is before the eyes of our slaves; that tragedy, it seems to me, will soon be enacted on an American stage, with new scenery, unless something is speedily done to prevent it. The actors are studying their parts, and there will be more such propertors as Walker. At present, they only want a manager. I fear, very much fear, that the retribution predicted in the book in question is at hand. It is a hard case for the south to be sure. The southern planter has not himself instituted the present state of affairs; it came down from his fathers. It is hard for him to give up his inheritance, still harder to overcome the habits in which he was bred. Even the immediate emancipation of his slaves, and the restoration of their natural rights, would, perhaps, produce much evil. It will be harder for his children to see this change brought about by the red hand. But—when the slaves shall have obtained even the limited degree of knowledge possessed by the free blacks, if they do not rise and strike for freedom, if they do not settle the account that has been scored for two centuries, Mr Jefferson will have been proved to be right in his opinion. When they shall no longer have the excuse of ignorance, and shall not avail themselves of their strength, they will indeed be proved to be heathens, unworthy of the name or privileges of men. It is astonishing, Mr Garrison, to hear some of the free and intelligent sons of New-Eng and speak on this subject. A lawyer, of no mean attainments, said, a few days ago, in my presence, that the slaves in the south are well enough; that their condition is

preferable to that of the poor whites here; and, in short, that they were happy. I have often heard similar opinions expressed. They are indeed contented, and so is a horse or an ox, and for the same reason. It is the happiness of a brute—not of a man. If to eat, drink and sleep, without a thought of the past or future, constitutes earthly felicity, then are slaves happy indeed, and their condition cannot be bettered. Even then they are not quite so happy as a horse, for they feel the whip more sensibly. Ask any white who expatiates on this happiness, if he would, if he could, get rid of his capes and perplexities by changing conditions with a slave. No; but the slaves are black, and that argument oversets all the rules of logic—it is unanswerable. V.

FREE ARTICLES.

To the Editor of the Liberator.

Sir—I was glad to see in your paper of April 2d an answer to the first of a number of questions published some time since, relating to the use of articles produced by slave labor. I have been hoping to see the subject fully discussed, and am induced to offer a few observations relating to it, and by way of answer to the second question, in case you have nothing more satisfactory upon the subject. The reasons offered by your correspondent for giving a preference to articles produced by free, over those produced by slave labor, appear to me conclusive. 'Are there equally strong reasons for giving up altogether the productions of slave labor?' It appears to me that every argument which your correspondent uses for preferring free articles, is equally strong for giving up, wholly, those produced by slave labor. For, whatever good may be accomplished by refusing to purchase any article produced by slave labor, will be precisely the same, so far as I can see, whether a similar article, produced by free labor, is or is not to be obtained; the only difference being in the convenience to the consumer. To say that we will give the preference to rice or sugar raised by freemen, and will not purchase that which is raised by slaves, when the other can be procured, is taking one step; to say that, when the free cannot be procured, we will go without, and still refuse to purchase that which is raised by slaves, is taking another step in the same direction. If, indeed, such a preference be given, as including giving a premium for such articles raised by free labor in our own country, as are usually raised by slave labor, perhaps the advantages may be greater than even from total abstinence from the productions of slave labor, when substitutes are procured elsewhere. But this must depend on the actual circumstances of the case, of which I have not sufficient knowledge to be able to judge, and it is a view of the subject not adverted to in the answer given to the first question.

If the reasons which have been offered for giving a preference to free labor articles, and abstaining from those of slave labor, be sound, to adopt this measure becomes a matter of conscience and duty. For, shall we say that we have it in our power, in any way, to promote the emancipation of the slaves, and yet, that we may innocently decline doing so? It may be considered either as a positive measure, as actually doing something towards emancipation, in which case it is a duty of benevolence and charity, or more correctly, perhaps, as a negative measure, as simply refusing to continue accessories to the crime of slaveholding, in which view it is an obligation of justice. For if by ceasing to purchase the productions of slave labor, we should discourage slavery, it is because by purchasing them, we do in fact uphold and encourage it.

