(From the Christian Intelligencer.)

A GRAVE OBJECTION TO THE SCHEME OF AFRICAN COLONIZATION ANSWERED.

It is striking to observe with what avidity a portion of the community seize on any surmise or report discreditable to the character of the colonists of Liberia, and what an easy credence they give to that, which for aught they know, is "false witness against their neighbour." Great advantage has been taken of the removal of the missionaries of the American Board from Cape Palmas, as though this fact in itself were proof positive that the colonies were prejudicial to missions. It has even been confidently asserted that *the cause* of the removal of the missionaries was the corrupting and baleful influence exerted on the natives by the example of irreligious colonists.

Were this a true account of the matter, the friends of missions and the Christian community generally might hesitate to patronize the scheme of African colonization. To weaken their confidence in the great evangelical aspect of this scheme, and to cause them to withdraw their support from it, is doubtless the design, as it is the direct tendency of this representation, or rather misrepresentation of the case. But before our Christian friends, (whose *prayers* and *patronage* in the colonization cause we earnestly desire,) give credit to this report, and become prejudiced by it against the cause, we entreat them to peruse and ponder the following remarks.

I. In locating the mission at Cape Palmas, it was not the original intention to make the place the principal sphere of its labours, but only *a station of ingress*, by which to penetrate into some part of the Central Africa. If a more ample and inviting field offered, the removal of the mission to such a field was in perfect accordance with the original purpose of establishing it in Africa.

II. The labours of the mission by the letter and spirit of its charter, must be confined to the natives as "heathen," and could not embrace the colonists, who were nominally christian. The colonists very wisely pursued a policy adapted to blend and identify the interests of the natives with their own. The mission, on the other hand, by bestowing its labours and exerting its influence on the natives only, and seeking their benefit *exclusively*, very naturally tended to create what would seem to be a rival interest, or, at least, an interest somewhat *native* in its kind, and distinct from the colonial. "This," says a competent witness, "was the true root of the difficulty." The mission and the colony constituting in fact two distinct communities, and occupying a district of small extent, could not, in the present imperfection of human nature, be expected to work together without collision.

III. In addition to the difficulties just noticed, in the meanwhile, two other missions were established in the same place. Could *three* missions, in such circumstances, be expected to labour permanently in so close contiguity without serious embarrassment, without inevitable collision?—Could the missionaries of the American Board reasonably hope to be as useful there, and to effect as much for the wretched Africans as they could at some other station? Had their removal turned on this single point, and the rational prospect of greater usefulness been the only inducement, it would have amply justified the step. They found access to a place at the Gaboon river, a thousand miles nearer the point which the mission was originally intended to reach; and on examination, it presented a field so favourable and full of promise that the Board resolved to transfer the establishment to that position. Does this prove that christian missions,

prosecuted on a plan adapted to the actual condition of the colonists and the peculiarities of the country, cannot be sustained and successful there? The *increase* of missions at Cape Palmas proves the contrary. Are not the considerations now presented sufficient to satisfy any candid mind that the removal of the missionaries of the American Board from Cape Palmas is *not* attributable to the corrupting example of irreligious colonists on the natives, as *the exclusive cause* of that event? What was the character of the natives before they felt the influence of the colonies planted on their shores? Those who speak of them as being *corrupted* by contact with the colonists, betray great ignorance of the *real* character of the natives, and make the unfounded assumption, that they are comparatively free from the grosser vices of paganism. A good authority has given the following description of them in their original state:

"Blind adherents of the most degrading idolatry, polygamists, kidnappers, and some of them cannibals, from time immemorial; and having been for nearly three centuries under the exclusive tuition of European slave traders and pirates, from whom they had thoroughly learned all the vices of civilization, which savages are capable of learning."

How preposterous to charge coloured emigrants *from the United States* with setting an example *injurous* and *corrupting* to the native African, whose character the above paragraph does not exaggerate! Will those who bring this charge, and use it to throw odium on the scheme of colonization, as prejudicial to missions, tell us whether there ever was a *successful* attempt to establish and sustain a mission amongst the natives on the Western Coast of Africa till *since* the existence of the colonies there? We can answer, or make impartial history answer, that every attempt to do so utterly failed. The first foot-hold gained for christian missions on that coast was on *colonial* soil, and was retained by *colonial* protection. And just in proportion as the colonies acquire territory, and extend over it the rule of stable and salutary laws, and break up and banish the slave trade, will missions become permanent and flourishing there, and christianity find appliances by which to spread its light and benign influences over Africa.

CRUCIBLE.

THE LIBERIANS IN THE UNITED STATES.

No poor animal was ever more out of place, or more harrassed, chagrined and annoyed than the Liberian colonist on visiting the land of his birth and early *growth*, (we will not say *education*.) Jonathan in England, John Bull in America, or Jonny Crapeau in China, all, would be perfectly at home in comparison with the *free* Liberian in this *free* country. He has perhaps been absent long enough to forget in a great degree the peculiar unpleasant circumstances in which he was formerly placed; of the past he only conjures up agreeable and pleasing recollections. Not having in his early days been deeply sensitive to the innumerable indignities heaped upon him, he has forgotten that "such things were;" he has for years *acted*, *thought* and *felt* like a *man*, and associated only with men, without regard to physical distinctions; he has ceased to dream that there exists, on this earth, any grade of beings between him and his Father in heaven. He has the yearnings that all experience to visit the land of his birth—to view once more the spot consecrated by the visions of early childhood. Perhaps a murmuring stream, a majestic tree, or some huge over-hanging rock or

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)

1844