

3

REVIEW

OF THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW;

OR,

AN EXPOSURE

OF THE

ERRONEOUS OPINIONS PROMULGATED
IN THAT WORK

ON THE SUBJECT OF

Colonial Slavery:

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF

A SERIES OF LETTERS WHICH APPEARED IN THE "NEW TIMES"
OF SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER 1824.

WITH

NOTES AND AN APPENDIX.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY.

REVIEW
OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW,
&c. &c.

THE Sixtieth Number of *The Quarterly Review*, which has recently been published, contains an article entitled "West-India Colonies." In that article the Reviewer has given currency to some fallacious statements on the subject of SLAVERY, which it is the purpose of the present publication to examine and refute.

The Reviewer begins with referring his readers to a former discussion of the same topic, which appeared in the Fifty-eighth Number of his work, as containing "a detailed sketch"—and he means, of course, that it should be considered as an authentic sketch—"of the actual condition and treatment of the Slaves in our West-India Colonies." Whoever will take the trouble of turning to that article will find that it consists chiefly of assertions without a shadow of evidence. The Reviewer, who, it is plain, never visited the West Indies himself, instead of citing authentic documents, or adducing unimpeachable testimony in proof of his statements, supports them with extracts from anonymous letters, and with loose and unauthenticated details, obviously taken from the mouths of West-Indian planters

anxious to vindicate themselves in the eyes of the public. And these extracts and details he seems to expect will obtain implicit credit with the public, in consideration of the dispassionate tone in which they are communicated, and the kind of demi-official character which the work enjoys. At the same time, it would be difficult to select, from the immense mass of our periodical criticism, an article which has less claim to accuracy of statement, and more contemptuously sets at defiance those received maxims of political economy which, on other occasions, this journal has ably defended. It is not meant to accuse the Reviewer of any intention to mislead the public. Others doubtless have abused his confidence, and made him the unconscious instrument of misrepresentation.

In a similar strain of unfairness, an article entitled "Mexico" has been employed, in the following Number of the same work, to institute a comparison between the productions and trade of Mexico and those of Jamaica, in order to establish, what seems a favourite hypothesis with the Reviewer, That slave labour is more productive than free labour. The attempt, in the present era of light and knowledge, would be ridiculous enough from the pen of the meanest scribbler; but when it appears in the pages of *The Quarterly Review* it merits reprobation rather than ridicule. The Reviewer actually seems to perceive no cause for the superiority he assigns to Jamaica, except that cultivation is there conducted by slaves, and in Mexico by free men; just as if the miserable policy and oppressive institutions of Spain, its restrictive laws, its ruinous exactions, the absence of all encouragement to industry, the total want of security to property—as if all these were nothing in the scale! Nay, he even overlooks, in his estimate of the causes which have depressed the productive industry of Mexico, the civil war actually

raging there at the time ; and of which he admits, in other parts of *the Review*, the destructive effects.

But to come to the more recent article on this subject : The Reviewer professes there to give a true account of the reception which the recommendations of Earl Bathurst, on the means of improving the condition of the slaves, met with in the West Indies. Jamaica and Barbadoes, he admits, took the lead in protesting against them ; and much irritation and violence prevailed, especially in the former of those islands. He might have said, in both ; witness the destruction, in open day, at Barbadoes, of the Methodist Chapel, and the violent expulsion, at the hazard of their lives, of the missionary and his wife. “ The impression,” he goes on to remark, “ produced in other colonies was various. In some, the discontinuance of the stimulus of the whip in the field, and of the punishment of female slaves under any circumstances by flogging, was protested against as a measure incompatible with a state of slavery and with the necessary authority of the masters over their slaves. In others, these innovations did not appear to create any alarm. In the Address of St. Vincent, it is observed, that these practices had been virtually discontinued, and the Government are reproached with their ignorance of the fact. In Demerara, the Court of Policy were particularly zealous in assenting to, and expressing their readiness to enforce, those two particular regulations. In Antigua, the draft of a bill was submitted to the Legislature for ameliorating the condition of the slaves ; but it was lost on the third reading.” —Again ; “ No legislative measure has hitherto passed any Assembly comprehending the whole of the improvements suggested” by Lord Bathurst.

But I would ask, has any legislative measure passed any one of the Assemblies since their receipt of Lord Bathurst’s despatches, which comprehends, I will not say the whole, but any of his Lordship’s suggested

improvements? * The Legislature of Antigua cannot deserve much credit for having *rejected* a bill for ameliorating the condition of the slaves, which is all they seem to have done; and whatever zeal the Court of Policy of Demerara may have shewn in *inditing* resolutions for the abolition of the driving whip and of the flogging of females, we have not heard that it has extended beyond the council table; and the general and violent hostility to improvement prevailing there is too notorious to be denied.

There is, however, the island of St. Vincent, which, the Reviewer tells us, had, by its own account, virtually discontinued the practice of flogging women, and of driving the slaves in the field by the stimulus of the whip; and the planters of that island, it seems, even reproach Government with their ignorance of the fact. The planters of St. Vincent's, I admit, do insinuate something of this kind; but the Reviewer ought not to have given his sanction to the insinuation, without reading the proof to which they refer, in support of it,—namely, the 18th

* This is an error: it ought to have been noted, in justice to the Reviewer, that there was one exception—the small island of Tobago. In this island, containing 14,000 slaves, a law has been passed by which, in cases “of wilful murder or mayem of, or cruelty to, any slave by any White or Free persons, it may be lawful, in case no White or Free person was present, or can be produced to prove the facts, to admit the evidence of two slaves to prove the facts and circumstances attending such imputed murder, mayem or cruelty, and the concurrent testimony of such two slaves, if unimpeached as to their credibility, shall have the same effect in point of law as if a White or Free person had proved the same facts and circumstances.” A clause is introduced to secure the personal property of slaves, and another to abolish Sunday markets, substituting Thursday, and allowing to the slaves thirty-five days in the year for their provision grounds. Arbitrary punishments are limited to twenty stripes and if more than twelve are given it must be in the presence of a free person, other than the person punishing. It is creditable to Tobago to have thus far preceded the other colonies in the march of improvement. Much, very much, however, is wanting even here, in order to fulfil the instructions of Lord Bathurst.

clause of their new Slave Law passed in 1820. Now this very clause, on being examined, stands directly opposed to their statement. Indeed this clause, as well as every other part of the Act, is little more than a copy of the Slave Law passed in Jamaica in 1816. The St. Vincent's law on the subject is as follows:—

“ That in order to restrain arbitrary punishment, no slave on any plantation or estate shall receive more than ten stripes at one time, and for one offence, unless the owner, attorney, guardian, administrator, or manager of such estate or plantation, having such slave under his care, shall be present: and no such owner, attorney, guardian, administrator, or manager, shall, on any account, punish a slave with more than thirty-nine stripes at one time, and for one offence; nor inflict, nor suffer to be inflicted, such last-mentioned punishment, nor any other number of stripes in the same week, nor until the delinquent has recovered from the effects of any former punishment, under a penalty of not less than 15*l.* (7*l.* 10*s.* sterling) or more than 30*l.* (15*l.* sterling) for every offence.”

It would not be very easy to shew how this clause (at this moment the law of St. Vincent) operates to prohibit the flogging of women, or the driving of the slaves in the field by the stimulus of the whip. On the contrary, it comprehends all slaves, male and female, and that under the insulting pretext of *restraining arbitrary punishment*, within the scope of the terrible power which it gives to *every* owner, attorney, guardian, administrator, and manager, to inflict upon them, at their discretion, and without the possibility of any *legal* remedy, thirty-nine lashes of the cart whip; and it leaves to inferior agents the no less terrible power (considering who *they* are) of punishment, to the extent of ten stripes, without any limitation whatever as to the frequency of their infliction. The act moreover imposes no restraint on the power of whipping slaves not belonging

to plantations.—And this is the boasted law of St. Vincent, of which so much has been said, and the humanity of which the Government are reproached for not having recognised !!!

But the Reviewer appears to believe, that these practices, according to the St. Vincent's Address, have been "virtually discontinued." And what is the proof of this?—The assertion, at most, of the planters of St. Vincent: and not even their *assertion*—their *insinuation merely; and this in the very teeth of their law*. But in what one of the colonies has it not been asserted over and over again, in resolutions and addresses, that the slaves are better off than the peasantry of Great Britain? Has the St. Vincent's Address gone beyond this? And yet the Reviewer has virtually lent the sanction of his authority to the delusive statement, that the island of St. Vincent has discontinued the practice of flogging women and driving the Negroes in the field, although that statement is in direct contradiction to its own recent law ! *

There is one passage in Mr. Canning's speech, quoted by the Reviewer, which will shew how liable even a mind so penetrating as Mr. Canning's is to be misled on this question. Mr. Canning observes, that "it is but just to state that, under certain qualifications, the evidence of slaves is already admitted in the Courts of Justice of Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent's, and I believe St. Christopher's and Tobago." Now certainly in no law which has *appeared* from Grenada, St. Vincent's, and St. Christopher's, can any ground be discovered for this assertion. Indeed, with respect to St. Vincent's, the very contrary is

* The Reviewer intimates, that the innovations proposed by Lord Bathurst did not excite any *alarm* in St. Vincent's. The Address of that island, however, opens with a very opposite sentiment. Lord Bathurst's despatch, it says, "contains matter calculated by turns to excite alike our *alarm*, our astonishment, and our indignation."

the fact. The improved Slave Code of that island, passed in 1820, which has been vaunted as having anticipated all Lord Bathurst's suggested improvements, contains a clause (the 61st) which expressly enacts, "That the evidence of any slave or slaves, on oath, shall be taken for or against slaves, but *in no other case whatever* be admissible."

The slave law of Dominica admits, in certain cases, the evidence of slaves; but this admission is restricted and guarded with such excessive jealousy as to render it really of little or no use*.

All must agree with the Reviewer in regarding the Order in Council for the regulation of Slavery in Trinidad as a most important and beneficial measure. At the same time, it appears, in some particulars, to deteriorate the state of the slaves in Trinidad, instead of improving it. To shew this, it will be sufficient to contrast some of the provisions of the Spanish Slave-Code, which was, or ought to have been, the law of Trinidad, with the corresponding provisions of the Order in Council.

1st. By the Spanish law, the slaves, besides Sunday are understood to be entitled to a day in each week, and to thirty holidays in the year, to be employed for their own benefit †.—By the Order in Council, no time, exclusive of

* In a preceding note it will be seen, that Tobago has also admitted, under certain qualifications, slave evidence, in the case of murder, mayem or cruelty, perpetrated on a slave by a White or Free person; a regulation which forms a direct contrast to that enacted, on the same subject, by the Order in Council for Trinidad. (See below, p. 11.)

† This is also the case in Brazil. Mr. Koster, the author of *Travels in Brazil*, published a pamphlet in 1816, with his name affixed to it. It may be found in the sixteenth Number of the *Pamphleteer*. This valuable and accurate writer thus states the case of the Brazilian slave. Besides his food, which is "salt meat or salt fish, and the flour of the manioc," "the laws allow him to have the Sundays and holidays as his own," p. 313. "The Brazilian slaves who supply themselves with food,

Sunday, is allotted to the slaves. This defect must, of course, have arisen from a mere oversight in the framers of the Order; and they will doubtless be desirous of immediately remedying it.

Here, however, it is necessary to advert for one moment to a Minute of the Council of Trinidad on this subject, dated the 9th July, 1823. One of the propositions discussed by the Council is this: "That the Sunday should be devoted, by the slave, to repose and religious instruction; and that other time should be allotted for the cultivation of the provision ground." On this proposition the Council remarks—"No objection to this, under the guarantee, already pledged by his Majesty's Government, of allowing full compensation to the proprietor for the loss of the additional day."

The fair inference from this reply is, that hitherto the slaves in Trinidad have had no time but Sunday for cultivating their grounds, and providing for their subsistence and that of their families. But, if so, how is it that the authorities of the island have not enforced the provisions of the Spanish Law?*

Instead of indemnity to the planters,

have one day in every week for this purpose, but they are expected not to require any assistance from the master." They have also "in the course of the year, above *thirty* holidays besides Sunday." p. 327.

* The Spanish Cedula of 31st May, 1789, says, that on holidays "the slaves shall not be obliged or permitted to work either for themselves or their masters, except at the time of crop, when it is customary to grant them liberty to work on holidays."

This is further confirmed, by a reference to a work published by Longman, in 1810, entitled "Present State of the Spanish Colonies, by W. Walton, Junior;" in which that gentleman remarks, that "A considerable impediment to the progress of culture in Spanish possessions, is the great number of Feast-days that interfere with the labours of the field;" and again, that though Spanish slaves are denied many "subordinate conveniences, they are allowed a much greater surplus of time to procure them, and enjoy more indulgences than the slaves of other nations."—Vol. ii. pp. 140 and 143.

He goes on to say, that "a slave has the right of redemption; and,

for appropriating a day in lieu of Sunday to the slaves, they ought to be punished for violating the law, by having

in any dispute with his master, has the privilege of choosing an arbitrator. If he be not contented to live in the servitude of a particular person, by whom he may be ill treated, and can produce sufficient motives and another purchaser; or if he has had sufficient industry and economy to have amassed the stipulated sum of 300 dollars, he can demand his freedom, by refunding his purchase-money." "The price affixed by law for the redemption of a female, is 250 dollars. An infant, unborn, ceases to be the property of the owner, by the deposit of 100 rials (about 42s.); and after birth, by that of twenty-five dollars."

This general statement is confirmed by a more recent writer, who, in letters from the Havannah, dedicated to Mr. Croker, of the Admiralty, and published by Miller, in 1821, speaks of "the festivals held every Sunday and Feast-day," when "numbers of free and enslaved assemble" for amusement; and he afterwards describes them as "festivalizing on a *dios de dos cruces*, or a church holiday." He also recognizes the regulation which allows the slave "who is discontented with the treatment of his owner, to demand a *carta* or licence to be sold, or, in other words, to change his service," p. 42.