'In condemning slavery, and scorning slaveholders,' says Capt. Basil Hall, 'we are too apt to forget the share which we ourselves contribute towards the permanence of the system. It is true we are some three or four thousands of miles from the actual scene. But if we are to reproach the planter who lives in affluence in the midst of a slave population, it ought to be asked how he comes by the means to live at that rate. He gives his orders to the overseer, the overseer instructs the driver, who compels the negro to work, and up comes the cotton. But what then? He cannot make the smallest use of his crop, however luxuriant it be, unless upon an invitation to divide the advantages with him, we agree to become partners with him in this speculation—the result of slave labor. The transfer of the cotton from Georgia to Liverpool, is certainly one step, but it is no more than a link in the transaction. Its manufacture into the goods which we scruple not to make use of, and without which we should be very ill off, is but another link in the same chain, at the end of which is the slave.'

Strange to say, the man who wrote this appears to have had no idea that we are under any obligation to withdraw from this partnership in iniquity. But though he had not sufficient soundness of principle to arrive at this conclusion, it is one which his reasoning, not the less powerfully, forces upon every conscientious mind.

Are we then, as consumers of the produce of slave labor, in fact, abettors of slavery? To him who considers it a crime to hold a fellow creature in slavery, the thought is arising; but let him not quiet himself by turning from it, but by ceasing to do the evil which he has, perhaps, hitherto done ignorantly, or from want of thought. If this community can ensure the emancipation of the slaves, or of any part of

them, surely they are bound to do it; and what is this but saying that every individual in the community is bound to do his part? It will be said, of course, for it has been said, that the effect of one, or of a few individuals, giving up the productions of slave labor, would be so absolutely imperceptible, that the measure would be perfectly useless, and that, therefore, till many are ready to join, there can be no obligation upon any one. Perhaps the facility of this mode of reasoning may be made evident by considering, that by using it, each one to himself, so large a number may be kept from adopting the measure, as each one admits, might, by adopting it, produce the desired effect. But the more direct answer to the objection is, that if the use of these productions is positively assisting (in however small a degree) to keep men in slavery, no one, who considers it wrong to keep them so, is at liberty to assist even in this trifling extent.

In another view I consider this measure an important and desirable one. It is one that will bring the friends of the cause together as cooperators; it is a measure to unite them; and every one knows how much cooperation and sympathy add to activity and zeal. It leads each individual to feel that he is engaged in the cause; gives to each one something to do; and to feel that we can do something, animates us to new exertions. Slavery has been looked upon as an appalling and heart-sickening, but irremediable evil, and as much beyond the reach of any efforts of ours, as any evils that exist in the unexplored regions of other quarters of the globe. It is, I think, this very feeling of powerlessness to do anything for the removal of this evil, that induces the extreme apathy by which the moral sense of the community, on this subject, is so nearly obscured, and its energies paralyzed. But if, as your correspondent says, by the inhabitants of the northern states refusing to purchase the produce of slave labor, a general emancipation of the slaves must follow, and on a smaller scale the result must be similar, surely there is encouragement enough for the friends of emancipation, and the abhorers of slavery, to exert themselves. Let then each individual among them, who is persuaded of the propriety of this measure, look around him, and see if there is not some one, if no more, whom he can influence, and induce to join in it. Thus let unit be added to unit, till, however slowly, so many millions are added up, that, to supply the increasing demand, two millions of slaves must be transferred to the ranks of free laborers, added to our ten millions of freemen.

The sympathy of the free people of color, I should think, would easily arouse them to a willing adoption of this measure; not that it is more their duty than that of others, but it would not be strange or unbecoming if they should be among the first to perceive the duty.

The strongest argument I have heard used against this measure is, that it might be productive of irritation at the south. Let this be guarded against. It should not be pursued as a measure of offence, or hostility, or as an expression of anger, or horror, at the wickedness of slaveholders. Let it be plainly understood that, in adopting this course, we act from the dictates of humanity, and conscientious scruples of being partakers in what we consider the guilt of holding our fellow creatures in slavery. Were it thus adopted, and adhered to, only from such motives, could it be the cause of irritation to our southern brethren? Might we not rather hope that such a manifestation of our principles in regard to slavery, and of our sincerity in them, would have a favorable effect on some minds beginning to have misgivings as to its lawfulness?

Are there any objections to the proposed measure which I have overlooked or am ignorant of? There may be such, and, if there are, I hope those who see them will make them known. Is there any fallacy in the foregoing reasoning? If there is, I should be glad to have it pointed out. But if not, every individual who disapproves of slavery is bound to abstain from using the productions of slave labor.

J. E.

For the Liberator.

THE COLORED POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES. NO. 7.

