called, taken a few months since and brought into Key West, took in her cargo of slaves at Whidah, on the coast of Dahomey, in violation of one of these treaties.

In the volume last quoted, p. 201, is found a decree by the Portuguese government, of December 10, 1836, which begins thus:

"ARTICLE 1. That the exportation of slaves be henceforth prohibited, both by sea and land, in the Portuguese dominions, as well to the north as to the south of the equator, from the day on which the present decree shall be published in different capitals of the

"ARTICLE 2. The importation of slaves is also strictly prohibited, under any pretext whatsoever."

It is provided, however, in Article 3, et seq., that any planter removing from one of these Portuguese dominions to another, may, under certain restrictions, import slaves for his own use, not exceeding ten. This decree Portugal is bound by treaty with Great Britain to enforce. In immediate connection with the decree will be found a voluminous official correspondence, setting forth the non-fulfilment of that treaty.

This decree, interpreted according to Portuguese claims, covers all the habitable coast from the Equator, southward, to the British Cape Colony. And if there are a few chiefs on that part of the coast near the equator who do not acknowledge the Portuguese claim, Great Britain may easily make them acknowledge it, so far, at least, as this matter is concerned without violating any body's rights.

The British Cape Colony on the south, and Natal Colony on the southeast, guard the coast to Delagoa Bay. Thence the Portuguese Mosambique territory guards it, or rather is bound to guard it, northward, to the dominions of the Sultan, or Imaum of Muscat and Zanzibar, who claims the whole coast to the Red Sea and with whom Great Britain has a treaty for the suppression of the slave-trade.

It is manifest that if these treaties were all enforced in good faith, according to the professed views, claims, and intentions of the parties to them, no slaves could be exported from Africa. There would be no place where a slaver could buy a cargo. Squadrons to capture slavers on the "middle passage" would be useless, for there could be none to capture.

Questions about "right of search," or of "visit," would be obsolete for there would be no ships to which they could be applicable. Even if the United States should, as some absurdly prate, re-open the slave-trade by law, the iniquity would be perfectly abortive, for there would be no place where the Southern "fire eater" or the apostate Yankee could make his purchases. He would be at liberty to buy, but nobody would be at liberty to sell to him. Great Britain only needs to enforce her own laws in her African possessions, and her treaties with powers in Africa, or having possessions there, to cut off every nation on earth from all participation in this traffic.

The only possible exception is in relation to some of the coast, here considered as Portuguese. There are some four or five hundred miles of coast between Benguela and the Equator, including Loango and Angola, from the actual possession and control of which Portugal has gradually withdrawn, leaving the native tribes in a state of practical independence. The same may be true of small portions of the Mosambique coast. It is not understood that Portugal has ever formally relinquished her ancient claim to any of this territory, or that any European power disputes its validity. If its validity is admitted, then the Portuguese decree of December 10, 1836, and, consequently, the British treaties cover the whole of it. If otherwise, Great Britain may easily close this whole coast, by a few treaties, like the sixty-three or more that she has made farther north.

The process of such a making treaty is well understood by British negotiators; is plain, effective, and, in our judgment, justifiable. Take Gallinas, one of the most difficult cases in all Africa, for an illustration. A ship of war arrived, put down her anchors, and her commander proposed to negotiate, as he was duly empowered to do. The chief hesitated and delayed, hoping that the ship would leave; but were positively informed that the blockade would be continued, and every slaver coming out would be captured, till the treaty was made. When the chiefs were convinced that this would actually be done, they made the treaty, abolishing the slave-trade within their dominions. In the same way, treaties may be made

with every chief on the coast.

Great Britain, as we have already stated, has treaties covering the whole western coast, from the Great Desert to this old Portuguese claim. If she has stopped short at that point, it is doubtless because she recognizes that claim as valid; and then her treaty with Portugal covers that coast. But it would be in accordance with her practice in other cases, if, without denying that claim, she has made treaties with chiefs exercising a present practical sovereignty on some part of the country covered by it. We have seen no such treaties, and can not now command time for a thorough search. One fact, however, indicates their existence. In April, 1851, the British Commodore on that coast, at Loango, in an official statement to Commander A. M. Foote, of the U. S. Brig Perry, said: "Factories have been broken up at Lagos, in the Congo, and at Ambriz." The natnral interpretation is, that the operation of breaking up these factories was the same in all the three cases, and was recent. That at Lagos, north of the equator, we know was broken up in execution of one of those sixtythree treaties; and the inference is natural, that those in the Congo and at Ambriz were broken up in execution of treaties, either with the native chiefs or with Portugal; and in either case, the fact shows that British power can break up factories on the line of coast covered by this old Portuguese claim; and without factories, cargoes of slaves can not be collected and shipped.

We repeat, therefore that Great Britain has the whole export trade in slaves from Africa completely in her power, and can stop it when she pleases, by preventing exportation. And in view of these facts, what shall we say of all that British clamor, about the American flag covering and protecting the slave trade?, Without her indulgence, there could be no slave trade on the ocean for the American flag to cover. It is only by her indulgence to Spain, that slaves can be landed and sold. It is only by her indulgence to other powers, in Europe and in Africa, that the slaves can be bought and shipped. The American flag cannot cover the embarkation of slaves at Whidah, in violation of her treaty with Dahomey,

nor their debarkation in Cuba, in violation of her treaty with Spain. But, besides all this, the facts do not bear out this British clamor. It has been asserted that under the treaty, a British cruiser has no right to capture an American slaver, even if found with a cargo of slaves on board. We believe that some such order was once issued by some British official to his subordinates, probably for the purpose of making American policy appear odious, and thus forcing the government of the United States to concede the "right of search;" but we have never been able to find any such stipulation in any treaty, or any such demand in any American document. No American negotiator has refused to the British government the right to visit, search, and capture any ship engaged in the slave trade, whether she has slaves on board or not. The only claim of the United States is, that if a British cruiser visits, searches, and detains an American

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)