"There are many Coloured People," he adds, "whose freedom is the purchase of the extra earnings allowed them by law." "The number of free People of Colour in this island is nearly equal to the total amount of that class in all the islands together. This is attributable to the mildness of the Spanish Slave-Code, which softens the rigour of their hard destiny."—"Every slave under the Spanish colonial law, who tenders his master the sum he was bought at, is entitled to enfranchisement, *nor can his master refuse it*. It is equally permitted him to purchase a portion of his freedom by instalments, as his ability allows, being then said to be *coartado*, or *cut*; and such are, in consequence, entitled to a licence to work where and with whom they please, paying to their master a *rial* (5d.) per day, for every hundred dollars remaining of their value, beyond the instalment they have paid. Many who are not *coartado* are allowed by their owners to labour where they please, under similar conditions; by which means an industrious slave may, in a few years, procure sufficient to ransom himself. The excellence of such a regulation it is easy to appreciate. The permission to purchase freedom by portions, is both a wise and merciful policy. It satisfies the master with a high interest, during the period the slave is working out his freedom; and it imbues the latter with habits of cheerful industry, while he is, as it were, knocking off his chain link by link." pp. 40—42.

A farther confirmation of these statements is to be found in our own Privy Council Report of 1789, part VI, where the following provisions are represented as forming a part of the law of the Spanish Colonies, regarding slavery, viz.

"Any slave, on proof given to the Governor of bad treatment by the owner, may insist on being transferred to another master at such

withheld it from them. Or do they pretend to have a right, by any law Divine or human, to the labour of their slaves on the Sunday; that labour being, in fact, given to the master, which is appropriated to feeding the slave? Who would have believed it possible, prior to this Minute of the Council of Trinidad, that if any day besides Sunday should be allotted to the slave for raising food, to enable him to work for his master, the master would claim to be indemnified for so doing by the parent state? Without a doubt these gentlemen will find themselves mistaken in supposing that the Government has guaranteed to them any such indemnity. Nevertheless, it is to be regretted that the Order in Council should have overlooked this important part of the case; and, while it prohibits the Sunday to be employed in labouring for the master, should have omitted to allot any other time to the slave for his provision grounds.

2. By the Spanish law husband and wife cannot be separated by sale or transfer*.—By the Order in Council the

price as may be settled between the purchaser and the seller; and if the latter is exorbitant in his demand, the Governor is to name a third person as umpire.

“Any slave who by his industry and economy has raised a sufficiency to purchase his manumission, may demand his freedom from his master, on paying an equitable price; and if the master should prove unreasonable, the Governor, on the application of the slave, is to appoint two appraisers, who are to fix the price.”

The Report adds, that “It is said there are nearly 20,000 free People of Colour in the city of Havannah alone.”

* This is clearly indicated in the provision of the Spanish Cedula, which enjoins it upon the master to prevent the unlawful intercourse of the sexes, and to encourage matrimony among his slaves. “Neither must he hinder them from marrying with slaves of other masters; in which case, if the estates are distant from one another, so that the new married couple cannot fulfil the object of marriage, the wife shall follow her husband, whose master shall buy her at a fair valuation, set upon her by skilful men, who shall be nominated by the two parties, and, in case of disagreement, a third shall be appointed by the Justice to fix the price. If the master of the husband does not agree to the purchase, the master of the wife shall have the same facility.”—In the same way, says Mr. Koster, “The Brazilian slave cannot be separated from his wife, for a Christian church has joined them in bonds of matrimony.”

prohibition to separate them is restricted to judicial sales. A proprietor therefore, it would seem, may now sell them separately at his discretion, which by the Spanish law he could not have done. This defect in the Order is the more remarkable, as Mr. Canning, in his speech of the 15th March 1824, stated, that "in all future sales, families shall not be separated;" and yet, if the 23d clause of the Order be examined, it will be found that the prohibition applies to judicial sales exclusively.

3. By the Spanish law (see the Minute of the Council of Trinidad of the 9th July, 1823), the testimony of slaves is received in all cases *quantum valeat* *.—By the Order in Council, this general admission of slave evidence is laid under several new and important restrictions. It cannot now be received unless the slave is certified by some clergyman or religious teacher to understand the nature of an oath. Neither can it be received in civil suits against the master, nor in any trial affecting the life of a White man. This last exception, wholly unknown to the Spanish law, makes a most unjustifiable distinction between the White and all other classes, although half of the slaves and other property in the island belongs to Free Persons of Colour. But, independently of this circumstance, it is impossible to use terms too strong in describing its hurtful tendency. If a White man, against whom, till now, slave evidence might have been legally adduced, should murder a slave, though a thousand slaves may have witnessed the fact, not one of them can be heard in evidence. It moreover holds out an actual premium to murder. If a White man should be twice convicted of cruelly treating a slave, he forfeits, according to the Order in Council, all the slaves he possesses. All therefore that is now necessary

* One of the propositions discussed by the Council is, "That the testimony of slaves be received *quantum valeat*;" on which the observation is, "A law to this effect is already in force."

for him to do, in order to protect himself from this calamitous result, is to kill the slave outright. No slave evidence can then be received against him. The following extract of a letter from Trinidad, dated the 17th of June, 1824, will be found to confirm this view of the clause in question. It is from a proprietor of Colour:—

“ The draft of the Order in Council of the 15th March has quite disheartened us, and has completely removed every doubt concerning the system which his Majesty’s Ministers propose following with respect to us. I confine myself to the 36th clause, by which, in capital cases, the evidence of a slave is rejected against a White man, and received against a Coloured individual; and yet the Order is said to be for the melioration of slavery! It is quite the contrary. Under the Spanish law, the evidence of a slave *was* admitted against a White man; so that, instead of bettering his condition, it has deteriorated it. At this time, murder may be perpetrated by the privileged class with impunity, unless a free person be present*.”

It is readily conceded to the Quarterly Reviewer, that the resistance of many of the West Indians, to the measures now pursuing for the mitigation and extinction of slavery,

* Let it not be supposed that there is the slightest wish to impute blame to the framers of the Order, on account of this or other defects. They did what they believed to be best, under all the conflicting circumstances of a very difficult and delicate case. But it would be treachery, both to the Government and the Slaves, to shrink from representing in their true colours the effects likely to follow from such regulations as these. Government acted, doubtless, with the purest intentions. That, however, will not alter the tendency of this particular provision. It is remarkable, that the Assembly of Tobago have admitted slaves to give evidence in the very case which forms the exception in Trinidad.

The references made to the Order in Council are made to that draft of it which was laid on the table of the House of Commons, on the 15th March, 1824, and was afterwards printed along with Mr. Canning’s speech on that occasion. The writer cannot find that any other edition has been published, or is to be obtained, in this country.

is produced more by their dread of the loss of property than by their abstract love of slavery; and that the crime of creating and upholding the slavery of the West Indies is a national crime, and not the crime of the slaveholders alone. For the loss, therefore, which individuals may incur by its abolition, they have a claim on the public. The Reviewer, however, admits, that nothing can be more absurd than the pretensions of the West Indians on this subject; and he instances the claim preferred by Trinidad (a claim also preferred by other colonies) of indemnity for the concession of Sunday to the slaves, and of a day in lieu of it for the cultivation of the food which is to sustain them in toiling for the benefit of their masters. Now the principle which has led the Reviewer to this just and reasonable conclusion with respect to Sunday, will be found to apply to many other usurpations, contrary to all law and all justice, to which the Mother Country has been no party; nay, which have been studiously concealed from her knowledge. Something may also be to be said hereafter on the claims of those mercantile speculators, who, within the last twenty or thirty years, have become the chief possessors of sugar estates in the West Indies. But, concurring with the Reviewer, that wherever a claim to indemnity can be *fairly* established, it ought to be *fairly* met, it is unnecessary now to enter on this wide field of discussion.

The hypothesis of the Reviewer, however, that the resistance of the West Indians to the proposed reforms of their system arises solely from a dread of the loss of property, certainly takes too narrow a view of the question. If it were just, would almost all the great West-Indian proprietors resident in this country have concurred in Mr. Canning's Resolutions? The clamour against these has proceeded chiefly from men of little or no property, many of whom are the salaried servants of those very proprietors.

The resident White inhabitants of the West Indies have been the chief opponents of Lord Bathurst and Mr. Canning; and they are described by Governor Elliott, in his despatch to Lord Liverpool of November 21, 1810, to consist of "attorneys, managers, overseers, self-created lawyers, self-educated physicians, and adventurous merchants, with little real capital and scanty credit."

But the Reviewer blames the Abolitionists for not having been more complimentary to the West Indians: it was very imprudent, to say no more, and unnecessarily offensive, to represent them as likely to perpetuate their resistance.—Certainly, if the leaders in the cause of Abolition had to deal only with the West-Indian proprietors resident in England, and acting under the influence of public opinion in this country, the complaint of the Reviewer might have been more just. But the decision of the question at issue, it is plain, lay not with those gentlemen. And as the experience of thirty-five years had left no doubt as to the reception which the proposal of reform would meet with in the West Indies, it was only fair to warn Government and Parliament of the hopelessness, and not of the hopelessness only, but of the danger also, of the course they were pursuing in referring the matter to colonial deliberation. Had the Abolitionists, considering the views which they entertained, been silent upon this point, they would have been as guilty, as the Reviewer deems the Missionary Smith to have been, of neglecting a plain and obvious duty.

In discussing the question of free labour, and the advantages to be derived from its substitution for slave labour, the Reviewer has confined his objections to a single point; namely, that "no example exists of free Negroes collectively performing the duties required in the cultivation of the sugar cane, the staple production of the

Tropics." The sugar cane, however, is not *the staple*, but only *one* of the *staple* productions of the Tropics; and it is no small concession on the part of the advocates of slave labour virtually to admit, in this early stage of the discussion, the practicability of cultivating the other staples by free labour, and to be driven, in their defence of slavery, to entrench themselves within the line of sugar planting.

The Reviewer seems to assume, that the cultivation of the sugar cane must of necessity be *collectively* performed in order to succeed. This assumption, however, is disproved by facts. The sugar cane is cultivated to a great extent in Asia. In most cases, its cultivation is pursued by the farmer, with the aid alone of his family, and occasionally of a few hired labourers. The Reviewer cannot think of sugar-making, except as it is practised in the West Indies, where the labour is performed by slaves, and where the cultivator of the cane is also the manufacturer of the sugar. But in the East Indies, where each individual husbandman plants a few acres of canes, he either sells the canes when ripe in the market, or their juice, when expressed and boiled into a thick syrup, to the adjacent manufacturer of sugar. In some parts of the East, however, in Java for example, large plantations of sugar belonging to Europeans are conducted entirely by means of hired labour. The proprietor contracts, perhaps, with an intelligent native of China to perform the requisite work at a fixed sum. The contractor procures the labourers, and pays them, ploughs the ground, &c.; and the work is both well and cheaply done.

That sugar then can be grown by free labourers, either collectively or otherwise, the Reviewer will not deny. Would he, or would the West Indians, be content to admit the free growers of sugar to a fair competition with the growers of it by gangs of slaves? If they would, why do they maintain with such pertinacity the protecting duty

against East-Indian sugar? Let our sugar market be but thrown open to the world at large, or even to our own possessions, and a short time will prove that neither whips, nor chains, nor collective cultivation by slaves, are necessary in order to supply us regularly with as fair and as cheap sugar as ever has been produced by such miserable expedients*.

But the Reviewer, perhaps, intends to rest the strength of his argument on the word *Negroes*. Is there then, in reality, something in the nature of the *Negro*, which renders him incapable of being acted upon by the same motives which operate on the Hindoo, or on the natives of Siam, China, or Java? If the Reviewer's theory were true, that, because the climate of the West Indies supplies the wants of nature almost spontaneously, the free Negro will not work, it would be equally true of Hindostan, Java, or Siam: it would be equally true of the multitudes of Free Blacks and People of Colour scattered over the West-India Colonies, and the competition of whose aspiring industry the dominant White has hitherto found it necessary to keep down by harsh and oppressive restrictions. "It is the nature of the African to be indolent," says the Reviewer. His metaphysics on this particular subject seem as little entitled to respect as his political economy. Is it not then the *nature* of the European, the American, and the Asiatic to be indolent also? If the whip were the only stimulus applied to extract *their* labour, would they be less reluctantly incited to exertion than the slaves in the West Indies? Let those who have tried the compulsory labour of convicts in New South Wales, or of parish paupers in England, be consulted, and their report will uniformly be, that they would prefer paying high wages to the free labourer, to being

* See a pamphlet recently published by Hatchard, entitled East-India Sugar.

forced to employ, for his bare food and clothing, the convict or the pauper, who derives no benefit from his exertions. Now the Negro slave derives no benefit from *his* exertions in his master's service, beyond that of saving his skin from the lash: and why should he do more than is sufficient for this purpose? As for food, and clothing, and shelter, and medicine, he must have some share of these, or he can do no work at all; any more than a horse or a mule that is not fed. The Reviewer, therefore, seems bound to try the effect of higher motives—of wages, for instance—before he inflicts upon the Negro his metaphysical malediction, and excludes him from the brotherhood of humanity. If we look around the West Indies, shall we not find many thousands of emancipated slaves and their descendants, toiling industriously, accumulating property, acquiring knowledge, fulfilling the relative duties of life, rising into moral distinction, and struggling manfully and perseveringly, but submissively, against the civil and political evils which tend to crush their efforts? “Oh, but,” says the Reviewer, “they will not cultivate sugar *collectively*.” Be it so; and what then? Shall we not be able to procure sugar for our tea and coffee, because the free Negroes of the West Indies may not choose to cultivate the cane in gangs?

The Reviewer is aware that the Negro slaves in the West Indies even now voluntarily raise, in considerable quantities, for their own benefit, such articles as they *dare* to raise or cultivate, and as will bring a good price in the market—such as hogs, fish, poultry, firewood, grass, vegetable provisions, and fruit. As for “sugar, cotton, coffee, cocoa, or other goods or merchandise of any sort,” (see St. Vincent's Law, clause 73), slaves are interdicted from selling them under severe penalties. But let us suppose that a sugar plantation in Jamaica were divided into little farms of five or ten acres each, and let to the

more industrious of the Negroes, and that the proprietor kept the sugar works in his own hands, assuring those who might continue to cultivate the sugar cane of a ready market for it at his manufactory. The same stimulus at least would exist in this case, which now exists for their raising, during the brief pittance of time granted them to provide food for themselves and their families, that superfluous quantity of yams and plantains, and those oranges and pine-apples, and pigs and poultry, with which they supply so abundantly all the markets of the islands. Can the Reviewer assign any good reason why they should not grow sugar cane to supply the neighbouring mill, as readily as they now grow other articles to supply the demand of distant markets; or does he fear that labourers could not be *hired* to assist in manufacturing sugar, if adequate wages were offered?