RULE VI. All the power of the master over the slave may be exercised, not by himself only, in person, but by every person, bond or free, whom he may depute as his agent.

This is a general principle which is recognized throughout the slaveholding country. It is the same which prevails in the British West India. How much this right of delegating authority adds to the severity of slavery, is obvious. If punishment were only allowed to be inflicted by the master, or by some one in his presence, or under a special order, directing a specific infliction for a specific offence, previously proved, it would do much to relieve the misery of slavery. It is the master's interest to preserve the health and strength of his slaves, and to make them contented with their situation. It is, therefore, obviously for his interest, that they should not be so frequently and severely punished as to weaken their bodies or depress their spirits. The agents to whom the unlimited power of the master may be delegated, besides being destitute of the

strength which will, in most cases, prevent cruelty in him, are usually men of less understanding, and less principle, than he is. The cruelty and severity of slave owners are notorious at the best character of slave owners are notorious at the best. But not only are the poor slaves subject to oppressive and cruel treatment from their overseers, they are also liable to be beaten with the whip at the pleasure of their fellow slaves, called drivers, when they superintend their labor.

On this subject, though the law is well understood, the following extract, from the laws of Louisiana, may be worth extracting, as it seems to me that this mere definition of slavery affords as strong an argument against its toleration as any labored argument could do.

'The condition of a slave being merely a passive one, his subordination to his master, and to all who represent him, is not susceptible of any modification or restriction, (except in what can incite the slave to the commission of crime), in such manner, that he is not his master, and to all his family, a respect without bounds and an absolute obedience, and he is consequently to execute all the orders which he receives from him, his said master, or from them.'

The following passage from Stephen places this subject in a just point of view.

'The slave is liable to be coerced or punished by the whip, and to be tormented by every species of personal treatment, subject only to the exceptions already mentioned, by the attorney, manager, overseer, driver, and every other person to whose command or control the owner may choose to subject him, as fully as by the owner himself.—Nor is any special mandate, or express general power, necessary for this purpose: it is enough that the infliction of the violence is set over the slave for the moment, by the owner, or by any of his delegates, or sub-delegates, of whatever rank or character.

To West Indians, these will appear consequences of an owner's authority, as natural and obvious as it is of his property in a horse, that I may depute a servant, and every other person to whose government or control the owner may choose to subject him, as fully as by the owner himself.—Nor is any special mandate, or express general power, necessary for this purpose: it is enough that the infliction of the violence is set over the slave for the moment, by the owner, or by any of his delegates, or sub-delegates, of whatever rank or character.

But these properties of colonial slavery, are by no means derived from the stock from which some of its advocates have attempted to deduce its legal pedigree in general, and whereto they have had the impudence to refer for its legitimate nature and rules. The English lord had an arbitrary power of beating or correcting his vassal; but it was a power which he could only exercise in person, and with his own hands. He could not delegate that important and dangerous authority; not even *pro re nata*; much less constitute general attorneys, managers, overseers, and drivers, with a power of driving and whipping, *ad arbitrium*, the human cattle whom he gave them in charge. The vassal might have an action against any man but his lord for beating him, except for just cause; and it was no legal defence in such action to plead, that it was done, by the command of the lord.' P. H.

O. L. has anticipated the expression of our feelings with regard to the meeting alluded to in his communication. His strictures deserve attention. Virginia, the Rev. Dr. M'Auley said, was wholly supplied with the bible; and yet there are in that State nearly half a million of slaves, from whom the word of life is withheld!

BIBLE SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the Liberator.

Sir—I was present, a few evenings since, at a meeting in favor of the Bible Society, held at the Rev. Dr. Channing's Church in Federal-street. The Rev. Dr. M'Auley, who first addressed the meeting, stated many facts to show how much bibles were wanted in different parts of the country. Among other instances, he mentioned how large a part of the population in some part of North Carolina were destitute of the Bible. This, he said, was the white population; for the laws prevented the distribution of bibles among the slaves. Your readers no doubt know, that in several of the slave states, it is a criminal offence to teach a slave to read or write. Dr. M'Auley, however, in making this statement with regard to the laws of North Carolina, not only did not express any abhorrence of this atrocious tyranny, but did not utter a single word from which it could be inferred that he did not heartily approve the policy of North Carolina, in thus attempting to exclude its black population from the blessings of knowledge and religion.

