

THE LIBERATOR

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND ISAAC KNAPP, PUBLISHERS.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS. SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1838. NO. 20.

TERMS
\$20 Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

ADVERTISING
All letters and communications must be post paid.

AGENTS
John C. Lovjoy, Bangor, Me.
Joseph W. Foster, Hartford, Conn.

NEW-YORK
John C. Lovjoy, New-York City.
George H. Burt, Brooklyn.

WASHINGTON
John C. Lovjoy, Washington City.
John W. Alden, Baltimore.

THE LIBERATOR
[For the Liberator.]
COLONIZATION CRAFT.

Danforth, and in a recent notice by Mr. Finley. Those letters by Mr. Danforth will work all their evils, for the papers which publish them will not admit a reply.

A few days ago, an official article appeared in the New-York papers, from the office and signed by the Agent of the American Colonization Society, stating that several highly respectable persons of the colored people of New-York and the surrounding country have lately applied for a passage to the Colony.

One of the grand movements by which the Colonization Society is impelled in the northern States, is the incessant clamour which is repeated in every circle against the citizen who calls in question the rectitude of a scheme which is founded upon unrighteousness.

One of the grand movements by which the Colonization Society is impelled in the northern States, is the incessant clamour which is repeated in every circle against the citizen who calls in question the rectitude of a scheme which is founded upon unrighteousness.

rotten meal and stinking fish to eat; and forty stripes, save one, every morning for breakfast. The poor creature, dreading the threatened laceration, absconds, and then the robbers hypocritically maintain that the possessor of the house went away, and gave up to them the title and occupancy of the house with his own consent.

Just such is the relative position of the man-stealer, the slave, and the Colonization Society. The Georgian slaveholder has four, or seven, or twelve feeble, diseased or worn out slaves, aliaz whipped, starved, and helpless American citizens, too old or emaciated to work, and he tells them—there are some silly people at the north 'with more money than brains,' to let Mr. Danforth's elegant cart of the Abolitionists, who will pay well for your freedom, and therefore you must go back to Africa, your own country, by the first ship which sails to Liberia.

COLONIZATION AND EMANCIPATION.
Letter from Professor Wright, of the Western Reserve College, Ohio.

Dear Sirs—Being assured that the shadow of manumission has appeared under several communications in your paper, in defence of the Colonization Society, belongs to me—in Middletown, Ct, though a stranger to me—I propose to examine his third number.

The 'toxin notes' of Philanthropy; heard on the plains of Ohio; seem to have called forth, in this number, a defence of slavery, rather than of colonization, prefaced with sneering statements. We are told, 'The claims of the negro, connected and interwoven as they are with the interests of the whites, have been very generally "discussed and enforced."

The criminality of slavery is 'now universally admitted'.
It is a 'misfortune' as well as a 'disgrace', common to the North and the South.

The influence of the Colonization Society is in hazard of being weakened, if not entirely destroyed, by the misguided zeal of men who 'judge from a few truisms'; that is, I suppose, who take for granted the first part of the by-laws, to wit, 'that the Colonization, as well as the truth of certain declarations in scripture.

From these statements we gather, 1. That the just claims of the negro are suffering from their being unduly weakened, if not entirely destroyed, by the misguided zeal of men who 'judge from a few truisms'; that is, I suppose, who take for granted the first part of the by-laws, to wit, 'that the Colonization, as well as the truth of certain declarations in scripture.

man ever do any thing without at last doing it immediately?
But wherein consists this impracticability? Why, herein—the slaveholders will not practice it. Therefore, according to Vindex, the doctrine is not true, that they ought to. An admirable way of disproving a doctrine, and convenient to thieves in general, as well as to slaveholders in particular.

Vindex evidently confounds two inquiries which should be kept distinct. 1. Whether the slaveholders ought to do a certain thing; and 2. If they ought, whether they ought to say so. Let him relieve himself of his anti-republican distinction between the people and the States, State Legislatures, Congress, &c., and come to these questions in order. If it is wrong for one man to hold slaves, it is wrong for two, for three, for four, and so on ad infinitum. If it is wrong to hold slaves at all, it is wrong now, for an individual or for a nation. Then the slaveholders; a man, ought to liberate their slaves now, and employ them as free laborers under the equitable control of law.

In one point I do not differ with Vindex. He assigns as one reason why the scheme of immediate emancipation cannot secure the approval of the slaveholders, the fact that they have accustomed themselves to look to the Colonization Society as the only means of freeing them from the burden of their slaves.

After having objected to the doctrine that it is impracticable, Vindex proceeds to inquire, whether, if the plan which proposes the immediate abolition of slavery is supposed to be practicable, our duty requires us to adopt it. This question he thinks can only be decided by a reference to 'consequences.' Without any distinct confessions of the 'plans' he proceeds, borne on by the same spirit of prophecy, into futurology to examine the consequences.

1. If the universe did not make itself, God made it.
2. If God is independent—he is not bound to any man, or to any creature, or to any creature, and never did—not he made all things according to his own plan and will.