The advocates of slavery are very inconsistent in their reasonings. It has become the fashion among them of late, to represent in glowing and certainly exaggerated colours the property accumulated by slaves, the produce of their own voluntary labour during the fragment of time allowed them by their masters. Thus, Sir Ralph Woodford tells us how the slaves in Trinidad may amass much beyond the wants of the utmost ambition or profligacy. Thus, Mr. R. Hibbert's affidavit-men describe the slaves on Georgia estate as wallowing in abundance. Thus, a Dr. Stobo, with a parade of minute statistical research, has produced a flaming account of property accumulated by the slaves of Tortola. In short, we hear from all quarters of the West Indies, not only of the desire of the Negroes to acquire property, but of their efficiently employing the means within their power to that end. And under what circumstances is this effected? With a mere scantling of time at their own disposal,—and with every temptation to seek repose, in preference to active employment, which

can be supplied by natural indolence, or by the exhaustion of unremunerated labour under the lash, for five or six days of the week, for the benefit of another,—they nevertheless so diligently and skilfully appropriate that scantling, either in cultivating their grounds, or in working for hire, as to add greatly to their comforts, and even to amass wealth. Such is actually the statement, not only of many of the West-Indians, but of the Quarterly Reviewer himself, in his Fifty-eighth Number (pp. 491 and 492).

The Reviewer's difficult and perplexing problem is therefore already solved. He himself may be adduced to prove, that a stimulus has been already found of far greater potency than the whip. Why then should he leave it to be inferred that the whip is alone capable of rendering the labour of the Negro beneficial to the planter? He will find it hard, by the utmost exertion of his metaphysical skill, to convince reasoning men in this country, that if a Negro will work industriously, from *moral* motives, on a Sunday or Saturday, he will not also be influenced by the same motives to work industriously on the other five days of the week. The problem, then, is solved by the concurrent testimony of the West-Indians and the Reviewer. Their own statements and admissions, if followed out to all their consequences, would be sufficient to prove, not only that the Negroes are fit for freedom, but that their freedom would be a pecuniary benefit, no less to their masters than to themselves.

The Reviewer says he is anxious for a fair and temperate inquiry into this subject. So, unquestionably, are the Abolitionists. Twice has Mr. Whitmore attempted to obtain a Committee of the House of Commons to investigate it, and twice has he been foiled in the attempt by Mr. Huskisson and the West-Indians. To what, in fact, did Mr. Whitmore's motion respecting the Sugar Duties, to what indeed *could* it tend, but to a full and radical development of the

grand question of free and slave labour. It is therefore to be hoped, that in the next session of Parliament all whom the Reviewer can influence will support Mr. Whitmore, when he renews his motion on this subject.

With a very imposing gravity, the Reviewer next tells us, that "those who advance facts of the correctness of which they are not absolutely certain, allow themselves a latitude very nearly approaching to criminality." This is, without a doubt, a very just remark. He adds, however, "We are sometimes afraid that there are persons engaged in polemical controversy *upon this subject*, so hurried on by their detestation of slavery, so morbidly anxious for its extinction, that they are disposed to adopt the most dangerous of all human principles of action, that the end may occasionally sanctify the employment of means which, in themselves, and abstractedly taken, cannot be justified." Has the Reviewer no fear, then, with respect to those who take the opposite side in this controversy? Are there no criminal misrepresentations to be apprehended on the part of those who love, as well as on the part of those who detest slavery; no dishonourable means to be suspected among the partisans of the former, for attaining an end which they think important? And is it no indication of the partiality of the Reviewer, that he should deem it necessary to preach exclusively to the Abolitionists, as if they alone were capable of resorting to base and unworthy arts to promote their objects? But on what does the Reviewer found this severe monition to them? Instead of a sly insinuation against the honesty of their principles, would it not have been more manly to have denounced the detected delinquency on which he grounds his reproof? If he meant to direct it against the Anti-Slavery Society, he ought to have shewn that any thing has been either done or written by them, which, in this particular respect, will not bear his keenest scrutiny

And with respect to individual writers, though some of these may be ill informed, yet he would find it difficult to prove his charge even against them. At least I know of none who have given currency to representations half so inaccurate, or, being inaccurate, half so mischievous, as some which have been made by the Reviewer himself. And as for the Sunday-School Tract which seems to have excited his solemn rebuke, although several expressions in it certainly require qualification, yet it contains no very material inaccuracy of statement, and is well adapted to promote a distaste for colonial bondage in the rising generation.

But this system of diffusing a knowledge of the real nature of slavery through the land, the Reviewer tells us, he “decidedly reprobates.” And why does he reprobate it? The reason is curious. “We do not object,” he says, “in the slightest degree, to a deep-rooted hatred of slavery, or a thorough knowledge upon that or any other subject.”—This is precisely the kind of preface to be expected when a man is about to defend slavery, or to plead *against* diffusing a knowledge of it. He therefore proceeds—“But we protest against this thorough knowledge or deep-rooted hatred being confounded with religious feeling, or employed for party purposes.” There is really something ludicrous in this sort of protest. Does the Reviewer mean that we are not to decide the question of slavery on religious grounds? That in this case alone we are not to try our conduct by the immutable principles of right and wrong, which are laid down in the Word of God? That in this case alone we are not to appeal to the Christian maxim of doing to others as we would they should do unto us? That here alone we are not to bring into operation that Divine charity which seeks to relieve our fellow-creatures from temporal misery and oppression, from mental degradation, and from spiritual death? And what again does he mean by *party purposes*? Is it that the energies

which are enlisted in favour of the freedom and happiness of mankind, in favour of the oppressed against his oppressor, are to be likened to a scramble for place, or some paltry question of party politics? Who are the parties? On one side 800,000 colonial bondsmen, with nearly the entire British nation: on the other, less than 2000 proprietors of sugar estates (for the question, even as the Reviewer himself has put it, has now become a sugar question) in the West Indies, aided by those in this country whom their Parliamentary influence, or their good dinners, or their common hostility to Saintship, or the mere ties of blood or interest may attach to their cause. Party purposes! Yes, the purposes of truth and justice and humanity—the promotion of the universal freedom of man—the cause of morality and religion—the cause of their country—the cause of God! May the people of England, young and old, be ever found devoted to such purposes! the zealous, unswerving, unshrinking partizans of such a cause!

The Reviewer, however, still argues that we act immorally, nay, that we are guilty of *a breach of faith* in agitating this subject. He says, “Parliament having deliberately placed in the hands of the Executive Government the solution of this difficult and fearful question, we consider it a breach of public faith to thwart and impede their measures.” It is certainly a begging of the question that we thwart and impede their measures. And as for the compact here spoken of, when was it made, and what are its conditions? Is it binding on one party only, like the Reviewer’s admonition; or does it bind both? When was it ever heard before, that because Government or Parliament had entered on the consideration of a great public question, interesting to the feelings of every man in the community, that question was to be withdrawn from free, unrestrained, general discussion, and that those who should venture to discuss it would be guilty of *a breach of public*

faith? It seems, however, to be the Reviewer's object to silence those only who would advocate the cause of Negro freedom: he accuses them alone of breaking faith with the Government. In what light, then, does he view the whole host of colonial journalists, and of some journalists at home, and of colonial writers of different descriptions, who have been incessantly squirting out their filth and venom on this subject during the last year? Has he no monitory voice for them? These are secure from the Reviewer's castigation. He reserves his ire for the Abolitionists. They must be arraigned for breach of faith, if, in order to set their cause right, they do but exhibit a plain statement of facts, and expose the misrepresentations (for to their ribaldry and invective they reply not) of their opponents.

But what has the Quarterly Reviewer, whose high displeasure the Abolitionists have incurred, to say for himself upon this point? Is it no breach of faith in him to have marched into the field of battle, and to have mingled so vigorously and efficiently in the conflict? Mr. Canning's resolutions, according to him, ought to have shut every honest man's mouth on the subject. And yet, from the hour when these resolutions were passed to the present, who has been the most active, efficient, and quietly pertinacious controversialist on this interdicted question? Why, the Quarterly Reviewer himself. Already have three ponderous articles proceeded from his pen, in opposition to the Abolitionists; all, we presume, in perfect loyalty to the Government. But no sooner does some unlucky wight, who happens to think differently from him, attempt to parry the deadly blows which, under the guise of a specious but hollow neutrality, he, or others under his shield, have been aiming at the very vitals of the cause of Negro freedom, than our ears are dinned with exclamations of bad faith! Such conduct is very intelligible. But is it also candid

and impartial? It might be excused indeed in a West Indian, but is utterly reprehensible in the *Quarterly Review*.

The respectable character of *The Quarterly Review* makes it difficult to suppose, that, in order to maintain any argument, or to serve any cause, its conductors would wilfully pervert the sense of a writer, by mutilating a passage cited from his work, so as to make him seem to contradict himself, and to inculcate the very opinions which it is his main endeavour to refute. Such, nevertheless, is the effect of the way in which the Reviewer cites and reasons upon the language of Mr. Stephen in *The Crisis of the Sugar Colonies*.

In that pamphlet, written and published at the outset of Bonaparte's counter-revolutionary attempt on St. Domingo, and while his true objects were yet veiled with the deepest dissimulation, the author demonstrated that his design was the restitution of slavery, and pointed out the formidable difficulties which would oppose him in that perfidious project. Among the considerations which probably had determined the Chief Consul to make such an attempt, Mr. Stephen noticed the impatient wish he felt for the restitution of the agricultural and commercial interests of France in her colonies, to which Negro liberty *seemed to be* an insuperable obstacle; and reasoning, as he supposes Bonaparte to do, he puts strongly the contrast between the great productiveness of St. Domingo, when cultivated by slaves, and the then contracted state of its exports.

“ While the Negroes were in bondage, the colony was rich and flourishing by the effects of their labours; since their enfranchisement, it has become a comparatively neglected waste. All the solicitations of the officers of the Republic, all the influence and authority of their own favourite Chief, have failed to recal them to any tolerable degree of regular industry. What then remains, but either

to restore the rigid yoke of the private master, and renew the coercion of the cart-whip, or permanently to leave this fine island in its present unprofitable state?"

After citing this passage, the Reviewer adds, "And is this all that *remains*? We trust not:" just as if the dilemma propounded had been one that the author himself was disposed to maintain, and with reference to the present time; whereas his very next words, following the quoted paragraph, are—" *Thus it appears, at first sight, not unnatural for the Chief Consul to reason;*" and he proceeds to shew, in no small part of the work, the unsoundness of such reasoning, and the gross impolicy of the measures founded upon it.

It is freely admitted to be impossible that the Quarterly Reviewer could mean to produce the unfair and fallacious effect which is thus produced. But it is at the same time very unfortunate that it was not prevented, by adding to his extract those two important lines, especially as the pamphlet is not now to be bought, and as the whole object of the citation is to mark the opinions of Mr. Stephen, who is styled (unquestionably with perfect truth) one of the most able and indefatigable advocates in the cause of Abolition, as being incompatible with those he and his friends now entertain. Even if the Reviewer's intention was to cite this writer, not for opinions, the reverse from what he really held, but for the fact of the neglect of agriculture, at that time, in St. Domingo, it was still no small breach of candour to withhold the explanation of that fact which the author subjoins; an explanation which renders the authority neutral at least, if not directly hostile to the critic's purpose. Mr. Stephen ascribed the aversion from agricultural labour among the Haytians, not to any native fault in their character, such as the Reviewer wishes to establish, but to the effects of that odious system which it is his object to palliate. Mr. Stephen described the driving method

in use upon sugar estates, and pointed out, among its other pernicious consequences, that it precluded the influence of those moral and rational motives, by which a repugnance to regular industry is overcome in the minds of free persons ; while it rendered the particular species of labour formerly exacted by the lash, not only degrading, but odious in the eyes of the enfranchised Negroes. But the author shall speak for himself: and it is well that the Reviewer has afforded the opportunity of reproducing, at this juncture, before the public, the following powerful and striking statement:—

“ Man,” says Mr. Stephen, “ is naturally indolent and impatient of bodily restraint. Though spurred by his hopes and fears into activity, and often to the most ardent exertions, he is with difficulty bent to the yoke of uniform and persevering labour.

“ The suggestions of foresight, however, are very powerful impulses, especially when seconded by habit; and the great Author of our nature has conferred on them a mild as well as a rightful dominion. When we bow to the golden sceptre of reason, obedience has many facilities, and its pains many mitigations. Nature is not thwarted more rudely than the rational purpose demands; and the mind, while it urges on the material frame, cheers it, in return, with refreshing and invigorating cordials. Look at the most laborious peasant in Europe, and, if you please, the most oppressed: he is toiling, it is true, from painful necessity; but it is necessity of a moral kind, acting upon his rational nature; and from which brutal coercion differs as widely as a nauseous drench in the mouth of an infant from the medicinal milk of its mother.

“ Is the impelling motive fear of want, or dread of a master’s displeasure? yet he sees, on the other hand, the approbation and reward attainable by exertions, whereof the degree, at least, is for the moment spontaneous. Self-complacency alleviates his toil, and hope presents to his

view the hearty, well-earned meal, the evening fireside, and perhaps the gratifications of the husband and the father, in promoting the well-being of those dearest to his heart. Is his work fatiguing? He is at liberty, at least, to introduce some little varieties in the mode, or breaks in the continuity of it, which give him sensible relief. He can rest on his spade, or stay the plough a moment in the furrow; can gaze at a passing object, or stop a brother villager to spend a brief interval in talk.

“ To the reflecting mind, these little privileges will not appear unimportant, when contrasted with the hard and cheerless lot of the field Negro. *He* is not at liberty to relax his tired muscles, or beguile his weariness, either by voluntary pauses in labour, or by varying its mode: he must work on with his fellow-slaves, let fatigue or satiety groan ever so much for a moment's respite, till the driver allows a halt.

“ But far more deplorable is the want of all those animating hopes that sweeten the toil of the European peasant. To the Negro slave, driven to his work, his involuntary exertions, as they can plead no merit, can promise, in general, no reward. His meal will not be more plentiful, nor his cottage better furnished, by the fruits of his utmost toil, viz. in his master's service. As to his wife and children, they can hardly be called his own. Whether the property of the same or a different owner, it is upon the master, not on himself, that their subsistence and well-being depend. The Negro, therefore, casts his hoe from no impulse but that of fear, and fear brought so closely and continually into contact with its object, that we can hardly allow it to rise above brutal instinct, and call it rational foresight, without ascribing to the docility of the horse an equal elevation. The other great and pleasing spring of human action, hope, is entirely cut off.

“ When these peculiar circumstances are duly consi-

dered, the rooted aversion of the free Negro to his former labours cannot excite surprise. It is unnecessary to suppose that they were excessive in degree, for, in their kind, they were too irksome to be, by the most patient of our race, contentedly endured, or remembered without abhorrence."

