

REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT

OF THE

FACULTY OF DAINE SEMINARY,

IN RELATION TO THE RECENT DIFFICULTIES IN THAT INSTITUTION,

BY JOHN FRANKLIN,

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF RIPLEY,

AND AUTHOR OF "LETTERS ON SLAVERY."

RIPLEY:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.
Campbell & Palmer, Printers.

1835.

PREFACE.

The author of the following review is a native of Tennessee. He was brought up and educated in that state, and resided four years and a half in Kentucky, and of course, has had an opportunity of an extensive acquaintance with the system of slavery. He regrets that in jury, as he believes, done the cause of truth and humanity, has made it necessary for him to appear before the public in opposition to those whom he has esteemed as brethren. He has said nothing that he did not believe justice to suffering humanity required. Any severity that may appear, is the result of the subject, and not of personal feelings against the brethren under review.

A REVIEW, &C.

THE Faculty say in conclusion that "It is the first time, so far as we know, in which the inmates of a literary or religious institution, when misunderstandings have arisen between them and the faculty, have been sustained by religious newspapers, and religious men, and christian ministers, upon partial information, and the ex-parte testimony of the discontented."

This is a severe charge, and seems to present an uncommon case. In view of it a generous public will the more readily excuse an examination of their own account of the matter.

They tell us that "It is known, that an Abolition Society, formed some time since in the Lane Seminary, has recently been abolished by the trustees—and certain regulations passed, to avert from the institution the evils which its existence occasioned."

That a large portion of the students regarded these measures as an attack upon the principles of Abolition itself, an inhibition of free inquiry, and a despotic encroachment upon their rights—and that for conscience sake and the cause of humanity, and the rights of free inquiry, they have been constrained to ask, and have received a regular dismission from the institution."

The fact first stated is one of rare, if not of unprecedented occurrence. The trustees of a Theological Seminary abolished a benevolent society, formed by theological students. It is difficult to conceive of reasons to justify such a measure, especially, when the piety and talents of the young men are brought to view. The faculty entertain no doubts of their piety. After speaking of the misjudgment of the students, they say, "We always have believed, and do still believe, that they have acted under the influence of piety and conscience." And they speak of their talents in terms no less favorable. "We have said, and we repeat, that we have never witnessed more power of mind, or capacity of acquisition, or felicitous communication in popular elocution, in the same number of individuals; and we add, the attainments of the past year, as developed by daily intercourse, and by the closing examination, were honorable to them and satisfactory to us."

From these statements it appears that the Society abolished, was formed and directed by pious, talented and industrious young men. They had not permitted their attention to the society to divert them from their appropriate studies. It also appears that they had committed no direct immorality, else a conscientious faculty could not have given them a regular dismission as members of the institution in good standing. They violated no law of the institution. The

Society was in accordance with the usage of all protestant institutions. The Society was right in itself; it was formed in the noblest feelings of the human heart, and in opposition to one of the blackest sins that ever stained human character. It was brought into existence by the call of degraded, weeping, bleeding, tortured and perishing humanity. How could the humane heart resist such a call? To it the young men responded. They opened the broad book of facts. In this they saw that slavery had mingled her cup with every ingredient of sorrow. They saw the raging tide of oppression, red with the blood of the bodies and souls of men, sweeping over more than two millions of immortal beings. They heard the wail of the dying, and saw the mangled bodies of the dead! They felt, they acted. It was benevolent, and well meant action, and as such claimed from the trustees, in their measures, mildness and forbearance. But they could scarcely have inflicted a deeper wound upon the feelings of the heart than by the abolition of a society formed under a sense of duty combined with so much sympathy. Surely no ordinary reasons can justify such a procedure, and it will be extremely difficult to vindicate it from the charge of unusual severity. And it may be added, that slavery presents such enormity in cruelty and crime, that larger allowances should be made for the extremes of abolitionists than for those of any other class of men. "Oppression maketh a wise man mad," whether he endures it himself or sees it inflicted on others. This is the only subject upon which madness is considered as evidence of wisdom. Powerful minds take the deeper hold upon every subject they contemplate, and consequently are the more sympathetic, and easily driven to madness. If the students were driven to madness by the enormities presented, they should have been the objects of pity rather than of severity!

