

the Church, and another common sense in science. Our boys and girls cannot go up to the High Schools and be taught one principle, and go into the Church and have it contradicted. We must have harmony in all our relations. I am astonished how men can get accustomed to believing things said in the Church which they would scout at in every-day matters. I must think they leave their common sense at the church doors.

"I have been five years a Director of the Relief Union, and during the long, bloody war, I was working every day, dispensing charity to the good people who needed it among the soldiers' families. One day a most respectable, charitable gentleman, who was similarly engaged, said to me it was raining, and asked me to get into his buggy and he would take me home. During the ride he said to me, 'You are a Jew.' Yes, said I. 'You seem to be a good man.' I am happy to meet your approval, was my remark. 'And I am sorry that you will be lost,' he said, with a sad tone. I did n't know what to answer. I knew the man had common sense, and thought it strange he could not use it then as on other matters. Truth is harmonious, and consistent with every other truth. Let thrones crumble, and sceptres tremble; let aristocracies shake on their foundations; let parliaments fear and quake when twenty thousand men pass by claiming their rights; let priests cry perdition, ruin here and hereafter; don't mind it at all; stand firm, stand still, and see the help and the hand of the Lord. Truth must conquer, it will triumph. Progress is slow; the march of the human race is long, but there is only one end, turn which way you will.

"It is my prayer that with one heart and one mind we may work on, in the great task intrusted to us as a free people, reconciling the human race, and leading them to love one another as brethren, with the motto ever before us: 'A free church in a free State, and God one, forever and ever.'"

WEST INDIAN EMANCIPATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RADICAL:

My dear friend, F. W. Newman, has written me a letter concerning my treatment of the Jamaica troubles in your pages, correcting me in several important particulars. It is so important that we of America shall know all the facts on this subject, that I send you the main part of Mr. Newman's letter, observing only that my own account followed the most authentic documents I could procure.

Yours Truly,

M. D. CONWAY.

Westbourne Grove Terrace, London, Feb. 2.

EXTRACT.

“ I REMEMBER the outline of events as though it were yesterday. Wilberforce’s agitation against the Slave Trade succeeded soon after I was born : in my boyhood and earliest youth the agitation against Slavery began. Before I was of age, the Tory Ministry was already making vehement efforts to improve the condition of the Slaves ; trying to extort from the planters, especially, 1. Right for the Slaves to be heard in evidence before juries ; 2. Right of legitimate marriage. (Perhaps other things also, but these were most talked of.) They got nothing but flat refusals, and ultimately insult. Sir George Murray, Colonial Secretary, sincerely did his best. Mr. Canning, in 1825, as (Tory) Foreign Minister, uttered a speech of vehement eloquence in Parliament, against the planters, being stirred up by cases of frightful cruelty, of which the Ministry had official knowledge. But the Tory Government stood on West Indian votes too much, and therefore could not dare to do anything effectual. The Reform Act of 1832 changed the Constituencies, and Lord Grey’s Ministry was momentarily omnipotent to do everything which public opinion approved. (It could have reformed the Lords, the Church and the Universities, and so have carried us fifty years forward, but it would not.) The public horror caused by the official avowal of the cruelties spread the movement for total abolition as no eloquence could have done. Wilberforce was quite superannuated, and the new movement preached a new doctrine, that by *reason of the moral nature of man, Slavery is an essential immorality*. This superseded all idea of compensation to the planters. It also cut us loose from Biblical spectral pleading, and was adopted by all the Dissenters, however Biblical their theory, and by the most ardent Philanthropists of the Evangelicals. I have a tract by Sir George Stephens, brother of Sir James Stephens, so long in the Colonial Office, one of the new leaders of the movement, in which he says retrospectively that they never had any considerable success with the public until they proclaimed and urged this doctrine. It is true that they also argued that Slavery is wasteful, and that it was nonsense to pretend that free labor cannot compete with it. In fact, the West Indian party would not allow even East Indian sugar to come in on the same duties, but had a protective duty against it ; which was a confession on their part. Surely our abolitionists will not be blamed by you for using this argument. In every nation there is a class so materialized in mind, that it resists all noble and generous arguments, but yields to economical ones. We ought not to despise their votes, if we grieve over their low sentiment ; and, if we use the moral and spiritual arguments as primary, we can never degrade our cause by adding economical ones.