The whole of this passage (though requiring, in the last sentence of it, some qualification, which the author's further experience would doubtless incline him to admit), as well as the author's practical views in general, were certainly very unfit for the Reviewer's purpose: but he should therefore have abstained from quoting *The Crisis* at all. Besides, if the experiment of St. Domingo had afforded a fair test of the disposition and habits of the African race in an unsophisticated state, it is strange that the Reviewer should go back, for the result of it, to the very commencement of the present century; and, stranger still, that he should cite his facts from an author who sets out with carefully guarding himself from all responsibility as to his statements on this subject, on the score of the profound darkness which at that time prevailed in Europe, as to the interior state of that island. "From the interior of St. Domingo," says Mr. Stephen, "scarcely one distinct ray has reached our horizon, and its affairs are almost as unknown to Europe, as those of any nation in the centre of Africa:—

" ——— Res alta terra et caligine mersas."

But soon after this publication the darkness was in some degree dispelled. The French official accounts and an abundance of private information gave juster views of the effects of Toussaint's wise and beneficent policy; and it appeared that, notwithstanding all the waste, and all the disorders of revolution and of internal wars, agricultural industry had been in no small degree preserved. "The

cultivation of the colony," said General Leclerc, in his first official dispatches, "is in a much higher state of prosperity than could have been imagined." And as to the Southern division of the island, where the Revolution had not been attended, as in the North, with the general destruction of the mills, boiling houses, and other works necessary for the manufacture of sugar, it was found in a very flourishing condition. These facts are stated at large by Mr. Stephen, in a work, published two years later than *The Crisis*, called *The Opportunity* (pp. 10—21, &c.), in which, as well as in his *Life of Toussaint*, published about the same time, he has fully vindicated the character of the Haytians from the charge in question, and has shewn that St. Domingo, at the period of Leclerc's invasion, was illustrating the happy effects of its altered system. This makes it the more unfair in the Reviewer to cite this writer's first impressions of the case, avowedly the fruit of dubious rumour, without notice of their subsequent correction. The fact proved to be that at that period the whole island was in a rapid progress of improvement; and although Toussaint had possessed scarcely three years of peace, so much had been done by him to repair the effects of former anarchy and of seven years of destructive war, that had he been continued in the Government, and the devastations of a new counter-revolutionary war avoided, there is reason to believe that St. Domingo would by this time have been restored, even as a sugar colony, to all its former value.

Unhappily, Bonaparte, like the Quarterly Reviewer, was under private colonial influence, as he has since frankly acknowledged; and, like him too, he was deluded into the belief that slavery and the driving whip were necessary to the production of sugar. He lived not only to acknowledge, but to lament his error; and to confess that he had, in this instance, been the dupe of the ex-proprietors of the French colonies, with whom, through his wife Josephine,

he was connected, and whose prejudices he fatally imbibed. But the truth flashed on his mind too late. He had reduced St. Domingo nearly to a waste, and destroyed no small part of its scanty population, before a new war with England arrested his career.

After this addition to their former calamities, and when it had become evident that the restitution of the dreadful yoke of West-Indian slavery could permanently be averted only by force of arms, it would have been preposterous to expect, from the poor Haytians, any early and large advances in agricultural industry and wealth, even if new internal commotions and wars between the governments of Christophe in the North, and Petion in the South, had not soon again, and for a long time, called a large part of the cultivators into military service; and if the conduct of France, since her peace with this country, had not been such as to make the maintenance of large standing armies necessary to secure their freedom.

When all these considerations, and others that might be named, are taken into account, the case of Hayti repels instead of supporting the Reviewer's injurious imputations on the general character of Negroes. Among what people of the earth would industry have prevailed, in an equal degree, under the same adverse circumstances? To the destruction of the sugar works, and the want of capital to rebuild them, must be added that chilling sense of the insecurity of property, under which it would be utterly vain to expect that men should toil for its accumulation. Yet the Haytians have not only laboured sufficiently to procure for themselves, in the greatest abundance, all the necessaries, and some even of the elegances, of life, but to defray the whole expense of their establishments, civil and military, and to keep up copious magazines for the purposes of an arduous and ever impending war. If the enemies of their successive chiefs are to be believed, free labour in Hayti

has enabled them to amass great wealth for public and private uses, after providing for all the immediate services of the State. But, at least, they have maintained themselves, and sustained their own government, and defended their independence against all its foes. This cannot be denied: for, during the long term of nearly thirty years, they have clearly had no foreign protection or support. Which of the colonies, cultivated by slaves, can make an equal boast? Certainly not Jamaica, nor any other of the British islands. They all lean continually on the mother country, not only for military defence, and for the support of their own interior government, but for commercial privileges and premiums, in the shape of bounties to their own produce, and prohibitory impositions on the produce of other countries, in order to enable them to continue their boasted agriculture, by means of slave labour, without loss and ruin.

After all, if the most authentic public documents, and the reports of Parliamentary Committees, concurring with the representations of the Assemblies themselves, deserve any credit, the business of sugar planting, by slave labour, has been on a general average productive, not of profit, but loss, during the whole era of Haytian freedom. It is not very modest, then, in the planters and their apologists to arraign, as the Reviewer has done, their neighbours of Hayti, for not raising much of the same profitless commodity, though they have no mother country to give them for it a monopoly of her markets, and to pay them bounties on its exportation. Yet we are desired to infer, from the smallness of their sugar crops, that they are indolent, and make a bad use of their freedom. The Reviewer strongly applies the same argument to Sierra Leone, without even ascertaining whether its soil be fit for sugar. He regards the free labour in that colony as no proof that the Negroes will work without the driver's whip, merely because they do not raise sugar. The raising of sugar, it seems, is

this writer's only test of the capacity of the African for voluntary industry. If so, let the West-Indians bring in a bill for allowing sugar, the produce of Sierra Leone, to be imported into this country on the same terms with their own, merely that they may have the credit of this argument in some future defence of their predilection for slave labour. At present that article, if raised in the British colony of Sierra Leone, cannot be imported without paying a heavy additional duty, a duty altogether prohibitory, in order to protect the sugar of our West-Indian islands. If in the latter, therefore, it is raised at a loss, it seems no very clear indication of a want either of good sense or of industry, that it is not raised at all in the former.

After all, no one is disposed to contend, that free labourers, either at Sierra Leone or St. Domingo, will voluntarily work as hard as slaves may be compelled to work under the driver's lash. The comparative productiveness of the two species of labour does not depend on the degree of muscular exertion which each class of labourers may be incited for a time to yield, but on the more or less costliness of the article which each produces. What would it signify to Jamaica, that, by means of the whip, she could extract from her 340,000 bondsmen twice the quantity of sugar which would be grown by twice the number of labourers in some other part of the world, if, compelled to come into the same market on equal terms, she were obliged to sell her sugar for ten shillings per cwt. less than she had paid for raising it and bringing it to market?

It was doubtless with some such view of the subject that Mr. Stephen, in the pamphlet called *The Opportunity*, p. 21, remarked, (and thus far had it suited the Reviewer's purpose to cite the passage, might he have fairly referred to Mr. Stephen's authority,) "That the produce of St. Domingo will soon be as great as it was before the Revolu-

tion, is, I admit, more than can be reasonably expected. The number of adults fit for labour is unquestionably reduced in a very great proportion. Nor will free men and women ever be brought to work so intensely as slaves are compelled to do by the coercion of the whip. They will not labour more severely than consists with the preservation of health, with the ordinary duration of life, and with the maintenance and increase of native population;—points, unhappily, which have been but too much disregarded by our West-Indian economists*.

Industry is a well chosen word, when used by the planters and their apologists in these discussions: but industrious labour, to deserve that honourable appellation, must be performed by choice, or, at least, without physical compulsion. It would be an utter mockery to praise a

* It is obvious, that in the whole of his reasoning on this subject, Mr. Stephen had in view the mere quantity of labour which the compulsion of the cart-whip is capable of extracting, as compared with the quantity which will be voluntarily yielded by free labourers. This, however, is but a mere fragment of the question of free and slave labour. The problem to be solved is this: Will not any given portion of land yield a greater return for the capital employed upon it, when cultivated by free labour, than it would yield if cultivated by slave labour? This question has been set at rest, to the satisfaction of every sound political economist, by Mr. Cropper and Mr. Hodgson.

An attempt has been made to defend the conduct of the Quarterly Review, towards Mr. Stephen, by a quotation from his recent work, p. 90: but the attempt has been made in the same unfair and partial manner as that exposed above. Mr. Stephen had been shewing it to be the almost uniform statement of West-Indians, that the labour of a few days will furnish subsistence for a year; and then he exhibits them as affirming, that their Negroes must starve, if a higher price cannot be obtained for their sugar. But, if a few days will furnish food for the year, what a reproach to West-Indians, that their Negroes should be distressed for food under any circumstances! Such in substance is Mr. Stephen's argument; and a most powerful *argumentum ad hominem* it is, whether the West-Indian statement be true or false. Nor would it be at all invalidated by admitting, that the Negroes in the West Indies, like the peasantry in all other parts of the world, will, in general, do no more work than the subsistence of their families demands.

man for this virtue on his descent from the tread-mill; but to ascribe industry to the field Negro, with a driver behind him, would be an insult still more cruel. His excess in this species of industry is too often a curse instead of a blessing, and a premature grave is its natural reward. It would, without doubt, be better that the poor Africans were indolent than industrious at that expense, even if they should be as idle as the Whites in the West Indies are for the most part proverbially known to be.

The *Quarterly Reviewer's* main argument for slavery then is this; that without it sugar cannot continue to be cultivated as at present. Thus far he is right:—so severe is the labour which the cultivation of sugar, as it is now conducted in the West Indies, requires, that no *voluntary* labourers would encounter it: the terror of the cart-whip is indispensable, in order to prevail with them to grapple with it; just as men are propelled to the cannon's mouth by the danger which awaits their refusal. And this is precisely what the Abolitionists have all along affirmed respecting sugar-planting, as carried on in the West Indies. They have represented West-Indian sugar-planting as a cruel and deathful service; and have given it as their opinion, that if the cultivation of sugar must retain its present character, and continue to be followed by its present effects, no choice is left to us but to deliver ourselves from all participation in its guilt by abstaining entirely from the use of sugar. But there clearly exists no such painful necessity. No apprehension can now be entertained either of our not being able to procure sugar at all, or of our paying for it at a dearer rate, if slavery were suddenly swept from the face of the earth. So far, indeed, is such an apprehension from being well founded, that it is only because we choose to maintain slavery, that we pay for sugar at the present high rate. And as for St. Domingo, if in that island they should decline growing sugar at all,

either on account of the expensiveness of the works which its manufacture is supposed to require, or on account of its comparative unprofitableness, or on account of the prohibitory or protecting duties with which it is almost every where met, it would not affect in the slightest degree the question of free and slave labour.

With a view, however, to establish his own doctrine on that question, the Reviewer strives hard to prove, that the statement made by Mr. Whitmore in the House of Commons, on the 13th of May, 1824, of the extent of the trade of Hayti, on the authority of M. Inginac, the Secretary of the Haytian Government, is altogether fallacious. It may be so; and it is for M. Inginac to vindicate the truth of his official representations. But whether they are true or false, one thing is clear, and that is, that the Reviewer has not succeeded in disproving them. Does not the Reviewer know, that the American year is from September to September; and the Haytian year from January to January? Yet he takes it upon him to condemn the Haytian returns as fallacious, because they differ numerically from the American. He entirely overlooks, also, what is a well-known fact, and what is even recognized in the American statements for 1821; namely, that many vessels clear out from the United States for Cuba, as being the first island in their route, or for the West Indies generally, which, nevertheless, land their cargoes at Hayti. If this be so, it must follow of necessity, that the Haytian account of imports from the United States will greatly exceed the American account of exports to Hayti*.

Let us consider, also, the slightness of the grounds on which the Reviewer would throw discredit on the Haytian document. "In 1822," he says, "Great Britain imported

* The Reviewer's mistake as to the year, and as to the substitution of dollars for pounds, being stated to be merely typographical, is passed over.

from Hayti 41,623 cwt. or 4,662,784 lb. in weight of coffee, which the Haytian document gives as being 13,548,591 dollars in value—an obvious mistake, for both statements cannot be correct.” The Haytian document, however, does not state the export to be 13,548,591 dollars in value, but so many pounds in weight*. In the next place, the Reviewer has altered the terms of the document. He represents it as saying, that this quantity was actually *imported into Great Britain* in 1822. Now the document only states, that in the year 1822 there were *exported from Hayti, in ships belonging to Great Britain, 13,548,591 lb. weight of coffee.* That quantity, it is obvious, might have been exported from Hayti in British ships, and yet not landed in Great Britain. What is to hinder a British ship from carrying Haytian coffee to its best market, the continent of Europe, instead of bringing it to this country, where it is loaded with prohibitory duties, and whence it must be re-exported before it can come into consumption? The same may be said of American ships: they are not bound to return laden with their coffee, or other articles, to the United States, but may seek for them the best market they can find.

After this statement, whatever the facts of the case may be found to be, is it too strong language to employ the words of the Reviewer himself to characterise his reasonings on this subject? “*We cannot too strongly reprobate,*” he says, “*this attempt to impose upon our credulity; and we are satisfied that it will meet the reprobation of all reasonable men, whatever their sentiments may be upon the general question; and we hope it may serve as a caution to all those who wish to form an accurate opinion upon this contested subject, to examine well the data on either side before they surrender their conviction.*”

* This is the typographical error adverted to in the last note.

In no part of this article does the Reviewer appear to have acted more unfairly, than in the representation he has professed to give of the provisions of the *Code Henri* for regulating Haytian labour. Suppose a Frenchman or an American were to profess to give a view to the world of the condition of the English labourer, and in the execution of his purpose were to quote only that part of our Statute Book which consigns vagrants to the workhouse, or which carts paupers home to their own parishes, or which fixes the hours of manufacturing labour; and then were to exclaim, Such is the boasted freedom of the English peasant, "a freedom not very far removed from the character of slavery;" would not the whole ire of *The Quarterly Review* be poured out on such a man? His vocabulary, rich as it is, would scarcely supply terms of vituperation strong enough to designate the combined ignorance and unfairness of such a description. And yet what has the Reviewer done on this occasion? He has realised this imaginary case. He has overlooked all the obligations imposed by the *Code Henri* on the proprietors of estates towards their labourers; he has omitted to state that the labourers were entitled to a fourth part of the gross revenue of the plantation; he has forgotten to point out that the labourer was no longer subject to the caprice of the owner or his agents, but that an appeal in every case of complaint must be made to the Magistrate, to whom proprietor and labourer were equally amenable, and without whose fiat not the slightest punishment could be inflicted. That a very strict police was necessary in Hayti on the sudden emancipation of all the slaves, and after all the disorders that had prevailed there, must be admitted. It would have been an impeachment of the wisdom and foresight of the Government, if they had not provided such a police. But surely there is nothing peculiarly harsh, as the Reviewer would intimate, or which indicates a very oppressive state of society, in

compelling labourers, each of whom is by law entitled to receive his share of a fourth of the gross produce of a plantation, to perform a fair and equal proportion of the labour of raising it; or in treating every vagrant as vagrants are liable to be treated in this country. The Reviewer, however, while he was giving a distorted view of the *Code Henri*, in order to support the cause of Negro slavery, must have known that that code, be it good or bad, was no longer in existence in any part of Hayti. It never had any operation beyond the northern division of the island, and it entirely ceased even there, in 1820, on the termination of the life of its author Christophe.