I do not suppose that Dr. M'Auley approves of the despotism of North Carolina. I cannot believe that any man, who is engaged in promoting the distribution of the scriptures among the poor and enlightened, can believe that any part of the human species ought to be debarred from these blessings, merely because they are of a dark color. Supporting his sentiments on this subject to coincide with those of all good men at the north, I think that he is pursuing a mistaken policy ever to mention such laws, without at the same time expressing his opinion of them. He ought not to be willing to be supposed capable of countenancing such laws for a moment. He ought not to allow the public to think that those who patronize the Bible Society, wish it to be kept from the slaves.

I am persuaded, sir, that much injury is done to the cause of human liberty and improvement, by the studied silence which too many persons at the north observe on the subject of slavery. If the

sciences which are cherished almost universally among us, were to be fully and fearlessly expressed, it would shake the whole fabric of oppression to its foundations.

This course of concealment and caution actually leads us to lose sight altogether of the wretched condition of two millions of our countrymen, who are pining in the bonds of oppression. True one of the other gentlemen who spoke at the same meeting, observed that we have given a wider scope to individual liberty than any community that ever flourished before. What a sentiment to be uttered in a country, one sixth part of whose inhabitants are suffering under a worse than Egyptian bondage!

You will understand, that I am far from being opposed to the Bible Society. I shall always advocate the universal diffusion of the scriptures. But, sir, I consider one of the strongest reasons for diffusing the book in this country, is that the principles of the gospel must put an end to personal slavery among us. 'Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' O. L.

The following communication presents the colony at Liberia in a new aspect. We suspect, however, that the natives give in exchange for European goods, ivory, camwood, &c. to a considerable extent, as well as slaves and money.

For the Liberator.

THE COLONY.

Mr. Russwurm, at Liberia in Africa, has sworn to God that there is no other place that a colored man can call his home but Africa! I believe that when a man is born, that is his home; so every colored man who is born in Africa, can certainly claim that place as his home. But if Mr. Russwurm's solemn oath, in the presence of his God, refers to the colored natives of these United States, I must say, the man is mad; perhaps laboring under a burning fever incidental to the climate of his adopted country. Mr. Russwurm particularly mentions, that 'there is no other place!' Has Mr. R. forgotten Hayti—South America—and I can, with propriety, add, the Danish and French West India islands? The King of Denmark has issued his decree, (which has been already noticed in the Liberator,) through Governor Van Slichten, declaring all the free people of color equal with the whites. Already has a black man been appointed Aid-de-camp to the Governor, and one admitted to the Bar. Since the French revolution, the colored people in the French W. I. islands have enjoyed similar privileges to the whites. I am informed by a white Spaniard, that Genl. Paer, who is now commander-in-chief of Venezuela, in South America, is a mulatto. Now, we plainly see how near Mr. Russwurm's declaration, in the presence of God, approximates the truth.

I cannot close without saying something concerning that prejudice-stirring body,—the Colonization Society. It has promised, by colonizing the colored people in Liberia, to put an end to the slave trade. Such, however, is not the consequence—it is exactly the contrary. Let us view the fact.

It is well known, that the only object the African chiefs have in making wars on the neighboring tribes, is to obtain money, which they readily get by taking prisoners of war to the coast, and buying them away to the slave traders for gold and silver coins. Before the colony at Liberia was established, those wars had been less frequent, because only a little gold and silver was wanting to dazzle the eyes of the chiefs; but now the colony is established, the money, which before was an almost useless article to the chiefs, becomes of great utility.—They cannot purchase articles at Liberia without paying the precious metal for them; consequently a good deal will be required to purchase the many extravagances at the Colony, which I saw copied from the Liberia Herald into the Commercial Advertiser of this city. To obtain this money to trade with the colony, the chiefs must renew their wars with double vigor, to make prisoners to barter on the coast with the slave traders. The very money that the colony receives for goods is the price of human flesh! There is a great quantity of doubloons and Spanish dollars in Liberia, as I am informed, which was brought there by the natives;—so it is clear that that very money arises from the sale of the unfortunate prisoners who are taken in war. I do not hesitate to say, that as the colony in Liberia increases, so will the slave trade. (1) Colonizationists, instead of destroying the slave market which would overthrow the slave trade, have planted in Africa a nursery to extend the inhuman system.

New-York.

(1) One thing is certain: the slave trade continues to increase in activity and extent. Colonizationists may make the most of the fact.—Ed.