The trustees did more than abolish the society, they passed "certain regulations." These the Faculty have not given us in their original form. It is necessary therefore to give a specimen of them drawn from another source.—"Rule 2d, The Students shall not hold general meetings among themselves, other than those of a religious or devotional character, or for purposes associated with the course of studies; nor deliver public addresses, or lectures, at the Seminary, or elsewhere, in term time, other than those connected with ordinary religious exercises; nor make public addresses, or communications, to the students when assembled at their meals, or on any other ordinary occasion, nor be absent from the Seminary in term

time, without the approbation of the Faculty, or of such persons as they shall designate for that purpose."

In this rule there is something rare and unprecedented. I doubt whether such a law can be found in any other institution in the protestant world. And it is the more surprising that it was made for those who are acknowledged to be talented and pious.— There is another regulation no less surprising. "Ordered that the executive committee have power to dismiss any student from the Seminary, when they shall think it necessary so to do." This surely is a short method of doing business. This is the only way to purge out the abolitionists; when no crime can be alleged against them, dismiss them without crime and without trial. These are some of the regulations made to avert from Lane Seminary the evils occasioned by the existence of the abolition society.— There is reason to apprehend that these regulations will yet give the trustees and faculty more trouble than the evils they were designed to avert. It is no matter of wonder that "religious newspapers, and religious men, and christian ministers" sustained the students in seceding from an institution under such regulations.

Let us now examine the reasons on which these severe and unprecedented measures were founded.

The faculty tell us "It was the spirit and manner of doing a few things not necessary to the prosperity of the Society itself, against the advice of the faculty, and reckless of consequences in doing violence to public sentiment," "that rendered the existence of the Abolition Society inexpedient and impracticable in Lane Seminary."

1st. They acted against the advice of the faculty. It must be granted that students ought to yield to the advice of their teachers so far as it can be done with a good conscience; but there may be cases in which even a faculty may give wrong advice. A Socinian faculty might advise students to deny the Lord that bought them, but ought they to receive such advice? A colonization-faculty advise their abolition students not to discuss two prominent and distinctive principles of Abolition, lest they should "commit the institution before the public on a subject upon which the public is divided and exceedingly sensitive," when they themselves had already deeply committed it by their own public addresses on the other side. The students give the advice respectful consideration, and then proceed with their discussion. Are they worthy of blame? If the faculty take the liberty of discussing one side before the public, should they not tolerate the students in the discussion of the other among themselves? Had the faculty pursued this liberal course, and informed the public that though they were in favor of Colonization and must support that system, yet they had no right to interfere with the sentiments of the students in relation to such matters, and that many of them were Abolitionists, and as such should be tolerated, the institution would have gained the confidence and respect of all parties; and by this time, instead of nineteen, might have had a hundred theological students. Now, generous Colonizationists, as well as Abolitionists, are offended at the intolerant regulations of the trustees, after all the labored exposition given by the faculty. And thus an institution richly endowed by christian liberality is dragging along with nineteen theological students.

2. The students did "violence to public sentiment reckless of consequences." But was public sentiment right? Was it in accordance with the Gospel? The history of the world shows that public sentiment has been oftener wrong than right. Many of the greatest enormities ever witnessed on earth have been

sanctioned by public sentiment. In the judgment of many of the wisest and best men of the nation, public sentiment is wrong, egregiously wrong. The object of the students in their society was to cooperate with similar institutions to change what they deemed wrong in public sentiment. This they and all others had a right to do. Without such a right there could be no public reform. To attack public sentiment, when wrong, with argument and example is no violence, else the Saviour and all his apostles did violence to public sentiment. They attacked it both with argument and practice, and were charged with turning the very world upside down. It is no violence to do what is our duty. Public sentiment assumes the chair of the Pope when it places itself above investigation, and meets opposing arguments and practice with clubs and stones.

Let us now examine the facts of the violence alleged;—The first is the discussion and decision of the two following questions.

I. Is it the duty of the people of the slave holding states to abolish slavery immediately?

II. Are the doctrines, tendencies, and measures of the American Colonization Society, and influence of its principal supporters, such as to render it worthy of the patronage of the christian public?

"The discussions were protracted through seventeen evenings, and resulted in a vote that it is the duty of the slave-holding states to abolish slavery immediately; and that the doctrines, tendencies, and measures of the Colonization Society and the influence of its principal supporters are not such as to render it worthy of the patronage of the christian community."