One great object of *The Quarterly Reviewer*, in treating the subject of colonial slavery, being to prove that sugar cannot possibly be cultivated by the labour of free Negroes, he is, therefore, naturally anxious to falsify Mr. Clarkson's statement of the success of a well-known experiment, made in Barbadoes, by a Mr. Steel, who conceived the dangerous project of substituting the stimulus of wages among his slaves for that of the cart-whip. "The failure of this system," we are told, "either as increasing the comforts of the Negroes, or as an experiment of profitable cultivation, is shewn in Mr. Macqueen's work." As it is upon the testimony of Mr. Macqueen that the Reviewer relies in this instance, without doubt or question, and upon whom he of course wishes the public, after his example, to place the same unhesitating reliance, it seems necessary to examine his title to be cited as an adequate authority by the Reviewer; who, while affecting great moderation himself, may thus contrive by a sort of side-wind to accredit the mistatements and exaggerations of others. A few particulars will shew that Mr. Macqueen is not always a safe guide to follow, even if we make no account of his being evidently a fierce partisan of the West-Indian system.

1. An instance had been mentioned, in the notes to the Debate on Mr. Buxton's Motion (p. 234, &c.) of twenty-six slaves, who in the year 1776 had been emancipated in Tortola by a Quaker of the name of Nottingham, and who in 1822 had increased to forty-three, and were then living in comfort, and conducting themselves respectably. Among other things, it was stated that they were free from debt, and had acquired some property; that many of them had joined the Methodist Society; and that not one of them had ever been tried for any crime, or had ever occasioned any burden to the community. No sooner had this statement appeared than the whole artillery of Mr. Macqueen was pointed at the poor Nottinghams; and pages of his book are employed to exhibit them as "an intolerable nuisance to people of all ranks"—an assertion which is sufficiently extraordinary, considering that none of them had ever been tried in a court of justice. By way of destroying at once all the credit due to the Nottinghams, from this or any other circumstance related of them, Mr. Macqueen published two anonymous letters, the subject of which is to represent these enfranchised Negroes in the most odious light possible. Some parts of these letters, however, are so obviously untrue as to deprive the whole of all title to authority. "The greater part of the females liberated by Mr. Nottingham," says Mr. Macqueen's correspondent, "died without issue. Most of the males connected themselves with female slaves, and were consequently relieved from the trouble of providing for and supporting their children." Now, does not Mr. Macqueen know enough of the West Indies to be aware, that, if the greater part of these females had died without issue, their number could not have increased from 26 to 43—now, indeed, to 44? The alleged connexion of the male Nottinghams with female slaves could not

have added to their number. Whence, then, has arisen the increase--which is not denied—an increase which is the more remarkable, because the surrounding slave population has decreased, in the same time, nearly in the same proportion in which the Nottinghams have increased?—But this is not all. “I remember,” says one of these veracious correspondents, “a few years since, seeing one of them (the Nottinghams) in the Court-house of Tortola, attending a prosecution of his against a gentleman of the neighbourhood for an assault and battery on his own person. The gentleman, having found him in the VERY ACT of committing some *depredation on his property*, was, from the fellow’s unbounded insolence, provoked to lay his whip, which he happened to have in his hand at the time, over him. In the course of the trial, when the defendant’s Counsel commenced his defence, he requested the plaintiff to come immediately opposite to him, for the purpose of cross-examining him, when, to his astonishment, and the astonishment of THE WHOLE COURT, the Counsel found adorning the shirt-collar of the plaintiff a gold sleeve-button of his own, which he immediately claimed, shewing the Court the fellow of it. The button had been STOLEN some time previous, by a female slave belonging to the Counsel, and wife to the plaintiff.” (p. 171.) Will the reader believe, that the whole of this circumstantial detail is a gross and wilful fabrication? And yet Mr. Macqueen adopts it as unquestionably true! No Nottingham ever prosecuted any gentleman in the courts of Tortola for an assault and battery on his own person! No such trial is to be found in the records of the courts of that island! The following trial, however, is to be found there:—“16th March 1821. The King versus John Lettsom, for an assault and battery on David Ham and Naomi Vanterpool: witnesses, Catherine Frazer,

Naomi Vanterpool, Cyrene Lake, Prince Vanterpool, Mary Frett. True Bill, D. J. Donovan, Foreman."—" Court adjourned to Thursday."—" John Lettsom was then called to the bar to plead to the indictments found against him on Monday last, when he pleaded not guilty to the one found against him for an assault and battery on D. Ham, as also to the one for an assault and battery on Naomi Vanterpool; but to the last mentioned indictment he afterwards withdrew his plea of not guilty, and pleaded guilty. Justices, W. G. Crabb, M. D. French, W. R. Isaacs, and R. King." Ham's cause came on, and Mr. Lettsom was found guilty. The facts proved were, that Mr. Lettsom, for some trifling cause, had seized David Ham and Naomi Vanterpool, two free persons, on their own land, had caused them both to be stripped to the skin and tied to trees, and had flogged them on their bare buttocks in a most cruel and shameful manner with tamarind whips, and also with a stick and rope. In the course of the trial Mr. Lloyd, the son-in-law of the defendant, and his Counsel on the occasion, saw in the collar, not of a Nottingham, but of David Ham, a gold button, which he challenged as his property, declaring it must have been stolen from him. David Ham affirmed that the button was his own property, honestly obtained; and there the matter ended. David Ham's wife also was Mary Frett, a free person, and not the female slave of Mr. Lloyd.—The above circumstance, it is pretty clear, has furnished the ground-work of the story which Mr. Macqueen's correspondent has fabricated, and Mr. Macqueen has circulated, with a view to injure the character of the Nottinghams. If this be not a fair deduction from the premises, Mr. Macqueen is at least bound to shew that the prosecution by a Nottingham, which is made the ground-work of his story, actually did take place.—The sentence of the Court on Mr. Lettsom was, that he should pay for

both assaults a fine of 150*l.* to the King, and that he should be committed until the fine and all fees attending the prosecution should be paid*.

* Mr. Macqueen has endeavoured to destroy the effect of the above statement, not by denying its truth, but by producing a long detail by a Mr. D. Frazer, of Tortola, to shew that the Nottinghams are an idle, profligate, pilfering set. All this proves nothing respecting the truth or falsehood of the particular fact related by Mr. Macqueen's former correspondent, and which was the point at issue on the present occasion. It would be easy to shew several palpable contradictions, even in this latest detail of Mr. Frazer. But, admitting the whole to be as true, as it evidently is untrue and exaggerated, it only makes the case of the Nottinghams a more remarkable proof of the beneficial effects of freedom, as compared with slavery. If they, though idle and profligate, immoral and vicious, have contrived to maintain themselves for nearly fifty years, without any burden on the community, without contracting debts, without being convicted, or even judicially accused, of any crime, and have in that time increased from 26 to 44, while the slave community around them has been rapidly decreasing; is it possible to mark more strongly than by these facts, the comparatively destructive nature of slavery? But the case, when all the circumstances of it are known, establishes this position still more strongly. Although Mr. Nottingham emancipated his slaves in 1776, he being then a resident in America, yet, owing to the war which intervened, it was at least eight years later before they were put in possession of their freedom. In 1790, their number had diminished from 26 to 20. From that time, however, they increased; and their number has since been more than doubled, notwithstanding all the harsh epithets bestowed on them by Mr. Macqueen's friend. How much more rapidly must they have multiplied, had they been sober, industrious, and moral! As for the charges of profligacy and vice, they are charges which affect not the Nottinghams only, but the Methodist Society, of which so many of them are members; and it behoves the Methodist Ministers at Tortola to explain how it is that such worthless characters continue to be connected with them. It now becomes their bounden duty to investigate these charges, and to report upon them.

One circumstance it would be improper to omit. The Governor of St. Kitts, who is also the Governor of Tortola, in his speech to the Legislature, in Dec. 1823, strongly recommended it to them "to weigh the justice and the policy of enlarging the privileges of the free population; amongst whom are individuals of worth and intelligence, in every respect competent to contribute support to the laws, and whose conduct, on all occasions, has afforded the best assurance of their ability to appreciate and maintain the rank of citizens. I venture to offer this topic to your consideration, under a firm conviction, that, by extending privileges to this class, you will promote their respectability in the

2. Mr. Macqueen affirms, that "the African Institution carry on a most terrific system of espionage against the West-Indian Colonies. Their spies in the colonies are numerous, and their character such as, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, renders them justly execrated and dreaded by every thing honourable and good in the community." "The instructions given to these informers or agents, whether local or imported, were to supply accusations, *quocunque modo* accusations. Such was the case of Mr. Middleton, engaged twenty-three years ago to take charge of the school at Walton, Jamaica. When that gentleman could no longer shut his eyes to facts every hour witnessed, and when he could obtain no accusations without violating truth, he transmitted his information accordingly; and the reply by return of packet to him was—'We have no further occasion for your correspondence; we are sorry to find you have been bitten by the rattle-snake; and we can believe nothing you may advance in future.'" (p. 241.)

To this statement Mr. Macqueen, by way of giving it authenticity, subjoins the following note:—" *Jamaica Royal Gazette*, July 19. The author states he had the information from Mr. Middleton himself."—On turning, however, to the *Jamaica Gazette* of 1823, it appears that the statement, thus given to the public by Mr. Macqueen as authentic, is taken from a furious attack on the Abolitionists by an anonymous writer who signs himself QUERCUS. Mr. Macqueen says nothing of this, but quotes as his authority the *Jamaica Royal Gazette*.

community, and thereby strengthen, and at the same time reward, that devotion, which, it must be admitted, they have always evinced for the defence and welfare of the colony." Shortly before the Governor delivered this speech, he had visited Tortola, and, among other things, had examined the state and condition of the Nottinghams. It is in his power, therefore, to decide this controversy; and to say whether he found them a lawless, idle, profligate set, living by crime; or a peaceable, orderly, industrious body, supporting themselves by their own exertions.—See further, on this subject, the Appendix.

But although Mr. Macqueen may be disposed to receive as true, every charge against the African Institution which Quercus or any other nameless writer may prefer, however improbable in itself, or however unsupported by proof, yet it is surprising that he should adopt a tale which carries its refutation along with it. "Twenty-three years ago," that is to say, in the year 1800, the African Institution, which is stated to have numerous spies in the colonies, employed a Mr. Middleton as an informer or agent, to whom it gave instructions, and with whom it corresponded. Now, it so happens that the African Institution had no existence in 1800, nor until seven years after that time. It was first formed in May 1807. Is it necessary, after this, to give a flat denial to every other part of the story, and to affirm, that no individual of the name of Middleton, residing in Jamaica, was ever known to the African Institution, or ever wrote to it, or ever received the slightest communication from it? The whole story, from first to last, is a false and calumnious invention, without a single fact, or the distant semblance of a single fact, on which to rest. It is, in short, a malignant fabrication, for which its circulators can produce no more proof than for a similar fabrication, also first communicated to the British public by the Glasgow Courier,—namely, that Mr. Stephen had been the proprietor of a plantation and slaves in the West Indies, which, on quitting that part of the world, he had sold to a purchaser; which purchaser, it was fairly enough argued, he was now endeavouring fraudulently to strip of his property, by promoting the emancipation of the slaves without returning the purchase-money.—Mr. Stephen never was the owner of a plantation, or even of a single slave in the West Indies*.

* Mr. Macqueen has very manfully retracted much of what he had said against Mr. Stephen, on former occasions. His information, however, is still incorrect. The correspondent, on whose testimony he relies, still makes Mr. Stephen to have been the owner of several

But "the spies of the African Institution in the colonies are numerous." This is just as untrue as that, in the year 1800, they had a spy in Jamaica of the name of Middleton. These spies, Mr. Macqueen, in the largeness of his faith, is disposed to reckon by hundreds: for ninety-nine out of an hundred of them, he tells us, are "justly execrated and dreaded" by that pure and honourable West-Indian community among whom they exercise their vocation. But how has it happened that none of them have been detected in the exercise of their vile calling, except this solitary renegado Mr. Middleton? Or is it supposed that, if they had been detected, they would have been treated with peculiar lenity and forbearance; with more, for example, than Mr. Smith, or Mr. Austin, or Mr. Shrewsbury? The whole body of colonial journalists and partisans are called upon to prove one tittle of all that they have so hardily asserted on this subject.

In the same spirit, and for the same purpose, and with the same truth, have *the Glasgow Courier* (of which Mr. Macqueen is the editor) and other journals, charged the Abolitionists with disseminating inflammatory publications in the West Indies; and this calumny has been echoed from mouth to mouth, until men have begun to believe their own fabrication. And yet, what object could the Abolitionists have in disseminating tracts or pamphlets in the West Indies? The slaves do not require to be told that they are *driven* to their work, and cartwhipped by their managers; nor the planters that they drive and cartwhip their slaves. It is the British public, and not the population in our colonies, which requires to be enlightened on these points; and it is to the purpose of enlightening the *British* public that the efforts of the Society are directed.

domestic slaves. This, however, is altogether untrue, and the undoubted fact is, that Mr. Stephen never was the owner of *a single slave*. — See his *Delineation of West-India Slavery*, preface, p. lii.

3. “ *No Creole slaves,*” says Mr. Macqueen (p. 255), “ or those who could fluently speak languages, generally understood, were so marked,” that is, branded by means of a heated iron; “ and NONE, either Creole or African, have been so branded since the Abolition.”

But let us only look at one of the latest *Royal Gazettes* of Jamaica, that for example of the 19th to the 26th June 1824, and very abundant proof will there be found of the incorrectness of Mr. Macqueen. The following are notices of slaves advertised, either for sale or as runaways:—

“ Elizabeth Francis, a *Creole*, marked G F, G F below, not plain, on the right shoulder.”