“ The idea that compensation to the planters was ever given by Parliament is a fiction of the planters after the event. Parliament voted freedom quite independently of compensation. No West Indian of 1833 dared to claim compensation. So long ago as Mr. Pitt’s youth, the illegality of West Indian Slavery had been avowed by him in Parliament without contradic-

tion. The West Indian planters appealed to the mercy of the Ministry to do something to help them through the inevitable crisis, and begged a loan of fifteen millions of pounds to be repaid in installments; since, not being accustomed to pay wages, they had no capital to manage the estates under conditions of freedom. When Mr. Stanley, now Earl Derby, then Secretary for the Colonies, asked for the "loan," Parliament voted it without hesitation, the great economist, Joseph Hume, not objecting. The West Indians at once saw their folly in asking a "loan." They came at once to Mr. Stanley, and said they saw great difficulty in repaying the money, and doubted whether fifteen millions was enough; and, in short, feared the colonies could not get through their difficulties — which, of course, was what Parliament desired — unless it was a *gift*: and they thought it ought to be twenty millions. Within three days of the vote of the loan, Parliament, at the request of Mr. Stanley, changed it to a gift of twenty millions. There was no idea in this of compensation. Nor was Parliament actuated by any low "shop-keeping" notions; it was full of the glow that pervaded the national heart. The nation abhorred the system, but pitied all its victims, and wanted to get rid of the guilt and disgrace, and was so glad to get rid of it, as hardly to think five minutes over twenty millions.

"Lord Brougham thought himself very wise, and was really mischievously stupid, in then devising a scheme of apprenticeship in order to accustom the negroes gradually to freedom, and obviate the danger of vagabondism and idleness. This idea had never come before the public during the agitation. It was concocted and approved in the Cabinet, and carried by the power of the Ministry; but its avowed purpose was for the advantage of police, and benefit of the negro himself, not as a private boon to the planters. Yet in a few years the planters not only called the twenty millions "compensation," and so dinned it into our ears that the new generation has come to believe it, but had the impudence to claim the apprenticeship as part compensation.

"The Ministry of Lord Grey sincerely wished to defend the negro from the planter, and tried to do so by stipendiary magistrates. You censure it (and us all) for not giving land and education to the negro; but first, unhappily the English mind is not even yet enlightened as to the rightfulness of this for even English peasants; next, Parliament had no legal control over the West Indian Parliaments, which had as full legal right there, as our Parliament here. *

"It is not true that the English nation, which desired emancipation, was counting on the negro as sugar and coffee makers, and became disappointed when less sugar was produced. The great falling off in West Indian sugar did not occur as a result of freedom, but as a consequence of the admission of first, East Indian, and next, of Brazilian sugar into the

* This hardly meets my statement. The English Parliament had at least the power to do as much for the freed negroes as for the planters: to the latter they gave 20,000,000 pounds, to the former — .

British market on equal duties. Those who still held together as "abolitionists" — a small but influential band — exposed themselves to the imputation of inconsistency for resisting the equalization of duties on Brazilian sugar. Previously they had said, 'Slavery is wasteful, a free labor can compete with and beat it.' At the second stage they said, 'The West Indians now having free labor cannot compete with the slave labor of Brazil.' Nothing so much damaged them with the public; they appeared to make the West Indian negro their pet. It was notorious that by the aid of the high protecting duty the negro was flourishing greatly; as appeared, ten times as well as English peasants. The West Indians then used no sugar but slave-sugar. They sent every hogshead of their own to England. As soon as these laws were abolished, the West Indian planters found many estates not worth cultivating. A large diminution of exportation took place, which the English nation neither regretted nor knew; but certain newspapers, and Mr. Carlyle, took up the cause of the planters, and began an unceasing course of slander against the negroes, by which they have perverted the minds of the whole younger generation of our educated classes.

"It is most true that the abolitionists had no understanding and no foresight as to the cruel oppression which the negroes as freemen would have to suffer from the white local legislatures. But if they had foreseen it, I believe they would have been powerless to induce Parliament to overthrow, by an act of illegal power, the West Indian Constitutions, and put all the islands under the Crown, and nothing short of this could have even begun the amelioration needed. How much less could they have induced Parliament to make the negroes free-holders, when all our Political Economists were preaching the intense mischief of little freeholds, and thought that the dying out of that system in England was the *vis medicatrix* of nature throwing off a disease! In part, the sincere ignorance of our people, — in part, the aristocrätical sentiment of our land owners, — made it impossible for the last generation to do justice to the free negroes. . . .

"You must also remember, that although whigs and tories alike were shocked by the slavery *as it was*, the moral zeal against slavery *as such* came from below, and after it had removed the slavery, could not be sustained in activity. Cobden used to say, that the nation cannot have more than one agitation at a time. After the apprenticeship was terminated, the nation imagined that the work was done. The negro *seemed* to be put on as good a footing as the English peasant, and to cease to be any immediate object that could call forth our exertion. The ministry, overworked on all sides, had more than enough to do in resisting attempts to make a new slave trade, under pretence of Coolie immigration, and had so little strength to spare, that it did not wish to bring on itself more odium from the planters than was inevitable. This may be a weakness, but is not the 'coffee and sugar' theory you impute."