The faculty themselves are witnesses that this was no hasty decision. It was the result of protracted and thorough investigation, such as became questions of so much moment. Here is, at least, some evidence of prudence, as well as a desire to know the truth.

It may now be asked, Had they as members of civil society a right to discuss these subjects, and form opinions upon them? Had they a right publicly to express those opinions when formed? That they had this right I presume none will deny. Again let me ask, if slavery is a sin, ought not a theological student to know it? Ought he not to discuss it, and so be prepared to meet it with scripture and argument as he ought other sins? Or is the business of ministers to reprove unpopular sins only? Or have theological professors learned a lesson of prudence from the case of John the Baptist? And are they determined to teach their students to beware of reprovng the sins of the wealthy and the great? It properly belongs to theology to decide that slavery is a sin, and its union with politics forms no reason why the theological student should not expose, and condemn it in as strong terms as any other sin of equal magnitude, if any equal it has. And if the Colonization Society tends to foster that sin, it is proper that it should be also exposed and condemned. The students then, in their discussions, were not quite so far from the field of theology as many have supposed. The subjects were appropriate, and to discussing them neither the faculty nor the public had any reason to object.

The next thing to be considered is the correctness of the decision.

1st. "It is the duty of the slave-holding states to abolish slavery immediately."

That slavery is a sin, and ought to be abolished sometime, is now generally admitted. The only fault then that can be alleged against this part of the decision is, that it defines the time when it should be abol-

ished. The students took it for granted that slavery was a sin, and drew the rational conclusion that men ought to cease from it immediately. If this is a wrong conclusion, I do think the young men ought to be pardoned; for with all the light President Young has given us on the subject, I cannot see how they could have avoided it. If it is not the duty of the slave-holding states to liberate their slaves immediately, it must be their duty to hold them in bondage, of course slavery is no sin. President Young assumes it as a truth that they are not, in their present state, capacitated for freedom, and that they ought to be held in servitude until prepared for liberty. But this is not self evident, and where is the proof? What are the qualifications necessary to freedom? According to the laws of every State, all sane persons of sufficient bodily strength to labor for support, or who have the means of their own, are allowed to enjoy liberty. This is the only safe rule, and according to it the colored people are capacitated for freedom. To this we may add, that there is talent and information enough among them to form and administer a good civil government, and better than most of those now in the world. A number of settlements formed by the lowest grade of slaves give ample proof that they are capable of government, and that President Young's assumption is without foundation. If they are not capable of freedom now, it is a plain case they never will be. A gradual emancipation will never essentially add to their information. They who bring them up like beasts, without instruction, hold them for gain, and will never educate them under a system of gradual emancipation. None are educated now farther than conscience impels, and it will be so under all circumstances until they are liberated. It is painful to see so talented a man as President Young plastering up the consciences of men with notions so delusive.— Who does not know that the number and ignorance of slaves are increasing every year; & that matters are continually growing worse and worse? If ever slavery ought to be abolished, it ought to be abolished immediately. Now is the safest and best time.

2d. "The doctrines, tendencies, and measures of the Colonization Society, and the influence of its principal supporters are not such as to render it worthy of the patronage of the christian community."

I remark that this was their opinion of that Society, and they had a right to express it. If wrong let the Society meet it with facts and arguments.— It is matter of regret that this decision is not without foundation. It requires no very direct immorality to render a society unworthy of patronage. If it does not answer a valuable purpose; if it is not likely to accomplish the ends for which it was formed; if its doctrines are unsound, and its tendencies unfavorable, or the influence of many of members injurious; any one, or all of these may render a society unworthy of patronage. And it is not difficult to show that all of these are applicable to the Colonization Society.