“ William Bullock, a *Creole*, marked T S, heart on top, on left shoulder.”

“ Fin, a YOUNG *Creole* Negro boy, marked S on right shoulder.”

“ Edward Frazer, a MULATTO *Creole* man, marked R S on shoulder.”

“ William, *alias* Harry, a *Creole*, marked apparently I A on right shoulder.”

“ William Slater, a *Creole* BOY, has blister marks on the left, and marked A S on the right shoulder.”

“ Frank, a YOUNG *Creole* SAMBO man, mark not plain on right shoulder.”

“ Robert Henry, a YOUNG *Creole* man, marked M R. *about* the shoulders.”

“ Sam, a YOUNG *Creole* Negro man, marked G J. on right shoulder.”

“ Robert, a YOUNG *Creole* Negro man, marked apparently T. R. P. on left shoulder,” &c. &c.

4. Mr. Macqueen, professing to quote from a publication of the Anti-Slavery Society, entitled *A Brief View of the Nature and Effects of Negro Slavery*, thus states one of the propositions (p. 263):—

“ Next we are told, that the Negroes are driven to their

work, and compelled to labour *under the lash on Sunday*, in order to procure a maintenance for themselves."

Now the following is the passage *literatim* which Mr. Macqueen, affects to quote:—

"Besides being *generally* made to work under the lash, without wages, the slaves are further obliged to labour for their own maintenance on that day which ought to be devoted to repose and religious instruction."

It is unnecessary to follow Mr. Macqueen into his elaborate vindication of the Slave Trade, because it comes just eighteen years too late*; or into his argument against the possibility of obtaining sugar from Bengal, because he has only to procure the abolition of the protecting duty, in order to establish his position beyond all controversy; or into his attack on Hayti and Sierra Leone, because the Negro inhabitants of those colonies are already free, and in no danger of being deprived of their liberty by any misrepresentations; nor into the slanders against Mr. Cooper and Mr. Meabry, two of the witnesses brought forward in "Negro Slavery," because they have themselves abundantly refuted those slanders. Only one other point shall be noticed.

Mr. Macqueen, speaking of the charges of gross immo-

* Mr. Macqueen professes himself "an enemy to slavery in the abstract." (p. 9.) He makes ample amends for this heterodoxy, however, by his defence of it in detail. Thus he tells us, without adducing even the slightest shadow of authority for his assertion, that the emancipation of the *cerfs* or *villeins* in Russian Poland had produced utter ruin both to master and slave, and an open revolt which it required 500,000 bayonets to keep down. (p. 15.) "These facts," says Mr. Macqueen, "may be ascertained by any one who will take the trouble to inquire." But where are the traces to be found, of the formidable ruin and revolt here spoken of as arising from the emancipation of the *cerfs* in Russian Poland? In other provinces, namely Esthonia, Livonia, and Finland, the happiest results have followed from a similar measure. Mr. Macqueen will, perhaps, favour the world hereafter with his authorities.

rality brought against the Colonists, observes, that “ the *shameless writer* of the Notes on the Debate on Mr. Buxton’s Motion, aggravates the bitter libel thus:—‘ The married man in Jamaica, who keeps his brown or black mistress, *in the very face of his wife and family, and of the community*, has generally as much outward respect shewn him, and is *as much countenanced, visited, and received into company*, especially if he be a man of some influence in the community, as if he had been guilty of no breach of decency, or dereliction of moral duty.’” Mr. Macqueen charges the writer of the Notes with being guilty of “ a most atrocious falsehood” in uttering these words; and yet, as he refers to the very page of the Debate (p. 152) which contains them, he must have been aware that they are not the words of the annotator, but the words of Mr. Stewart, the author of *The Past and Present State of Jamaica*, who had resided twenty years in that island, and whom Mr. Macqueen himself quotes as a credible witness (p. 305). The words, therefore, which he stigmatises as “ a most atrocious falsehood” of that “ shameless writer,” the annotator, are the words of Mr. Stewart. I would only observe, that Mr. Stewart is borne out in his statements, “ *shameless*” as they may be, by Dr. Williamson, another friend of the West-Indian cause, who resided fourteen years in Jamaica. And here it is impossible not to remark, that, supposing Mr. Macqueen and his West-Indian friends had succeeded in discrediting the testimony of Mr. Cooper and Mr. Meabry, what would they have gained by their success, so long as the unimpeached testimony of Dr. Williamson and Mr. Stewart remain to prove the very same points which Mr. Cooper and Mr. Meabry are violently assailed for asserting? There is something very unaccountable in the fact, that while Mr. Cooper and Mr. Meabry are traduced as liars and calumniators, on account of the representations they

have made of West-Indian manners and morals, a most guarded silence has been maintained with respect to the still stronger representations of Dr. Williamson and Mr. Stewart.

But, it may be said, "what is all this to the point in hand? It proves nothing as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of Mr. Macqueen's statements with respect to the experiment of Mr. Steele, of Barbadoes. In this particular instance Mr. Macqueen may be right, and Mr. Clarkson wrong." Doubtless this is possible; but then, as some of Mr. Macqueen's statements on this subject are drawn from sources to which there is no access, it is natural, after all that has been stated above, to feel some distrust respecting them. The witness to whom he chiefly refers, Mr. Sealy, is described as the manager of a neighbouring estate to that of Mr. Steele. Now, even if he were not himself one of the persons displaced by Mr. Steele when he got rid of all White managers and overseers, and abolished the whip, he is obviously of that very class of men who were the most likely to view his plan with prejudice and aversion*.

* This remark applies also in its full force to a witness produced by Mr. Gladstone, of Liverpool (see his Correspondence with Mr. Cropper, p. 64), and who deprives himself of all title to confidence by the very first sentence of his statement. Speaking of Mr. Steele's slaves, he says, that from 1780 to 1797 they "decreased from 262 to 240, whilst there was a general increase going on upon the neighbouring estates." From the Privy Council Report it appears that, in 1788, the Council of the island declared, that "it is certain that Negroes do in general decrease in this island." And in proof of this declaration the Tables annexed state, that the Negro population, which in 1770 was 76,334, was in 1780 68,270, and in 1786 only 62,115, although about 15,000 slaves were imported from 1770 to 1786. It further appears, from Bryan Edwards, vol. i. p. 350, that the numbers in 1792 were only 64,330, although 3970 had been imported during the preceding six years. In the face of this overwhelming evidence, Mr. Gladstone's witness has the temerity to assert, for what purpose he can best explain, that from 1780 to 1797 a general increase was going on in Barbadoes. Is it possible to confide in such testimony?

The Reviewer speaks of Mr. Steele's experiment as having been carried on for *thirty* years. Of the experiment, however, detailed by Mr. Clarkson, nothing is known from any authentic source, except during a period of *seven* years—namely, from 1783, when it first commenced, to 1790. It is very possible, therefore, that the experiment may have completely succeeded during those seven years, but that, from causes yet unexplained, it may have failed afterwards. The only knowledge we have of this plan is from the letters of Mr. Steele himself, contained in Dr. Dickson's volume on the "Mitigation of Slavery," published by Longman in 1814. Mr. Steele's last letter on the subject is dated 30th Sept. 1790. He was then, according to Dr. Dickson's account, ninety years of age; and, as from that day all further correspondence ceased on his part, we are left wholly in the dark as to what changes may have subsequently taken place in his plans, even during his lifetime. We do not even know whether he continued capable of superintending the business of his plantation; or whether his growing age and infirmities obliged him to delegate that task to another. In the latter case, which is the most probable, it could hardly be expected that the plan should not fail; and we know for a certainty, Mr. Beckles, the Attorney-General of Barbadoes, having himself told us so, that "at his death," if not before, "they reverted to the old system." (Macqueen, p. 427.)—The plan must needs have failed under such circumstances. But the question is, did it succeed during the seven years in which alone we know that Mr. Steele himself conducted the experiment? This does not appear to have been denied by any of the witnesses. Mr. Steele's own evidence is decisive of its success; and no contradictory evidence has yet been brought forward which can invalidate his.

On examining Dr. Dickson's work, which contains the only authentic record of this experiment, it appears that

Mr. Steele arrived at Barbadoes in March 1780. He had suffered much, he says, from "evil and unfaithful agents," particularly in the destruction of his Negroes. The evil appeared to him to proceed from the barbarous laws and customs prevailing in the island. He specifies particularly, the Law No. 82, Hall's edition, clause 19, as giving "encouragement to irascible and illiterate men to commit murder with impunity," and as accounting for "the continual decrease," and "the unfeeling and unnoticed destruction of slaves;" and to the Law No. 148, clause 8, which disqualifies all Negro evidence, whether Free or Slave, from being received against White criminals. Mr. Steele laboured hard to procure an alteration in these and other Colonial Laws, and established a society, by means of which he had hoped to effect that object; but having failed in this hope, and finding that the Colonial Legislature was indisposed to any improvement, he turned his thoughts to the trial of some experiments on his own Negroes, "*in order to find out whether rewards might not have some better effect upon their senses, than by trusting to punishments alone.*" (Dickson, p. 9.) This, be it remembered, was the specific object at which he aimed.

As "a *beginning*" of his general plan, Mr. Steele tells us, that, "towards the *end* of 1783," he took the whip and all power of arbitrary punishment from all his White servants, which produced their resignation, as they "could not bear the loss of their whips." He then formed a magistracy among the Negroes themselves, and accepted the offer of a near neighbour (who consented to abide by his rules) to superintend his estate; but this man proved of "the old stamp," and Mr. Steele, having satisfied himself of his infidelity, dismissed him also. He now resolved to try whether he could not obtain the labour of his Negroes "by voluntary means, instead of the old method of violence;" and he soon found that "for a small pecuniary

reward, over and above the usual allowances," the feeblest Negroes, and those deemed the most indolent, cheerfully performed even the holing of land for canes, the most laborious work of an estate, for less than a fourth part of the stated price paid to jobbers. He repeated the like experiment the following year, with equal success; and "on the 18th of November 1789, I gave all my slaves," he says, "tenements of land, and pecuniary wages by the hour, the day, or the week, for their labour and services," according to a plan which he fully details. Speaking of the effect of this plan in one of his letters (p. 112), he observes, that from the year 1773 to 1779 (a period of seven years), through bad management, the annual average profit had been only one and a quarter per cent.; in the next four years, notwithstanding the great hurricane of 1780, a little above 2 per cent.; but in the years 1784, 5, and 6, after his new plan was in operation, besides increasing the stock, it cleared $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. He states in another place (p. 157), that in forty years, his plantation stock had decreased one half; that in three years and three months, from June 1780, in a population of two hundred and eighty-eight slaves, fifteen had been born, and fifty-seven had died. "An alteration," he says, "was then made in the mode of governing the slaves: the whips were taken from all the White servants, all arbitrary punishments were abolished, and all offences were tried and sentence passed by a Negro Court. In four years and three months, under this change of government, there were forty-four births, and only forty-one deaths." "But in the same interval, the annual neat clearance of the estate was above three times more than it had been for ten years before." The unfairness of Mr. Macqueen and the Reviewer, on this subject, is conclusively established by a reference to p. 582 of *The Review*, where they assert, that "at the commencement of his (Mr. Steele's) system, in 1780, there

were on that estate two hundred and eighty-eight Negroes, and at the close in 1797, only two hundred and forty (a decrease of forty-eight), while the surrounding properties had a general natural increase." The incorrectness of this last assertion has been already proved. (See the last note.) But it is at least equally incorrect to say that Mr. Steele's system *commenced* in 1780, when Mr. Steele himself affirms that it did not commence till 1783. In the three years which preceded its commencement, he states the decrease of his slaves to have been forty-two, or at the rate of fourteen in each year. But the whole decrease from 1780 to 1797, was, the Reviewer admits, only forty-eight. The decrease, therefore, from 1783 to 1797, could only have been six, that is, a decrease at the rate of one Negro in each twenty-eight *months* of the time, instead of one in every twenty-six *days*, which was the rate of decrease during the former period. What a remarkable contrast! And what an incontestible proof, on the statement of the Reviewer himself, of the admirable efficacy of Mr. Steele's system!

Such is the statement of Mr. Steele himself; and certainly it furnishes no proof of failure. We have proof that his plan was *abandoned*, at his death at least, if not sooner; but no proof that it *failed*. If the Quarterly Reviewer can produce any evidence to shew that the details which Mr. Steele has given under his own hand, are untrue, that will be a good reason for rejecting his experiment as a proof of what he alone intended to demonstrate by it; namely, that rewards might have a better effect in inducing the Negro to work than punishments. But surely it is no evidence of the converse of that proposition that the plan was discontinued; and no authority has been produced to shew that it was continued beyond the year 1790.

Without attempting to press this experiment into the service of the Anti-Slavery cause, beyond its fair and obvious

bearing, it is at least evident, that after an experiment of seven years, Mr. Steele satisfied himself that it was possible to turn the labour of his slaves to much more profit by the application of the stimulus of wages than by the application of the stimulus of the cart-whip.

The Reviewer is very angry with the Abolitionists for thwarting and impeding the measures of Government. One of those measures is to abolish the cart-whip as a stimulus to labour in the field. Is it possible for any writer to do more to thwart and impede this most important part of the plan of Government than the Quarterly Reviewer has done, by the present and his two former articles on Slavery?

In the progress of our Review of *The Quarterly Review*, we have now come to that part of the article on the West-Indian Colonies which respects the Anti-Slavery Society; and here we meet with the same ill-disguised hostility, and the same wantonness of assertion, which have already been so largely remarked upon. The Reviewer's first observation is a misrepresentation of the fact. According to him, the Report of the Committee, which was read at the Anniversary Meeting of the Society on the 25th of June, stated, "that the insurrection at Demerara was proved to have originated solely in the concealment by the Governor of the instructions sent from the Government at home." (p. 583.) Now even if the word *solely* had been excluded from the sentence, the statement would still have been untrue. But the best exposition of its inaccuracy will be found in the following extract from the Report itself, which has since been published:—

"As the Resolutions proposed by Mr. Canning, with the declared sanction of his Majesty's Government, and with the acquiescence also of the whole body of West-Indians in Parliament, recognised explicitly the very principles on

which your Committee proceeded, and pointed unambiguously to the very consummation at which they aimed; it was thought right by the mover, and those who acted with him, to concur in adopting them; more especially as his Majesty's Ministers, in proposing to take the work of reform into their own hands, signified their intention of carrying into early effect many of the specific measures of improvement which had been contemplated by your Committee.