The Grand Sultan of Turkey has issued an edict forbidding his subjects to call the Christians dogs, an epithet which has hitherto been in common use among the Turks, and enjoins them to be on more favorable terms with the Christians.

When will the Grand Sultan of this country—PUBLIC OPINION—pass an edict, forbidding persons of color to be branded with brands and doomed to an interminable bondage? Verily, the Turk is our superior in humanity and justice.

From the Christian Register. THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

Ms Editor—Some weeks ago, two articles were published in the Register, in which the measures and objects of the Colonization Society were questioned. Since that time, several pieces have appeared in the Register in defence of the Society. As these pieces have not directly answered the objections which I have not directly answered, perhaps an answer to them is not formally advanced.

As the subject is one of great importance, and one in which the public is not fully versed, I take the liberty to state the objections to the colonization scheme again, and to consider some of the grounds on which the defence of the Society is placed.

The general principle on which this association is founded, is, that the free blacks are so objectionable and degraded, and so borne down by the prejudices of the whites, that their improvement in this country is hopeless, and therefore that they ought to be removed. I objected to this principle, because it necessarily led the advocates of colonization to exaggerate the character of the free blacks and to inflame the prejudices of the whites against them, and thereby to increase the degradation and ignorance, which every person of common humanity ought to seek to remove.

To prove that this had been the actual effect of the Society, I referred to the African Repository, now offer a few extracts from the aspirers of the Society, which amply confirm my statements. If I were to send all the quotations of this character which I might do, they would far exceed the limits of a newspaper. My extracts are made from a few numbers of the African Repository, and a Report of the Society, which are in my possession.

The Repository for April, 1825, speaks of the free people of color as 'degraded in character and miserable in condition, forever excluded by public sentiment, by law, and by a physical distinction, from the most powerful motives to the removal or increase of the prejudices against the African race.'

Many number of the same work again mentions the free blacks as 'notoriously ignorant, degraded, and miserable, mentally diseased, broken spirited, acted upon by no motives to honorable exertions, scarcely reached in their debasement by the heavenly light.'

Is not this an exaggeration? Is not its tendency to depress the spirits of the blacks, to check their exertions, and to excite a strong feeling of a necessity for their banishment?

The same writer says: 'Their freedom is licentious, and to many restraint [i. e. SLAVERY] would prove a blessing.' Another article in the same number says, 'no individual merit can elevate the black to the condition of the white man; no path of honorable distinction is open to him, &c. &c. and adds, 'in general, black people gain little, in many instances they are great losers, by emancipation.'

In the Repository of July 1825, are some extracts from a Discourse by Rev. Dr. Daniel Dana, of New-Hampshire, from which we take the following: 'In addition likewise to all the causes which tend to pollute, to degrade, and render them [the free blacks] miserable, there are principles of repulsion between them and us which can never be overcome. They can never forget their wrongs. And if they could, we could not. By a law of human nature, I mean of human depravity, the man who has injured a fellow being, becomes from that moment his enemy.'

Are these the sentiments of a minister of the gospel of peace and love? Could Dr. Dana really believe that if people of color were well treated, they would hate those who treated them well; or that there was no power in Christianity to remove the prejudices against the children of Africa?

In the Repository for September 1825, we find the following passage taken from a Virginia paper. 'The free negroes are not confined to slaveholding States. They are dispersed over the Union, and it is desired by their neighbors everywhere to remove them. If this class of persons existed only in Virginia, Virginia alone would be compelled to colonize them.'

How gratifying this language must be to the free blacks. How pleasant to be told they must be colonized. The United States Literary Gazette, as quoted in another number of the Repository, holds the following language.

'The labors of the Colonization Society, however, appear to us highly deserving of praise. The blacks, whom they carry from the country, belong to a class far more noxious than the slaves themselves. They are free without any sense of character to restrain them, or regular means of obtaining an honest livelihood. Most of the criminal offences committed in the Southern States are chargeable to them, and their influence over the slaves is pernicious and alarming.'

The following is from a Georgia newspaper. 'In this country a negro is neither free nor bond, but stands upon insulated ground, the outcast of all society.'

