'This convention would deprecate any departure from the principle which makes Colonization dependent upon the action of the free coloured people themselves.' It is true the convention 'warns' the free coloured people that there is cause to apprehend such an event; and that it will be uncontrollable; but this only implies, that though the friends of the coloured people will still desire to prevent it, they will not have power to control legislative action. And was it not a solemn duty to give this warning if the evil was foreseen? Must the catastrophe so much, and we will add, so long dreaded, be permitted to come upon these hapless people suddenly, and without preparation? Surely it was kind and merciful to apprise an unhappy, helpless race, that, long as their friends had resisted the measures which were 'maturing,' the time would come when they would no longer be able to prevent or postpone their consummation, and to advise them to seek a covert from the storm; to hasten to the asylum which God, in his good providence had provided for them, through the benevolence of their friends. If such were the real apprehensions of the convention, the resolution must be admitted to be wise and merciful. We rejoice that it has passed; and especially do we rejoice, that the convention has borne its testimony against any change 'in the principle which makes Colonization dependent on the action of the free coloured people themselves.' Colonization would be utterly odious and hateful without this feature. Maryland in Liberia would no longer be the land of promise to the coloured race, but would assume the aspect and the terrors of a Botany Bay. We hope the fears of the convention are unfounded. But it was christian kindness—it was filial duty to exhort those on whom the storm might come unexpectedly to secure themselves a covert and a defence.

'Now then, allowing that Bishop Waugh and brother Emory advocated and voted for this resolution, did they thereby 'identify themselves with the persecutors' of the people of colour? Do they 'breathe out threatenings against them?' Merciful Father! Beverly Waugh and Robert Emory breathe out threatenings! They the enemies of coloured men! It is impossible that any man who knows them can believe it. Even Le Roy Sunderland did not believe it—no, not a word of it, even when he penned it. He published it for effect. Not to aid abolition, but to weaken the attachment of Methdists to the Church, and to favour schemes long contemplated, but which cannot succeed until the church is rendered odious, by bringing her most eminent ministers into contempt.

'But will abolitionists who fear God—can they continue their support to such a vehicle of wilful misrepresentation as the Watchman? Can they do so without being partakers of other men's sins? Can the cause they espouse prosper in unrighteousness? O! 'my soul, come not thou into their secret—unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united.'

'Mr. Sunderland cannot escape by any subtilty or evasion. He has published Bishop Waugh and Mr. Emory as the persecutors of the people of colour—as breathing out threatenings against them—as endeavouring to make them 'miserable and wretched, poor and blind, and naked;' and he grounds his charge upon a resolution of the Maryland Colonization Society, which was before him at the time. This resolution he publishes, emphasized by italics, and emblazoned with capitals. He comments upon it, and tortures it. And he not only gives a meaning to it which it will not bear, but he has the effrontery to give it a meaning which is the very reverse of its whole import and bearing—nay, of the plain purpose and intention of the convention, explicitly and clearly declared. He makes the convention the advocates of coercive Colonization, when they unequivocally declare, that they would deprecate such a departure from the principle which makes Colonization dependent upon the voluntary action of the free people of colour themselves. He denounces Bishop Waugh and Mr. Emory for *advocating* a measure which the resolution itself 'deprecates!' And to show his contempt for the understandings of his own readers, he publishes the resolution, introducing it with a flourish of trumpets, vainly supposing he can impose upon his abolitionist subscribers by dint of capitals and italics. Nous verrons.

'But after all, the part which Bishop Waugh and Mr. Emory took, in regard to this resolution, does not appear in the published proceedings of the convention. It is possible that the original resolution, as offered to the convention, may have taken different ground; and we may owe it to the stand taken by these gentlemen, and others who are known to be watchful over the best interests of the people of colour, that the convention did not express other views, with regard to legislative action on the subject of colonization. It may reasonably be inferred from the fears the convention express, that public sentiment tends to strong measures; and if so, that this feeling was to be found among the members of the convention who had been deputed by mass meetings of the people themselves. If it shall be found, hereafter, that the friends of humanity owe to these and other clergymen the stand taken against this popular feeling, and the resistance which the resolution opposes to it, what will this veritable editor—this traducer then say for himself? What will he say? Why, just nothing at all. He will wipe his mouth, and publish an article on holiness and christian perfection, and there will be an end of the matter. How long good men will continue to sustain him in his unchristian course remains to be seen. It is hard for a party to give up a file leader; yet we do believe that there are many, very many abolitionists—modern—ultra abolitionists, who love the cause of truth and righteousness better than their party. If the result should prove us to have been mistaken, we shall lament it, but not on our own account; we shall deplore the weakness and waywardness of human nature, but we shall console ourself with the consciousness, that our expectation was founded in that charity which hopeth all things.'

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Q. Has there ever been an instance where two races that could not amalgamate by inter-marriage, lived as free men in harmony, in the same land, with equal social and political rights?

A. No! not one!

Q. Have there ever been any instances to the contrary?

A. Many. The most prominent of which is furnished in the case of the Moors and the Spaniards, both occupants of Spain at one time—both free—both civilized—both eminent in arts and arms. Colour interposed an insuperable barrier to inter-marriage, which was heightened by difference of religious faith, and the Moors had to remove from the land.

Q. How did they remove?

A. They removed before the sword.

Q. What is the inference drawn from this?

A. That if the abolitionists were to succeed to the full extent of their wishes, by making every slave in Maryland a free man, they would but increase the necessity of Colonization, as the only means of enabling the freed slaves, along with the other free people of colour, to escape peacefully and quietly, and advantageously in all respects, from a land, which history tells them, in the voice of solemn and constant warning, is but their temporary home.

Maryland Historical Society

The Maryland State Colonization Society Papers

XII. Newspapers
A. Maryland Colonization Journal

2. June 1841 (n.s. I, 1)—May 1861 (n.s. X, 24)

1841