1st. It does not answer a valuable purpose. It is said, that it will remove a dangerous and useless population from the country. That the free people of color are either dangerous or useless is yet to be proved. It is an assertion founded in prejudice, and supported neither by argument nor fact. No people under such civil disabilities ever did better. Amidst all their oppressions and reproaches they have been peaceable, and loyal to their government. They who have been loudest in reproaching them have availed themselves of their services. Such is the susceptibility of improvement in human nature that no race of people can be dangerous and useless by the fault of the government. A race of Hot-

entots brought into the United States and mingled with the inhabitants might soon be elevated to usefulness. All that is useless or dangerous in the free people of color is the reproach of our nation. It will be objected that their color is so different that intermarriages cannot with propriety take place, and of course, that equality can never exist which will render a union safe under the same government.— To this it may be replied that intermarriage is not necessary to civil equality. The Friends prohibit intermarriages beyond the limits of their own society; yet they and others with whom they will not marry stand upon perfect equality in civil rights. There is indeed a vast variety of grades in civil society that seldom intermarry, and almost never without disturbance, and yet all are equal in civil rights.— The distinction of color while it implies no inferiority on either side, forms a sufficient reason why there should not be intermarriages. In the judgment of both parties the entire black or the entire white is better than a mixture. The aversion to change is equal in both, and as ladies are plentiful among both parties, each having an abundance of their own, there will be no room for a quarrel about wives.— The alarm about amalgamation has no foundation in nature, in reason, nor in common sense. There is not one good reason why the black man should not enjoy a perfect equality with the white in civil rights. This does not require, white people either to eat, sleep, or walk, or intermarry with those that are black. All these are matters of private intercourse, and of personal choice, and do not interfere with civil equality. And the bringing of these things into the present controversy against abolition only shows the want of better arguments. It is painful to see men of talents bringing such pitiful considerations into competition with the liberties of more than two millions of human beings. If the above statements are correct the Colonization Society answers no valuable purpose in removing from the country the free people of color.

Again, it is said, that it will be the means of evangelizing Africa. To this it may be replied, that Africa can be evangelized sooner in another way, at less than half the expense of life and money. The money already expended in colonization would, in the hands of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, likely have been sufficient to accomplish the whole work. But Africa is yet to be evangelized; and we can scarcely say that the work is begun, though the sacrifice of life and money has already been equal to what would be reasonably required for the whole work. It may be added, that it is matter of serious doubt whether the Society may not become one of the strongest obstacles in the way of evangelizing Africa. It will be the means of giving the natives greater intercourse with profligate and wicked men called christians, and this every where forms one of the strongest barriers to the success of Missionaries.

Further, it may be said that it will prevent the slave trade. To this it may be answered, that the colonists will prove themselves better than the white men of this country if some of them do not give more aid to the slave trade than the rest can give to preventing it. The best way to abolish the slave trade is to abolish slavery and have no slave market.

Thus far the society answers no valuable purpose.
 2. It is not likely to accomplish the ends for which it was formed.
 That it had its origin in benevolent hearts, and was formed with good designs there is no good reason to doubt, and that it still carries with it many benev-

gent hearts and good intentions there is good reason to believe.

Its original ends were, to colonize the free people of color in Africa with their own consent; not because they were a nuisance, but because they were hated and oppressed. It was also intended to open a door for the entire abolition of slavery, to evangelize Africa, and forever put an end to the slave trade. These doubtless were ends it was intended to accomplish. At least these are the views of its designs under which I and many other abolitionists became its friends and patrons. Almost, if not all the Abolition Societies in the Union were merged into it.

There is now no probability that it will accomplish any one of these ends. At colonizing free people of color it can do but little by fair means. Their own consent cannot be obtained except in a few cases.—A large part of those colonized, have chosen it as the only alternative of perpetual slavery. They have been willing to go to Africa just as a man is willing to go to the penitentiary rather than be hanged. The original design was doubtless to have their own consent without constraint. Hence the constitution has been greatly perverted. And besides, it is found that the climate is unhealthy, and that colonization has been attended with a great sacrifice of human life.—That such sacrifice will be justified in the final judgment is extremely improbable. And for this we are all accountable so far as we have aided and promoted the society.

That it will open the door for the entire abolition of slavery is now no longer to be hoped, as will appear when its doctrines and tendencies are considered. That it has little tendency to evangelize Africa, and prevent the slave trade has been already noticed.

3. Its doctrines are unsound.

It doubtless was not intended originally to teach the doctrine that the slaves ought not to be liberated until they can be taken to Africa, yet this doctrine has been extensively propagated by the society, and is popular among its members, both in free and slave states. And even ministers of the gospel have been known to hold their slaves in bondage for years waiting their consent to go to Africa. And some holding the sacred office have declared that they would free them upon no other condition. This doctrine I pronounce unsound, and the practice of it unjust. Freedom is the right of the slave, and the master has no right to impose any such condition.