The next extract is from an Indiana paper, published in the Repository of May 1827. 'In consequence of his own invertebrate habits, and the no less invertebrate prejudices of the whites, it is a sadly demonstrated truth, that the negro cannot, in this country, become an enlightened and useful citizen. Driven to the lowest stratum of society, and entangled there for melancholy ages, his mind becomes proportionally grovelling, and to gratify his animal desires is his most exalted aspiration. Connected by no endearing link to surrounding society, he cannot feel a citizen's nameless incentives to a manly and noble conduct. The negro, who in this country, will be treated as an inferior being.'

year,—that the character of the Repository is as bad as all other papers,—and that my only reason for not using those recent numbers for making extracts from, is, that I have no later ones in my possession. They certainly support the charge made against the Society, of abusing the free blacks, and representing their improvement in this country as hopeless. I cannot, I confess, imagine any means more effectual for depressing the blacks and retarding their improvement.

I also objected to the Colonization Society, because it tended to retard, by representing the condition of the free blacks as worse than that of the slaves, and by directing the attention of slaveholders solely to colonization and diverting it from their other duties to their unhappy dependents. Some of the passages already quoted expressly avow the opinion, that the free blacks are more wretched than the slaves. Many others to the same effect might be cited. The publication of such opinions, opinions which are not supported by facts, and were invented by the advocates of slavery, as an apology for their oppression, cannot but count as a direct insult to the slaveholders. In many cases it is boldly avowed, that the slaves ought not to be liberated except 'on condition of their going to Africa or Hayti.' The Society in a memorial addressed to the several States say, that the managers of the institution 'consider any attempts to promote the increase of the free colored population by manumission, unnecessary, premature, and dangerous.' Is the Society by which such sentiments are advanced, the friend or the enemy of slavery?

In my former numbers I mentioned that the greater part of the free colored people of this country were opposed to the Colonization Society, and that they were opposed to it because they had felt its operations injurious to them by increasing the prejudices of the whites against them, and by making them to be regarded as intruders in their native country. This charge has not been refuted. But we may judge of the feelings of the colonizationists from one fact. Within the two or three last months, public meetings of the free blacks in Boston, New-York, and Baltimore, have passed resolutions expressing their opposition to the Colonization Society. These meetings, as I have been assured on good authority, were composed of the most respectable part of the free people of color. Their opinions on a subject in which they were so deeply interested, were entitled to respect and attention. But the friends of colonization, instead of attempting to answer the arguments of the free blacks, have expressed the greatest anger and resentment against them for daring to express any opinion on the subject. I confess I have read with deep sorrow and disgust the expressions of contempt and abuse, which various newspapers have published against these unfortunate people of color for presuming to think that they had a right to live in this country.

I have only a few remarks to add upon the arguments by which the Society has been defended.

It is very often repeated that the friends of colonization have engaged in the cause from motives of disinterested benevolence. I am willing to admit that this is true with regard to a very large number of them; but the conclusion is far from following, that their opinion on the subject are sound, or that the operations of the Society are not to be questioned, because its members believe they are doing good. A correspondent under the signature of 'A,' who gave an ingenious and well written defence of the Society in the Register of April 9th, has said that the Society wishes no blacks to go to Africa, unless they go freely; and that the whole scope of the enterprise is voluntary. In this I cannot agree with him. It is true, no measures of direct violence have been attempted to compel the free blacks to leave their country. But a moral compulsion has been used to drive them from the United States; which, on principle, is as indefensible as direct force. They are told, not only that they are degraded and oppressed, but that they always must be degraded and oppressed here—that the whites will never treat them like fellow men and Christians—that Africa is their country—and that if they refuse to go there, they never will be happy here. The effect of language like this to stir up the prejudices of the vulgar against the people of color, and to make their situation here uncomfortable, I have already sufficiently intimated.

The object of the Colonization Society is exposed. I quote from our shores. See our correspondent in reply to the question, Why not educate the blacks in America, says, it is a strange question to ask the Colonization Society, 'seeing that they have recently established a school for the express purpose of educating colored youth.' If this refers, as I believe it does, to the establishment of a school for the education of colored youth who are to be transported to Africa, a Society for that purpose having recently been formed, the sting of the charge still remains, viz. that the Colonization Society does not wish to remain in this country. If the blacks who are to remain in this country, if the Society has established any school for the education of any colored children who may be sent to it, the measure deserves unqualified approbation.

Your correspondent attempts to represent the climate of Liberia as healthy. I hope it may be so. But the impression which I, in common with the public, have derived from the reports from that country, made by persons who were evidently desirous of giving the most favorable view of it, is, that the mortality among the settlers had been very great, and still continues to be so.