3. If he made all things by his own will, then he governs them, that is, continues to create them, by the same will.
A REIGN OF OBEDIENCE to the government or will of God, and whose is disobedience; otherwise God is not independent; for if we are under obligation to obey a law, which is not the will of God, much more is God under obligation to obey the same. Let me illustrate. If a human servant is not under obligation to obey the will of his master, it must be because that will is wrong, which implies that the master has violated the very law which holds the servant, and, of course, that he is under obligation to that law.

3. If he made all things by his own will, then he governs them, that is, continues to create them, by the same will.
A REIGN OF OBEDIENCE to the government or will of God, and whose is disobedience; otherwise God is not independent; for if we are under obligation to obey a law, which is not the will of God, much more is God under obligation to obey the same. Let me illustrate. If a human servant is not under obligation to obey the will of his master, it must be because that will is wrong, which implies that the master has violated the very law which holds the servant, and, of course, that he is under obligation to that law.

apprehended consequences any otherwise than as motives to obedience. Abraham did not sin in raising the knife to slay his son. 3. As the written revelation of God is embodied in general commands and prohibitions, to bring actions to the test of it, we must have regard to the nature of those actions; and their nature is to be determined from facts which have, or have had, existence; Conscience decides in view of such facts. For example, to bring actions to the test of it, we must have regard to the nature of those actions; and their nature is to be determined from facts which have, or have had, existence; Conscience decides in view of such facts.

Upon such principles I am willing to rest my own case. If Vindex is not, I know not what plank saves him from sinking in the bottomless abyss of Atheism.

But for the sake of the argument, let us mit the application of the eighth commandment to the doctrine of slavery. Let us suppose the written revelation to say nothing applicable to the subject. This would suppose the duty of immediate emancipation. How are we to decide if, by consequences, for reasons that I have stated, but precedences in the light of which conscience is to act. This Vindex partially admits, for, though he has been helped to most of his consequences by an unbridled spirit of prophecy, he has in some degree pretended to reason to the future from the past. He speaks of 'barbarous cruelty, abandoned wickedness,' 'crimes too detestable to mention,' 'the most execrable excesses of joy or madness occasioned by the accession of a liberty for which the people were unprepared.' This might have foret, it might settle the question upon our present supposition, were it not for one important omission. It is not said how the people acquire their liberty. Surely the case where liberty under such freely granted, is not to be confounded with the case where it is refused, and liberty without law is obtained by force. Let Vindex specify—let him furnish names as dates. Let him tell us what persons he has 'heard of' who 'imbued their hands in the blood of their liberators,' and 'having murdered their benefactors, fell upon each other impressing and butchering.' If this was ever the case, the deed of the prophecy indeed applied to it with an emphasis. Such an act against an admitted personal benefactor, out of mere 'joy' would be received as proof positive of a madman in any court of justice—such are the well known laws of human nature. But there are facts, directly in point, of unconditional emancipation of slaves, in large numbers, which Vindex is challenged to show a particle of mischief to result in any court, and especially from such emancipations. If he should succeed, I will undertake to show 'substantial good' more than sufficient to counterbalance it.

Judging from an old Unitarian; that I am very fond of, I had supposed that the only preparation for liberty absolutely essential to its just possession, was that which would bring any innocent being within the term 'men'. But my opponent thinks differently. He thinks that I confine my vision to a too 'narrow prospect' over their slaves in Louisiana, and that the reason thus; the slaves in Southampton kill their masters to gain their freedom, ergo, if all the slaves should receive their freedom gratuitously, as soon as they had got it, they would do it, as they have done, in some countries, such as the Gulf of Mexico; just as they did in Southampton! From such logic as this the logic of Vindex takes wing—kinder passages of druggies into bondage,—pile white men's bones into monuments, and soaks the flag of freedom in murderous blood. But surely it has mistaken its element. What has the conspiracy of its slavemaster Vindex, or the Southampton affair, or the direct instruction in Jamaica, to do with unconditional emancipation? There is just the same analogy between these and the facts which belong to emancipation, as to use the language of a colored friend, 'there is—between stick your finger in the fire, and pull it out again.' What a most accommodating fancy for a determined slaveholder!

3. If he made all things by his own will, then he governs them, that is, continues to create them, by the same will.
A REIGN OF OBEDIENCE to the government or will of God, and whose is disobedience; otherwise God is not independent; for if we are under obligation to obey a law, which is not the will of God, much more is God under obligation to obey the same. Let me illustrate. If a human servant is not under obligation to obey the will of his master, it must be because that will is wrong, which implies that the master has violated the very law which holds the servant, and, of course, that he is under obligation to that law.

3. If he made all things by his own will, then he governs them, that is, continues to create them, by the same will.
A REIGN OF OBEDIENCE to the government or will of God, and whose is disobedience; otherwise God is not independent; for if we are under obligation to obey a law, which is not the will of God, much more is God under obligation to obey the same. Let me illustrate. If a human servant is not under obligation to obey the will of his master, it must be because that will is wrong, which implies that the master has violated the very law which holds the servant, and, of course, that he is under obligation to that law.

vertical text on the far left margin, including 'of cider in the' and 'the 7 per cent'.

vertical text on the far right margin, including 'of the six months' and 'the 20th of the'.