Another doctrine worse still is gaining ground. It is, that the colored people are not sufficiently informed to choose what is best for themselves, and that they ought to be compelled to go to Africa. Many colonizationists now avow it openly. And thus there is danger that the society will grow up into one of the most dreadful systems of cruelty that have ever afflicted the world. The late cruel enactments of the legislature of Maryland are to be attributed to the influence of these doctrines.

4. Its tendency is unfavorable.

The tendency of its doctrines is to perpetuate slavery. This is doubtless the very opposite of its original design. Let the doctrine prevail that the people of color cannot be free among us, and that they ought not to be liberated until they can be removed to Africa, and the society may go on to a thousand generations, but it will never carry off so much as the increase. The slave-holding states will contribute just so much to colonization as will make the society a safety valve. And slave-holders from generation to generation, will wait, in all good conscience, either the consent of their slaves to go, or the opportunity of sending them to Africa. It is impossible to conceive of a better plan to ease the

conscience of slave-holders. "The slaves can't be set free among us," "poor creatures it would ruin them." "They went to Africa," "or the society has not the means of sending them." "Surely, it is not a sin to hold them under such circumstances."—"Thus men are made to believe that slave-holding is a work of benevolence rather than a heinous sin."

Again, its tendency has been greatly to oppress the free people of color. Individuals and states have increased their oppressions in order to make them willing to leave the country. The late oppressive laws of Maryland may be presented in proof of this statement. And the shameful attempt some years since to drive the black people from Cincinnati, is directly in point. And will not soon be forgotten by the humane heart.

It should also be remembered that the Colonization Society has tended greatly to keep up and increase prejudice against the people of color. In the addresses of its members, and in its publications the free blacks have been represented as the lowest grade of human beings, and not fit to live among the whites.

5. The influence of many of its members is injurious.

The influence of a large proportion of its members has been exerted extensively against the immediate abolition of slavery. Strong prejudices have been excited against abolitionists. Never since we had existed as a nation have such efforts been made to put down free discussion, as have been made under the influence of colonizationists in the case of abolition. Attempts have been made to close up every avenue to public audience. Abolitionists have been persecuted, slandered, and reproached in almost every city, town and village; violent mobs have been excited against them, and dwelling houses and even churches have been broken up, and their furniture destroyed. And if you ask every one who moves the tongue of slander, or carries the weapon of death, he will tell you he is in favor of colonization, and "that the negroes shant be free among us."

Before the formation of the Colonization Society, Abolition societies existed maintaining the same sentiments that are now propagated by Abolitionists, and discussed them publicly, even in slave states without danger of exciting mobs, but now such is the influence thrown over society that Abolitionists are counted the worst of all fanatics, and threatened with tar and feathers, and every kind of personal abuse. That this has proceeded from members and favorers of the Colonization Society is susceptible of the clearest proof. This surely is a bad influence. Can it be the spirit of Christ that persecutes Abolitionists in every city? And would the spirit of the Devil make such continued efforts to put down a bad cause? Does not the very manner in which abolition has been opposed prove that its opposers are wrong? What but the want of argument can call up persecution in an age of light like this? Why all this effort to close up every avenue to public audience? Why so many threats of personal abuse? And why all this prompting of mobs? Do not these things prove that Abolitionists have appeals to make that require no ordinary resistance?

Severe as the decision against the Colonization Society may seem to some, it can be fairly sustained. It implies no censure upon those who are still united to it with benevolent intentions. Many wise and good men are daily leaving it and uniting with abolition societies. The scheme of colonization is wholly impracticable. To remove upwards of two millions to Africa would exhaust the wealth of the