The public will not be satisfied on this point by general remarks on the soil and climate, without complete returns of the number of emigrants, their ages, number of deaths, present population, &c.

I have already shown that the effect of the Colonization Society has been unfavorable to the cause of the negroes, both free and slave. Another benefit which is expected to arise from a colony in Africa is the extension of the benefits of civilization and Christianity to that benighted region. Even on this point I cannot help feeling some doubts. The history of the world does not show many, if any, instances of the settlement of civilized nations among savage tribes, in which the latter have been benefi-

ted. Look at the European colonies in North and South America, in the East and West Indies, and in Southern Africa, and what is the lesson which they teach us? We find that where the native tribes have been in extreme barbarism, they have been uniformly oppressed and have dwindled away before their civilized neighbors; and that where the natives have been more advanced in civilization, if they have not been exterminated, their moral and religious improvement has been scarcely perceptible, and no balance for the misery and waste of human life which has preceded and accompanied it.

Having already taken up more space than I intended, I must conclude.

SLAVERY RECORD.

We find the following advertisement in the Hancock Advertiser, printed at Mount Zion, Georgia, the editor of which paper, as we are informed, is the son of a New-England clergyman! Slaveholders, it seems, persecute even to Mount Zion!

'Ranaway from the subscriber, about Christmas last, a negro man by the name of Charles, who formerly belonged to the estate of O. H. Appling. It is supposed that he is in the neighborhood of Mount Zion, where he is generally known. A liberal reward will be given to any person who will deliver him to J. P. Knowles of Hancock. GREEN MOORE.'

Murder.—The N. C. Spectator states that in Spartanburg, S. C. recently a Mr Woodruff started to visit his father-in-law, Mr Dean, who was sick. He was waylaid by five Mr D's negroes, and killed; and the cause is said to be that they feared to become the property of Mr W. on the death of Mr D. Three were arrested, two hung 15th ult. and the third reserved as a witness against the other two, if arrested.

'Liberty or Death!' is a fearful motto to oppressors, but a glorious one to the oppressed!—i. e. in the estimation of worldly patriots. A few more cases like the above, we trust, will open the eyes of slave owners to the danger of their situation.

Two thousand negroes were landed at different ports in Cuba, from the first of February to the middle of March, notwithstanding the many vessels that are cruising to suppress the slave trade.

A slave at or near Old Harbor, Jamaica, has been convicted of the crime of preaching, and sentenced to six months imprisonment, and to be flogged!

He who is guilty of the crime of stealing a free person of color, or selling him as a slave—or dealing or selling a slave—is liable from five to fifteen years imprisonment, in the state of Tennessee—about the same punishment that is inflicted for horse-stealing!!! 'All men are born free and equal'—the slaves are men—ergo, slaveholders are guilty of stealing 'free persons of color,' and, according to their own enactment, ought to be imprisoned as criminals for a term of years! Can they all be accommodated in the prisons of Tennessee? If so, it is time to commence prosecutions.

JUVENILE DEPARTMENT.

For the Liberator.

A LESSON FROM THE FLOWERS.

Little maiden, little maiden! With the spring's first blossoms laden, Pause and list thee, while I tell Words that thou should'st ponder well. When thou pluck'd'st those glowing buds, Saw'st'th thou none whom drenching floods, Chilling winds, or blighting frost, Rudely to the earth had tost— Or which some rough foot had trod, Crush'd and broken, to the sod,— Till their leaves, all soil'd and stain'd, Not a brilliant trace retain'd? Yet had those been kindly rear'd, They had bright as these appear'd.

Thou art in life's joyous spring, Fair hopes round thee blossoming! And the glad thoughts of thy breast Sweet as perfume o'er thee rest, Yet not all as young as thou, Bright-one! wear so free a brow. There are some whose early years, Are all stain'd with hopeless tears,— Some whose joys and griefs are alighted, Some whose hearts are crush'd and blighted, Till each sunny tint is lost 'Neath contempt's unkindly frost.

Little maiden, little maiden! When thou seest one so laden With the stains that wrong and wo O'er the spirit's light will throw, Pass thou not with scornful eye And unpausing footstep by; For within thy shelter'd bower, That had bloom'd as bright a flower. Rather do thou lift thy head Gently from its rain-drench'd bed, And with watchful care restore. All the brilliant hues it wore, Till its grateful perfume be Rich and sweet reward to thee.