“ In their Circular Address of August 1823, giving a detailed account of these proceedings, your Committee, while they expressed their satisfaction that the Government and Parliament should have so clearly recognised the principles embodied in these Resolutions, could not refrain at the same time from expressing their regret, that the proposed plans of reform, instead of being made the subject of parliamentary enactment, should have been referred to the deliberation and decision of the Colonial Authorities. This circumstance tended greatly to damp the hopes which the favourable disposition of his Majesty Ministers was calculated to inspire. Past experience seemed to discourage the hope of effectual co-operation, on the part of the Colonists, in any plan which had in view the termination of slavery.

“ The Committee therefore, as well as the advocates of their cause in Parliament, distinctly stated their apprehensions that this mode of proceeding would lead only to delay and disappointment. They were of opinion, indeed, that in no way were the alarms on the subject of insurrection, which had been so industriously raised, more likely to be realised, than by submitting the meditated mitigations of the slave system to discussion within the colonies, instead of transmitting them thither in the shape of laws to be obeyed. And even if such a reference should produce no

positive evil, they feared that it would at least be fruitless of any substantial good.

“ The event has seemed to justify these apprehensions. The instructions of his Majesty’s Government on this subject to the Colonial Authorities, as contained in Lord Bathurst’s circular letters of the 28th May and 9th July 1823, were framed in an unexceptionable spirit of moderation, and were directed to objects of the very highest importance; and, had they been carried into effect, would have produced a most beneficial effect on the condition of the slaves. These instructions however, honourable as they were to the Government, were met in some cases by refusal, and in others by menaces of resistance. In a few of the smaller colonies, they have been treated with less of outward disrespect; and a disposition has even been professed to comply with his Lordship’s suggestions; but your Committee have not heard that any legislative measures have yet been adopted for carrying them into effect. It is to be presumed, that had such laws been enacted, they would have been laid before Parliament without delay. The Slave Law of St. Vincent, passed in 1820, has been represented indeed as containing great improvements, and as having even anticipated most of Lord Bathurst’s suggestions; but on examining it, this statement will be found to be altogether erroneous: it proves to be nearly a transcript of the last consolidated Slave Law of Jamaica; and, like that law, it leaves the great evils of the colonial system untouched*.

“ Even in those colonies where the power of making laws is vested immediately and wholly in the Crown, the reforms proposed by his Majesty’s Government, having

* See, for an account of the Consolidated Slave Law of Jamaica, the Appendix to the Debate of May 15, 1823, p. 148, &c.

been submitted to the previous consideration of the local authorities, experienced the same opposition and delay as in the colonies possessing legislative assemblies of their own.

“ It was no more than might have been expected, that while a chance remained of dissuading or deterring the Government from perseverance in its purposes of reform, the proprietors of slaves filling offices in the colonies would not be sparing of their objections, nor the White population in general of their clamours and alarms. And even if governors or public bodies, acting in the Colonies, were perfectly well disposed to carry those reforms into effect, they would still find that the delegation of legislative power on topics so delicate was a burden hard to be sustained. An imperative order would relieve them from embarrassment; whilst a discretionary authority could not be exercised, in opposition to local prejudices and passions, without sacrifices of a very painful kind.

“ The proceedings of popular meetings in some of the colonies, and the calamitous events in Demerara, too clearly illustrate the danger of such a mode of proceeding.

“ And while this danger was obvious, it seemed no less obvious, that if the supreme power of the state had at once authoritatively prescribed the course to be pursued, there would have been no ground to apprehend any inconvenient results. To suppose that the slaves would rebel against the Government, because it had taken measures for alleviating the rigours of their condition, would be absurd and irrational. Was there any thing, for instance, in the gift of Sunday as a day of rest; or in the mitigation of corporal punishment; or in the removal of restraints on manumission; or in the admission of their evidence in courts of justice, which could have a tendency to promote discontent and insurrection among the slaves?

“ Had the mode of authoritative enactment, therefore,

been adopted, instead of that of mere recommendation, the probability appears to be, that the effect would have been submission on the part of the planters, and gratitude on the part of the slaves. The cause of the mischief which actually occurred in Demerara, though grossly misrepresented at first, is now clearly ascertained. The evidence on the trial of Mr. Smith the Missionary, and on that of the slaves implicated in the insurrection, shews that the proximate cause of that unhappy event was the delay of the Colonial Authorities in giving publicity and effect to the measures of grace recommended by his Majesty's Government. The slaves learned that the supreme authority of the state had transmitted certain regulations for their protection and comfort, the benefit of which they were led to apprehend was withheld from them by the opposition of their masters. The expected good was also, it may be presumed, magnified by the mist of secrecy in which it was enveloped. It was supposed by some to be a gift of freedom, and the unfortunate men imagined that the oppression under which they groaned was no longer warranted by law.

“ On the whole, little doubt can now be entertained that not only has much evil arisen from having submitted the proposed reforms in the slave system to colonial deliberation, but that no substantial good could reasonably have been expected, or is to be looked for in future, from such a course. In the mother country alone can laws on this subject be effectually, and at the same time safely made.” (Anti-Slavery Report, pp. 3—7.)

Again—“ One conspiracy, indeed, though of a most shallow and inartificial texture, appears to have been actually formed, and one insurrection has most calamitously taken place; namely, that of which the public has heard so much,—the revolt of the slaves in Demerara. In that colony there were some peculiar predisposing causes to such an event, arising from the pre-eminent harshness of the

slave system prevailing there, and from the religious persecutions to which, in addition to all their other sufferings, many of the slaves were subjected in the course of the last year. While the irritation produced by this state of things was at its height, the Negroes learnt that his Majesty had instructed the Colonial Government to adopt certain measures for alleviating the rigours of their condition. Instead of experiencing, however, the expected alleviations, there is reason to fear that they found the hardship of their state rather increased than diminished. However this may have been, it was natural that they should be anxious to obtain clearer information on a subject which to them was of extreme importance. It seems to have been chiefly with this view that, on the 18th of August 1823, the slaves of a particular district agreed to strike work; and, in order to secure themselves against the rigorous measures of repression which they reasonably anticipated, they forcibly seized such arms as they could procure on the plantations, and confined in the stocks several managers and overseers. The arms, however, appear to have been seized chiefly to prevent their being turned against themselves; and it is the testimony of Governor Murray himself, writing on the 26th of August 1823, when affairs had already assumed a 'peaceable aspect,' that he had 'not heard of any Whites having been deliberately murdered by the misguided slaves.' On one plantation where the Whites resisted, two of them were killed. But it does not appear that, except in this instance, the insurgents took the life of a single individual, or that they demolished a single house, or set fire to a single cane-piece.

“ And even in the excepted case which has been mentioned, the Committee are credibly informed, that several of the insurgents were killed by shots from the house, before they returned the fire; and that when they had succeeded in entering the house, they spared the lives of the master

and mistress, who fell into their hands (the latter of whom had been slightly wounded), and did not afterwards inflict on them the slightest personal hurt.

“Here, then, we have a servile insurrection, divested of almost all those acts of rapine and bloodshed, by which such events have usually been characterised; an insurrection much more analogous to those tumults which occasionally occur among workmen in this country, when they conceive themselves to have been aggrieved by their employers, than to a traitorous conspiracy or rebellion of slaves.

“The case, however, was otherwise viewed in Demerara. Notwithstanding the moderation and forbearance, previously unexampled, with which the refractory slaves conducted themselves, seeking neither to take away life, nor to destroy property, their insubordination was visited with a tremendous vengeance. How many hundreds were slaughtered without resistance in the field, or hunted down by the Indians, who were called in to pursue them in their flight into the woods and swamps; how many, on being taken, were shot without the ceremony of a trial, or have since been executed by the sentence of courts martial; and how many more have had the flesh torn from their quivering limbs by cruel whippings, to the extent even of a thousand lashes, we have not accurately heard. But if the irregular proceedings and refractory conduct of the slaves in this instance—if their impatience to know what were those alleviations of their condition, which the reported benevolence of their Sovereign really designed for them, could only have been expiated by such a prodigality of blood, what can we imagine would have been the nature and extent of the punishments to which they would have been subjected, had they added to the crime of insubordination those of conflagration and massacre?

“The limits of a Report will not allow the Committee

to dwell on the circumstances attending the trials of those unhappy persons: they appear to them to have been conducted with an extraordinary disregard of the customary forms of judicial proceeding. The public, however, has a fair opportunity of appreciating the spirit in which justice was likely to be administered to these slaves, by the ample details published respecting another trial, that of Mr. Smith, the Missionary, upon which such a flood of light has been thrown by the recent discussions in the House of Commons. In the case of that deeply injured individual, who, as a White man, came within the pale of colonial privilege, every recognised principle of law and justice was grossly and openly violated. And if in his case, which it must have been known would attract considerable notice, as well as excite deep interest in this country; and in which a man of talents and information, aided for a part at least of his trial by Counsel, had to defend himself from charges utterly groundless; if, in such a case, all those principles have been so palpably and flagrantly outraged; what measure of fairness and impartiality was to be expected in the case of wretched and ignorant slaves, standing pinioned before their judges, unacquainted with the English language, uninformed of the specific charges against them until they were placed at the bar, and wholly unaided by legal advice? This is indeed a most affecting consideration."—(Ib. pp. 14—16.)

Let any one, after having read the above extracts, recur to the Reviewer's charge against the Anti-Slavery Society, whom he represents as having stated, "that the insurrection at Demerara was proved to have originated SOLELY in the CONCEALMENT by the Governor of the instructions sent from the Government at home;" and say whether it is too strong language to speak of it as a "misrepresentation of the fact," and as "untrue."

The Quarterly Reviewer attacks Lord Calthorpe and Mr Stephen, for having dared, at the general meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, to express an opinion of the innocence of the Missionary Smith, and of the gross violation of law and justice exhibited in his trial at Demerara. "Mr. Smith, in our judgment," says the Reviewer, "was guilty of the fact of concealing a traitorous conspiracy; and that concealment was calculated to produce, and did produce, consequences which were most injurious, and which might have been fatal to the whole community." He further impugns the opinion of Dr. Lushington, avowed at the same meeting, that "Mr. Smith's conduct had, throughout his mission, been marked with the most *circumspect prudence*;" and then asks, "Could it be wondered if the fears of the Colonists should be roused, on learning that the men now exercising the functions of Missionaries in the West-Indies had been sent out by persons who entertain such sentiments?" He concludes with expressing his conscientious belief that, "whatever may have been the defects of the proceeding which the court martial adopted, the intention of its members was pure, and that they had no desire but to do justice in that crisis of prejudice and passion to which they were on all sides exposed."

It is not easy to make out what the Reviewer means by being "exposed to a crisis of prejudice and passion," and that "on all sides," there having been only one side at Demerara; but it will be easy to shew that in the above extracts there are at least as many misrepresentations as there are sentences.

1. That there may have been honourable men, whose intentions were pure, on the court martial which tried Mr. Smith, it never was meant to question. We have only to do with the conduct of the majority; and whoever can calmly read the whole of these proceedings, and say that

they indicate "no desire but to do justice," must either have formed his notions of justice in some other school than that of England, or must be prepared to admit that at least there was gross ignorance on the part of the judges. But it is not on the trial of Mr. Smith alone, that the conduct of Demerara courts-martial, though graced, all of them, by the association of Mr. Chief Justice Wray, in his capacity of Lieutenant-Colonel, seems to demand a strict scrutiny. A most important document has recently made its appearance from the Demerara press; a duodecimo volume, drawn up, it is said, by Mr. Herbert, (the present Fiscal, and the framer* of the greater part of Jack's famous defence,) aided by the notes of Mr. Wray. It is entitled, "Report of the Trials of the insurgent Negroes;" and will be found to furnish a very fit subject for the review of the grand inquest of the nation.

2. The Reviewer seems to wish to have it understood that Dr. Lushington and his associates in the Anti-Slavery Society have been concerned in sending out the Missionaries who are now labouring in the West Indies, though he must have known that there was not the slightest ground for the insinuation. He must have known that neither among the Directors of the London Missionary Society, nor among those of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, is the name of Dr. Lushington, or indeed of any individual who spoke at the Anti-Slavery meeting, to be found. Not that it would have been any just reproach to them to have

* The use of this word has been vehemently condemned; and the fact, that Mr. Herbert was the *framer* of Jack's defence, positively denied. But what is Mr. Herbert's own testimony? "Every thing was suggested to me by Jack; and I was very particular in taking down his meaning, and in ONE instance, *used his own words*. I have endeavoured to *form* a connected narrative from the story he told." The defender of Mr. Herbert affirms, that Mr. H. *occasionally* used Jack's own words. Mr. Herbert, himself, swears he did it in ONE instance. It were well if we had Jack's own words, from first to last.

been found there: but still the insinuation shews the Reviewer's unfairness; and would even seem to justify the throwing back upon him the charge of invidiously attempting to "thwart and impede the measures of his Majesty's Government," by exciting the prejudices of the planters against Missionaries, as if these had been *sent out* by Dr. Lushington and his friends of the Anti-Slavery Society.

3. It is deemed by the Reviewer a cause of mortal offence, that Dr. Lushington should have lauded the *prudence* and *circumspection* of the Missionary Smith. Dr. Lushington is by no means singular in this sentiment. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive how any man (not a Demerara planter) can read the Journal and other writings of Mr. Smith, without being astonished at his forbearance in not giving vent to those indignant emotions excited in him, by the scenes he daily witnessed. He had hardly set his foot in the colony before he had to encounter the frown of authority, and to experience the extent of a planter's prejudice. "On my arrival in the colony," says Mr. Smith, in that part of his defence which was most strangely suppressed by the court martial (see the Society's copy of the trial, p. 76), "I was introduced to his Excellency, by Mr. Elliott. His Excellency, being informed of the object of my coming to the colony, asked in what way I proposed to instruct the Negroes. I answered, By preaching, catechising, and teaching them to read. His Excellency sharply replied, *If I ever know you to teach the slaves to read, I will banish you from the colony.*" And this speech was uttered by a British Governor, in the year 1817! Was it then to be wondered at that Mr. Smith should view, as he appears from his Journal to have done, the measures of General Murray, with respect to missionary efforts and the religious instruction of the slaves, with distrust and suspicion? And then with respect to the treatment of the

Negroes, he tells us, "The Negroes of Success complained to me of excessive labour and very severe treatment." "I thought they would work the people to death." "While I am writing this, the driver is flogging the people, neither manager nor overseer near." Again; "while writing this, my very heart flutters at hearing the almost incessant cracking of the whip." "The people have scarcely any time to eat their food; they have none to cook it, eating for the most part raw yellow plantains." Added to this severity of corporal suffering, he had also to lament "the various arts employed to keep the slaves from the house of God, and to punish them for their religion." And in the sight of all this complication of misery, what marks of impatience does he betray? What imprudent speeches or actions do these monstrous outrages excite? He pours his griefs only into the ears of his Heavenly Father, or records them in his secret journal, unread by any eye but his own, until it was dragged from its concealment and exposed to the public view of the Whites of Demerara; serving, at least, the purpose of rousing still further their ferocious rage against him. In short, the Reviewer may be challenged to specify a single circumstance in the conduct of Mr. Smith, during the six or seven years he had resided in Demerara, down to the 17th of August 1823, (of which day, more hereafter) which can be shewn to detract from the merited eulogium pronounced by Dr. Lushington on his prudence and circumspection.