nation, and sacrifice the lives of five hundred thousand. Let those who call abolitionists fanatics look at this! And let the benevolent heart look at it! Can the inconvenience of the colored people living among the white people equal the inconvenience of removing them? And is it right to make the sacrifice of life that must be made in removing them?—A small part of the money necessary to colonize them, would be sufficient to educate, evangelize and elevate them to citizenship, and without the sacrifice of life. Again, to remove them would desolate the South. The cotton, sugar, and rice farms must lie uncultivated. A generation must pass away before the white constitution could be formed and insured to labor in the south. Northern men must be called in to fill up the vacuum. And there would be another sacrifice of five hundred thousand lives. The constitution of the black is conformed to that climate. And if they were liberated, there would be as much need of their labor as there is now. It is the utmost folly to talk of removing them, or to say they cannot be free among us. The judgment will find them among us, and free too. There are two ways in which they may be liberated. The one is by the consent of their masters, and the other by force. The object of the Abolitionists is to have them liberated peacefully without the effusion of blood. In this they are true friends of the South. The South at this moment is in an awful crisis. God has sent among them a spirit of infatuation, so that they are likely to withdraw from the Union. They have shed the blood of innocence by starvation, extreme labor and cruel scourging. And it seems God is about to give them blood to drink. If they once enter the unequal contest with the balance of the Union slavery will be abolished in the struggle. That salvery lies at the root of the southern dissention admits of no reasonable doubt. It naturally tends to create an imperiousness that will bear no control. Nothing but its peaceable abolition can save the country from revolution and ruin. In a republican country, it is impossible to keep from slaves a knowledge of their rights. All laws to prevent them from learning to read and gaining information will only make the day of retribution the more dreadful. Ignorance will only prepare them for the greater enormities.—Abolition among us would be attended with less injury than either slavery or colonization. Immediate emancipation is safer than gradual. While gradual emancipation protracts the injustice and provocation, it does not in the least prepare the common mass for freedom. It is impossible to bring the mass of slaveholders to give special attention to such preparation. If there were at once an entire abolition of slavery, and all were employed as hirelings on their former masters' farms, and school teachers and missionaries sent among them, to instruct them in the duties of civil and religious life, the change would only be felt for the better. This is the only just and safe plan of emancipation. Their teachers in the first instance would be white, and would throw such an influence over them as would render every thing perfectly safe. This would form one of the grandest fields for missionary labor ever occupied, and to enter into it there would be one general rising up in the church. It is no use to stir up our prejudices, and say, they shall not live among us; that is a matter of unalterable necessity, no effort can avoid it; whatever inconvenience may attend it, must be borne. The idea of colonizing them is only calculated to wrap the nation in slumbers till sudden destruction shall burst upon her. So soundly had it rocked abolitionists to sleep that it required even the mobs of New York to awaken some of them. The students then, in their

decision have shown themselves not only the friends of the oppressed, but the friends of their country.—They have set the young men of the nation a noble example. They began reformation in the right place. When a deadly poison has penetrated the very vitals of society, the fountains of learning, piety and influence should be first purified. If literary and theological institutions, and christian ministers and the church, stand all the time feeling the popular pulse, who will carry on the work of reformation?—Let these fountains be purified, and the nation shall be healed. Hitherto the Presbyterian church as a body has refused to purge herself and come up to the work, and the Lord is about to divide her in the midst, and turn her glory into shame.

Another offence against public sentiment was, the students taught and practiced the doctrine of social intercourse according to moral character irrespective of color. One of their number, wearied with lecturing till late at night for the benefit of this poor oppressed, and despised people, having no other offer, accepted of the hospitalities of a respectable colored family, and passed the balance of the night under their roof. Another teaching among them, after the example of missionaries, to inspire their confidence by showing them that he did not despise them, as white people too generally do, and thus make them more willing to receive his efforts to do them good, boarded some weeks in a colored family. The same teacher happened to fall in with a colored woman on her way to the Seminary in order to make some inquiries of interest to her. She looked with confidence upon the students as the friends and teachers of the colored people and went for advice. The young man, as an acquaintance, walked along the road with her, as they were both going to the same place, and introduced her to the person she desired to see. It is said that he returned with her to the city. And if her condition as a poor distressed woman, needed his immediate attention, there was nothing wrong in returning with her. There was another case in which a woman in very ill health desired advice, and being unable to walk so far, or even to ride on horseback, rode up in a carriage accompanied by one female or more. This is the carriage of females that the faculty mention as having visited the Seminary and received the marked attention of the students. What this attention was the faculty do not tell us. But it is said this woman in ill health had an infant in her arms, and when about passing from the steps to get into the carriage, her debility was such that she staggered, and was falling, when one of the students being near stayed her with his hand, and took the infant out of her arms till she got into the carriage. Who on earth would not have done the same thing? Who could suffer a fellow being, worn down by disease, to fall down with her helpless infant in her arms, merely because she had a black skin, when it could be so easily prevented. Another case was, as it is said, of some black men, strangers in the city. They having heard of the efforts of the students of Lane Seminary to benefit the people of color, employed a carriage to take them up to see the institution. They looked at the buildings, and departed. This is the carriage of colored men noticed by the faculty. There were also some other familiarities with colored people, but these are the strong cases.