A VOICE FROM WASHINGTON!

A fifth city has spoken! The following resolutions were passed at a large and respectable meeting of the free colored citizens of Washington, D. C. held on the 4th inst. This is 'bearing the lion in his den.'

Resolved, That this meeting wish to distrust the efforts made by the Colonization Society to cause the free people of color of these United States to emigrate to Liberia on the coast of Africa, or elsewhere.

Resolved, That it is the declared opinion of the members of this meeting, that the soil which gave them birth is their true and veritable home, and that it would be impolitic, unwise and improper for them to leave their home without the benefit of education.

Resolved, That this meeting conceive that among the advocates of the Colonization system, they have many true and sincere friends; and do regret that their actions, although prompted no doubt by the purest motives, do not meet our approbation.

The Washington Spectator, of April 30, contains the communication of a colored man in praise of the American Colonization Society, and against the recent pretensions of his brethren in our great city. The writer, we presume, is John B. Heplburn, who received last year so handsome an overthrow by 'A Colored Baltimorean,' in the Genius of Universal Emancipation. If Mr H. has such felicitous notions of Liberia, and believes that he can never enjoy his rights here, why does he not emigrate? His language and conduct are grossly inconsistent. We pity his infatuation. He is clinging to a combination which is the worst foe to the free colored and slave population, with whom liberty and equality have to contend.

Assault.—The Evening Gazette informs us that a most daring and violent attack was made upon a lady and gentleman, on Friday night, in Cambridge-street, between 10 and 11 o'clock, by six colored men, who took hold of the lady and used very abusive and insulting language to both of them. Two of the men, Nathaniel Tidd and George Bodwin, have been arrested, and on Saturday afternoon were bound over by Justice Simmons of the Police Court, to take their trial before the Municipal Court, on the first Monday of June next, and for want of bail were both committed.—Transcript of Monday.

[We learn that the assaults were four young men. An act, like the above, deserves severe punishment; but it should not implicate our colored population as a body—for they are as indignant at such conduct as our white citizens. So long, however, as our colored youth are left, by the community, to grow up in ignorance, destitute of education, we must expect them to behave badly.]

It is stated that more than \$400 were contributed to the American Colonization Society, in March, by a few individuals in Natchez. Slaveholders seem to be very anxious to get rid of the free colored people: we can see through their philanthropy.

From Antigua.—The Antigua Free Press of April 7th states, that another week has passed in safety and tranquillity, without the least blessing of God; and some confidence was felt for the future. The country negroes were engaged in work, but the strictest vigilance is recommended.—Several slaves were under trial before the Military Commission.

The editor openly advocates the restoration of the full rights of citizens to the negroes, and says: 'there remain, of all the chartered colonies, we believe, only three, Antigua, Tortola and Nevis, in which these people have not been relieved, either wholly or in greater part, from their odious and hurtful disabilities.'

Louis Bonaparte died at Fort on the 17th of March. The loss by a late fire at Guayaquil is estimated at three millions of dollars.

'No White Slave,' next week. Other favors are solicited. We are under fresh obligations to 'H. F. G.' Her communication, with others, will be inserted in our next number.

A continuation of our remarks on the Marriage Law is unavoidably omitted to-day.

Fifty-three Representatives (National Republicans) were elected in this city on Wednesday.

On Sunday a white and a black, on board the sloop Berkshire, at Albany, got into a quarrel, and the latter threw the former into the river; where he was drowned.

The President of the Howard Benevolent Society acknowledges the receipt of one hundred dollars from a benevolent individual, unknown—to be appropriated to the relief of the sufferers by the late fire in Broad-street. Contributions were held at several of the private schools on Saturday, for the relief of the sufferers. Upwards of \$1000 were collected.

A ladies' Fair for charitable purposes held at Newburyport, yielded \$1000.

MARRIAGES.

In Philadelphia, on the 3rd inst. by the Rev. Ezra Styles Ely, Mr Stephen H. Gloucester, of Philadelphia, to Miss Ann Crusoe, of Washington city, del. On the 5th inst. by the Rev. Charles Hoover, Mr Thomas Bundy to Miss Maria Carroll, all of Philadelphia. On the 9th inst. by the Rev. Ezra Styles Ely, Mr Richard Carter to Miss Ann Willsbank, all of Philad.

E. M. C.

