number of local preachers could not be had without the delay and expense of sending to Grand Bassa—being also overcharged with other duties and in feeble health; we concluded to bear the injury until the next meeting of the quarterly conference for St. Paul's River circuit; and there Mr. B. was cited, at our request, by the preacher in charge, to answer to our complaint against him for his unkind and unjust treatment. Mr. B. however sent a note, assigning as a reason why he did not come, "that he could not receive the *sacrament* at our hands," which certainly would not have been offered to him in the quarterly conference, and therefore was no valid reason for absence.

But as it was the regular time for the examination of the character of all the members of the quarterly conference,—if any objections existed against an individual they must *then* be made known or entire silence kept afterwards. We, therefore, (after the preacher in charge had rehearsed the evil report of Mr. B. against us,) stated to the conference what were the facts in the case, and wherein we had been misrepresented. And with this, in connection with Mr. B's statements, of which sufficient evidence was there adduced, the quarterly conference, knowing from his note that his absence was *voluntary* and *without* a good reason, thought proper to suspend him as before named.

But Mr. B. says, "the Discipline of the M. E. Church requires that there be one or more witnesses in a case before a man can be condemned: but the Liberian Discipline does not require any witness at all to suspend a minister of the gospel from preaching from one quarterly conference to another."

This is indeed putting *us* down for naught, as though *his* slanderous statements were not to be gainsayed, but ours, in self-defence, were of no account. Suppose we had been the *first* to report and made statements very unfavourable to Mr. B's reputation, and when cited to appear before a proper tribunal, *refused* to attend: and Mr. B. had then given *his* version of the case and left the court to determine the matter, would Mr. B. think he had been well treated, if his statement had been called by us "no witness at all." According to this principle "he that is *first* in *his own* cause" not only "seemeth just" but "his neighbour" may *not* "come *afterward* and *search* him out."

If this is Mr. B's M. E. C. Discipline, we pray to be delivered from its administration in any and every way.

But Mr. B. is a little too fast about witnesses. In the trial of a local preacher, there is no mention of any number of witnesses, (though, of course, sufficient testimony is implied) necessary to form a judgment or verdict of *guilty*—the only allusion to witnesses in this case, being in reference to such as should *accompany* the preacher in charge in his *act* of *reprehension* for an offence *already* committed.

However, if we reason from analogy, or the manner of treating an offender among the common members of the church, we shall find that the Discipline represents that the accused *may* be found guilty, either on the testimony of the accuser, or in his absence, that of the "*next best* evidence;" and that "if the accused person *evade* a trial, by *absenting* himself, after sufficient notice given him, and the *circumstances* of the accusation be strong and presumptive," he is to be "esteemed guilty, and be accordingly excluded." See page 92, last edition of the Book of Discipline of the M. E. Church.

Now, in the quarterly conference we stood as complainant or accuser, viz: of Mr. B., for having slanderously misrepresented us in a matter in which his statement and our own was all the *direct* testimony that could be had—he was duly cited to appear before the proper tribunal and "absented himself,"—and under *these* "circumstances" what *less* than suspension could be inflicted, if *any* weight at all was given to our testimony?

As to that portion of Mr. B's letter which *professes* to give a true account of the conversation which took place at the time his large and unwarranted account of claims against the mission was rejected, it is proper to remark that it is only a *repetition* of the slander for which the quarterly conference saw fit to suspend him, and having replied to it before that body, (where Mr. B. *did not like* to be *confronted* with *testimony*, equal, at least, to his own,) we feel under no obligation to him, or any one else, to *repeat* that reply, merely because Mr. B. chooses to repeat his slander against us.

Should any think Mr. B's statements must be true because he has "taken his oath" that they are so, and declares he is "ready to take fifty oaths more" to the same effect, it would be well for such to remember that no man of *established* reputation for *veracity*, ever thinks of *volunteering* in the matter of taking oaths, because this necessarily implies his own conviction that he cannot be trusted *at all* to tell the truth, unless under the awful solemnities of an oath: and what then shall we think of the man who so *trifles* with oaths that *in order* to make the public believe his tale, he must *offer* to *repeat* his oath fifty times! Truly this is a sad indication of the want of correct moral principle and integrity.

But to give the reader some idea of what all Mr. B's *swearing* to the truth of his statements amounts to, we refer to a single item in the list of his allegations against us. In his letter, published in the Herald, he says *of us* "he *looked* towards a chair, with which I was afraid he would beat me."

But Mr. B. told Maria Dozier that we "*took* a chair to knock him down or beat him with:" and in his letter which he prepared to send to the Board, and to which he *proposed* to make oath before A. F. Russell, Esq. he says we "*made* for a chair," &c. Now which of these *three very* different versions does Mr. B. wish the people to believe? That we might have merely "looked at a chair" in the course of the conversation, as there were several in the room, is quite possible, but that we either "took a chair," or "made for a chair to beat" Mr. B. with, is utterly *untrue*, and in *this* characteristic *agrees* well with the various items of his story.

It is a little amusing, and therefore some relief in such a gloomy picture as Mr. B. has drawn, that he should have represented himself as *fleeing* from our room, (of which those below had no apprehension from his manner of descending the stairs,) to "escape a beating," when he appeared *hale* and *strong*, while we were so feeble as to be obliged, when sitting up, to keep our position in an easy rocking chair. And yet Mr. B. was "afraid of a beating," though he was between us and the door, and there was plenty of *help* just below stairs!

Is this the great champion in the battle with an *armed host* of savages, with so distinguished a war chieftain at their head as the far-famed Goterah? And could he fearlessly stand "powder and balls," with "showers of spears and arrows," from such a foe, and remain, as he has declared so many times in America, before large assemblies, perfectly composed; and yet now, at the *imagined* glance of a sick man's eye "towards a chair," take fright and "drop down stairs *in a hurry*," yea, in *such* a hurry that he forgot to tell Mr. McGill or any of the family, how badly he had been abused! Surely "the wicked flee when *no man* pursueth."

As to the amount which the Board of Managers allowed in favour of a mission *to be* established by Mr. B. either in what he called "Big Pessah," or else among the Goulahs, we have no need now to multiply words, as we have requested the Board, by letter, to send us a copy of the resolution which they adopted in reference to this subject; and shall doubtless re-

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)

1843