Now in all these there was nothing more than often takes place even in slave states. One of the best public houses in the city of Charleston was owned and kept by a black man. And the greatest men in the nation made it their home when they visited that city. In Knoxville, some years since, a wealthy

And respectable black man had as many of the respectable classes of society to visit and eat at his house as any other private gentleman of the place.

The state of the case in respect to the students was this. They found in the city of Cincinnati three thousand colored persons in a deplorable state of destitution of the means of education and religious instruction. They were warm hearted, and pious young men who had consecrated their all to the service of him who had loved them and given himself for them. They "counted the reproaches of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." They were preparing for the work of the ministry of reconciliation. An extensive field was here presented in which to begin the work of benevolence. They entered upon it with all the energies of vigorous youth, and all the sympathy of benevolent hearts. They organized Sabbath schools, and day schools, and a female school of the higher order. All of which presented the most flattering prospects. The Sabbath schools were crowded. Multitudes manifested a desire to hear the word of life. The students taught them on the Sabbath the duties of religion, and on week evenings they lectured on science.— They attempted to elevate this degraded and unhappy race both by science and religion. They were indefatigable in their labors, untiring in their zeal, and patient under reproaches. It seemed as if the spirit of Brainard had come from the dead. And their success was equal to their enterprize. This created great excitement among the citizens of Cincinnati, many of whom have been famous for their prejudices against the people of color, as is evident from their attempts a few years since to drive them by violence from the city. Slanders the most unfounded, if not invented, were retailed by the more respectable classes of the citizens and even in public prints, until the rabble of the city were excited, and the mob preparing to tear down Lane Seminary.— Nor was the state of feeling in the city churches better than that of the world. Some people of color began to attend public worship, and to give some serious attention to the salvation of their souls. Immediately a protest was published in the Cincinnati Journal against their mingling with the whites, even in the temple of God. This protest, it is true, was from an individual, but that it gave no offence is sufficient to show what was the mind of the churches. The proceedings of the trustees of Lane Seminary, all of whom we presume are members of the church, and the justification of them by the Cincinnati Journal, and the faculty, are directly to the same point.

When this whole matter is carefully examined, and the statement of the faculty taken as evidence, the proceedings of the trustees and the people of Cincinnati exhibit as clear a specimen of persecution as ever appeared upon the records of history. There is not a thing alleged against the students that is in itself a crime. Every item stated is fully justified by the example and injunctions of the Saviour and his Apostles. The popular men of the Saviour's time would no more eat with publicans and sinners than will the citizens of Cincinnati eat with black people. Yet the son of God eat with them unpopular as it was. Will any man of veracity say that either the character or condition of the colored people is worse than that of the publicans? Paul says "condescend to men of low estate." Are not the people of color the men of low estate among us?— Philip, by the express command of the Holyghost, descended into the chariot of a black man, and rode with him. This is quite as near an approach as

any of the students made to a person of color.

There is another consideration that ought to be presented. It is this, the whole was a matter about which the public that was so exasperated, need have had no concern. The public's guardianship of the students was wholly gratuitous. If the students degraded themselves by associating with black people, it was their own sacrifice. Every man has a right to choose his own associates. If he chooses a low grade let him abide by it; others can withdraw from him, if they think his grade too low for their society. There is a wonderful propensity in the public to undertake the guardianship of Abolitionists to prevent them from degrading themselves by associating with people of color. And yet the Father of a family of mulattoe children has been permitted to hold a seat in the Senate of the United States with almost unbounded popularity. This gives Abolitionists great reason to doubt the honesty of the guardianship tendered them by the public. Let any candid person compare the treatment of the students of Lane Seminary with the fact to which allusion has just been made, and determine how much sincerity there is in the public sentiment to which violence is said to have been done. It was not the attentions of the students to the colored people, but the public excitement occasioned by them, that made it necessary to abolish their society. The faculty convene the students again, and again, and admonish them with regard to the public excitement, but do they come out, and say your doctrine and practice are wrong; your intercourse with the people of color is a sin condemned by the word of God, and you ought to repent and acknowledge your fault? No, this they could not do. The first sentence could not be found for this purpose in all the Holy book. They could tell them that it would be "impossible to protect either them or the institution," but not a word about their sin. If their conduct had been criminal, could the faculty in good conscience have given them a dismission as in good standing. It does seem from the statement of the faculty that but for the excitement, the students might have been in Lane Seminary yet pursuing their studies in peace. In their statement the public excitement is brought into view as the urgent necessity, and not the sin of the students. This is fully confirmed by the following statement of the faculty. "The urgency of this necessity was greatly increased during their attention to the subject, by another visit to the Seminary, of a carriage of colored persons. This augmented greatly the public exasperation, and occasioned, as the committee believed, a necessity for suspending the Abolition Society in the institution."

Surely this is a bad beginning in Lane Seminary.— If it is to be governed by the excitements of Cincinnati, and especially, excitements so unreasonable; and if the students are to be placed under laws made to appease the mob, the church will have little to hope either from its purity or its influence. When it is found that it can be governed by city excitements it may expect to be favored with enough of them. Better far for the Seminary and the honor of religion, the mob had torn the building to the ground. It could have been reared again as a standing monument of integrity.

Another weighty consideration urged upon the student was, that the public was divided, and both parties had contributed to endow the Seminary, and both could not be pleased. This difficulty should have been met by the spirit of tolerance. Let both parties have equal privileges. If the faculty and trustees could commit themselves on one side, why not permit the students to commit themselves on the

other? The Colonizationists having the faculty and trustees, & the Abolitionists the students, would have given both parties an interest in the institution, and neither would have had any just ground of complaint. But say the faculty, the "things which were done, with the amplifications and invidious insinuations to which they gave occasion, went over the city and over the West, and rendered the institution an object of intolerable odium and indignation. It was then, perhaps, more like him who should have been its master, than it is likely ever to be again. It was hated without a cause, and for righteousness' sake. What the Saviour himself did, rendered him an object of intolerable odium and indignation. "That which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God." And that the prejudice against the colored people in the world and in the church is abomination in the sight of God there is no more reason to doubt than there is that God is just. "He that despiseth his neighbor sinneth." "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his maker." "But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors." That prejudice does oppress the colored people and throw obstructions in their way to eternal life by excluding them from the means of education, and the common privileges of the sanctuary, is undeniable. And that the trustees and faculty of Lane Seminary have taken sides with this prejudice, and sustained it by their influence is clear from their own proceedings and statements. And with them, it is to be feared, will be found the blood of souls, if not the blood of martyrs, when the judgment shall sit. I do not mean to say that they are not christians, but that they have committed a great in of which they ought to repent.

From the statements of the faculty I see no just reason to censure the students. Their intercourse

with the colored people was no more than such as missionaries always have with those they wish to instruct. And in their case it seemed peculiarly necessary in order to inspire the confidence of those that have been so much despised and oppressed by white people. The whole difficulty seems to have originated in hatred to the black people, and not in the imprudence of the students. We see no evidence of the "eminent instance of monomania," mentioned by the faculty. It seems that the public interfered with the rights of the students, and not the students with the rights of the public. The whole case reminds me of what is said to have happened some Methodist emigrants to Hayti. They commenced holding religious meetings, but so often as they met the Catholics mobbed them. The government prohibited their meetings, because they disturbed the peace of society.

From all that appears in the case the young men acted under a high sense of duty, and made no ordinary sacrifice to less the poor and needy for whom none else would make sacrifices. It is to be hoped that the pious, devoted and talented young men of the church will follow the example. The noblest achievements of christianity now to be made in our land, are on behalf of the colored people. Here is the only point where violent persecution is to be met. Here the heaviest cross is to be borne; and here the martyr's crown is to be gained. When christianity shall have broken every yoke, dispelled the night of oppression, and melted away the iron prejudice accumulated through many generations, and introduced the glorious increasing of universal jubilee, a higher note of praise will be sounded around the throne of God, and all heaven will be filled with joy. "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men."