But it will be said, that sufficient proof of his guilt is to be found in the single circumstance, that, according to the evidence of Jack Gladstone, "the deepest concerned in the revolt were the Negroes most in Parson Smith's confidence." On this subject much light has been thrown in the Preface to a work just published by Hatchard, entitled the "Substance of the Debate in the House of Commons" respecting the Missionary Smith. In the Preface

to that work (pp. xviii.—xxiv.) it appears, that, by a reference to facts, of 2000 persons belonging to his church, not more than five or six who had been baptised, none of them of any note in the congregation, and only one of them, Telemachus, a communicant, were tried and convicted. Twelve of the ringleaders, who were executed, belonged to estates where not one slave had been baptised by Mr. Smith or his predecessor; and on the estates where Mr. Smith had been most successful, the slaves did not join the revolt, but stood by their masters. Mr. Baillie's estate of Hope is an instance of this: there the Negroes not only did not join the insurgents, but continued quietly at their work, and carefully preserved the property of their master, manager, and overseers, until the return of the Whites from militia service. What makes this the more remarkable is, that another estate of Mr. Baillie's, Nonpareil, from which, being under a different attorney, religious instruction had been excluded, was deeply engaged in the revolt. On the very next estate to the Hope, Mr. Smith had baptised one hundred and ninety slaves, and they all stood by their master. On the plantation Brothers, the Negroes defended the Whites even at the risk of their lives, and there was not one absentee. Religion had been here greatly encouraged. Other instances of the same kind might be adduced; while it might be proved that almost all who suffered death, or flogging, belonged to estates where religion had made either little or no progress. Even with respect to Mr. Gladstone's estate of Success, the focus of the disturbance, the Negroes belonging to it who were executed were heathens, who had never been baptised; namely, Richard, Buffany, and Hamilton. Even Jack Gladstone, who was the chief ringleader of the mutiny, though he had been baptised, was no regular attendant on Mr. Smith, and was not considered as a member of the Church. He was, neverthe-

less, proved to have been particularly active in restraining all disposition to violence, on the part of his confederates, towards the Whites.

Of the few baptised persons who were executed, two were among those who were to be sold the ensuing week, and separated perhaps for ever from their dearest connections.

In fine, not a single circumstance appears previously to the 17th of August, which can be alleged, with the slightest colour of truth, against the prudence and propriety of Mr. Smith's conduct.

4. But Mr. Smith, the Reviewer affirms, "was guilty of the fact of concealing a traitorous conspiracy." This must refer either to the circumstance of his overhearing a conversation, on the afternoon of the 17th of August, of some slaves belonging to his congregation, from which it is said he might have inferred their intention to rebel; or to that of his receiving from Jacky Reed, on the evening of the 18th, a letter which apprised him of the existence of a conspiracy among the slaves, neither of which circumstances he communicated to the local government.

Now, with respect to the letter from Jacky Reed, it may be put entirely out of the question. He received it after six in the evening, only fifteen or twenty minutes before the revolt broke out on Le Resouvenir. But three hours before that time, Jack and his father Quamina had already been seized, on the estate adjoining Le Resouvenir, as conspirators, and had also been rescued by their fellow-slaves from those who were carrying them to George Town. This, however, is not all. The "Report of the Trials of the Insurgents," already alluded to as the joint production of Mr. Fiscal Herbert and Mr. Chief Justice Wray, brings another most important fact to our knowledge. It there appears that some time before Mr. Smith received Jacky Reed's communication, the Governor himself, already

apprised of the intended revolt, had actually visited the estate of Le Resouvenir, on which Mr. Smith resided, whence, after ascertaining the existence of the evil, he had returned to town, in order to take the necessary measures for repressing it. At the 9th page of this important document, now for the first time made known to the British public, stands the following statement, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned :—

“ EARLY on Monday the 18th, a servant of A. Simpson, Esq. of Plantation le Reduit, reported to his master an intended revolt on the part of the Negroes, and that the evening of that day was fixed for its commencement. Mr. Simpson repaired to town, which he reached about TEN o'clock, and *communicated the same to his Excellency the Governor*. The cavalry was immediately ordered out; and about four in the afternoon, his Excellency proceeded up the country, accompanied by Captain Campbell, his Brigade Major, Lieut. Hammill, his Aide-de-Camp, Mr. Heyliger, the Fiscal, and Mr. Murray, his Secretary, and arrived at Le Reduit” (about three miles from Le Resouvenir), “ where he examined Mr. Simpson’s servant, and ascertained, from other circumstances, that the information was but too correct. He accordingly proceeded to Mr. Van Cooten’s,” (about a mile from Le Resouvenir,) “ where he secured the Negro man, Mars, and set off for Le Resouvenir, intending to seize some of the head people, having been joined by Lieutenant Forrester and three of the cavalry. When his Excellency reached Plantation Montrose, a flame was seen at La Bonne Intention; the shells were distinctly heard blowing in various directions; the cheering of the Negroes was also distinguished. At the bridge between Plantation Felicity and Le Resouvenir, the Governor met a party of about seventy or eighty Negroes, armed with cutlasses and spears, and one or two muskets. They attempted to prevent his Excellency passing

the bridge, but without effect."—He here parleyed with them.

How is it possible, after these details, given to the British public by such high authority, to impute the slightest blame to Mr. Smith for his having taken no step, in consequence of Jacky Reed's letter, to inform the government of a revolt which was already notorious? Before Mr. Smith received it, the Governor himself had been actually at the plantation *Le Resouvenir*, and in possession of much more full and precise information respecting the revolt than this letter, when it arrived, could have communicated. How perfectly absurd, therefore, how worse than absurd, is it to represent Mr. Smith as a traitor, for not riding to town with Jacky Reed's letter, which did not reach him till after the Governor, who had previously been at this very plantation, and satisfied himself there of the existence of the revolt, had actually returned to town, in order to prepare the means of suppressing it!

These new circumstances, made known in the publication attributed to Mr. Herbert and Mr. Wray, must dissipate every remaining doubt, if any existed, as to the perfect innocuousness of Mr. Smith's conduct in the matter of Jacky Reed's letter, on which so much stress was laid in the Parliamentary Debate.

The single point remains to be considered of the guilty concealment with which Mr. Smith is charged, with respect to the conversation he overheard on the 17th.

The Quarterly Reviewer's charge against the Missionary Smith is this: "Mr. Smith, in our judgment, was guilty of the fact of concealing a traitorous conspiracy; and that concealment was calculated to produce, and *did produce*, consequences which were most injurious, and which might have been fatal to the whole community."—This was substantially one of the charges preferred against him by

General Murray—" For that he, the said John Smith, on the 17th of August last, and for a certain period of time thereto preceding, having come to the knowledge of a certain revolt and rebellion intended to take place within this colony, did not make known the same to the proper authorities; which revolt and rebellion did subsequently take place, to wit, on or about the 18th of August now last past."

It has been already shewn, that no blame could attach to Mr. Smith for his not having communicated to the Government, the letter received by him on the evening of the 18th, from Jacky Reed; and that no evil consequences whatever could possibly follow from the withholding of it. There appears still less ground, if possible, for charging him with a guilty concealment of any knowledge of an intended conspiracy, which he may have acquired on the 17th, or on any preceding day.

It stands on the evidence of Mr. Stewart, the Manager of Success, that, some days prior to the revolt, Mr. Smith had twice communicated to him, that the Negroes had an idea that their freedom had come out, and that they had been addressing questions to him on the subject; that, in consequence of this communication, he (Mr. Stewart) and Mr. Cort, the Attorney of Success, waited upon Mr. Smith, in order to inquire further into the matter, when Mr. Smith repeated his former statement, saying to Mr. Cort, at the same time, " that he was thinking of telling the Negroes from the pulpit, that the idea of freedom was erroneous," but that Mr. Cort dissuaded him from doing any thing of the kind. Now, in the charges against Mr. Smith, the revolt and rebellion are said to have been against " the authority of their lawful masters, managers, and overseers." Here, however, we find Mr. Smith taking an early opportunity of informing those " masters and managers" of the disturbed state of the minds of the Negroes,

with a view, doubtless, for it could be with no other, of putting them on their guard. He even offered to be himself the instrument of undeceiving the Negroes, with respect to the erroneous conceptions they had formed, by a public declaration from the pulpit; which offer these "lawful masters and managers" declined. Still the whole of the evidence shews, that he took all pains, in his private intercourse with the slaves, to correct their unfounded views, and to discourage all disposition to turbulence.

But Mr. Smith, it is said, ought to have gone to the Governor, and apprised him of the state of things. Mr. Smith had had abundant proof of the unfavourable reception which any thing coming from him would meet with on the part of the Governor. He adopted, therefore, the wise and prudent method of communicating his observations to those who, while they had a deeper interest in the matter, would, at the same time, be more likely than himself to be listened to at head-quarters. The Governor, however, had not been unapprised of the state of the Negroes' minds. The Rev. W. C. Austin gave it in evidence on the trial of Mr. Smith, that a short time before the revolt, he had discovered that much dissatisfaction existed among the slaves, a considerable number of whom came to state their grievances to him. He applied first to the Fiscal, who declined to interfere. "Their complaints," however, having been "uttered in a very extraordinary style and tone," Mr. Austin thought it necessary to report the circumstance to the Governor himself; to whom also he stated, that he felt "serious apprehensions" respecting the result. Their grievances appear to have been—the severity of their treatment; the lawless exercise of authority; persecution on account of their religion; preventing them from attending chapel, and holding evening meetings for religious purposes; taking from them their Bibles, &c.; and lastly, the neglect of their complaints by the local

authorities. The Governor treated the apprehensions of Mr. Austin very lightly, and wholly disregarded the warning given to him by that gentleman. What would have been the Governor's conduct towards Mr. Smith, had he dared to come to him on a similar errand? He admits himself to have been aware (see his official letter of the 24th of August) of "the *existing susceptibility*" among the slaves; and yet he distinctly says he attached "*no credit*" to the rumours of intended insurrection. Mr. Smith, however, must be punished with death, because he felt precisely as the Governor felt on this subject. He was aware, with the Governor, of "the existing susceptibility," and yet did not believe there would be any insurrection. Whatever guilt therefore may have attached to Mr. Smith on this score, attached in a far greater degree to the Governor. He, who alone could take precautions, was inexcusable for not having done so; and, after this neglect, he was infinitely more inexcusable for having prosecuted to the death, as a traitor, an individual whose guilt, if guilt there were, was inferior to his own.

Thus did the Governor judge in the case of another individual, the burgher officer, Capt. Spencer, who, when distinctly charged by Mr. Hopkinson, with having been informed of the intended plan of revolt, and yet having made no communication on the subject to the Government, and having taken no precautions as a Magistrate to frustrate it, *was acquitted by the Governor of all blame*; not because the statement of Mr. Hopkinson was untrue, but for reasons, every one of which apply with increased force to the entire exculpation of Mr. Smith. The Governor's judgment is, that "the revolt was so unexpected, and the information so little believed, that it was not deemed expedient to alarm the colony by any military movement; and as it clearly appears that Captain Spencer, who lived in the centre of the part in which it broke out, knew no

cause to believe the rumour of the day, *he could not have avoided both ridicule and censure should it have proved unfounded, if he had needlessly thrown the district into confusion and alarm by calling out the militia. And the moment which convinced him of the reality of the evil existing, deprived him of all power beyond a hasty and precarious attempt at concealment of his person.*"

The evidence of Captain Spencer himself on the trial of two Negroes, Ellick and Sam William, as given in what is called Mr. Herbert's Report of the Trials of the Insurgents, proves incontestibly the truth of Mr. Hopkinson's charges. He admits having heard of the intended rising in town; he came to his estate, quietly took his dinner, and after an hour and an half spent in this manner, sent for his drivers, to ask them if there was any truth in the report he had heard? In half an hour his house was attacked by the insurgents, and although his own slaves to a man (261 in number) appear to have offered to stand by him, and protect him at the risk of their lives, he went off on the first approach of danger, and hid himself in the cotton pieces. What would have been said of such conduct had Captain Spencer been the Missionary Smith?

But then it is alleged, that Mr. Smith heard certain words spoken on the evening of the 17th which ought to have alarmed him. The impression, however, made by the words in question, it is obvious, would be very different when uttered before an improbable event had taken place, or when re-examined after its occurrence. The words spoken to Mr. Austin by a body of Negroes, and reported by him to the Governor, were infinitely stronger and more alarming than any thing which Mr. Smith is alleged to have overheard; and yet they produced no apprehension of revolt in his mind, nor led him to adopt any measures of precaution. Captain Spencer was actually told early on the 18th, that there was to be a rising that evening. He

treats the matter as a fable. He calls out neither the civil nor the military power of his district, of which, as a magistrate and a militia officer, he had the command. He indulges for an hour and a half in the pleasures of the table, before he even begins to institute any inquiry into the truth of the rumoured revolt; and when the fact at length bursts upon him, he retreats from the danger. Captain Spencer, however, all this notwithstanding, is blameless in the estimation of Governor Murray. It would have been ridiculous, nay censurable in him, the Governor says, to have acted otherwise; and yet Mr. Smith, the Missionary, must be hanged by the neck till he is dead, for having overheard some loose conversation which, by a most strained inference, is construed to mean revolt, but upon which he did not immediately act.

And what is the sole evidence on which even this strained inference rests, on which Mr. Smith is charged with misprision of treason? It is on the evidence of two slaves, Bristol and Seaton, who disagree in their statements and were contradicted by other witnesses;—who themselves had a halter around their necks, from which they seem to have conceived that they had no chance of escaping, but by inculcating Mr. Smith;—and who are altogether discredited by the colonial Authorities in other parts of their testimony, which do not go to establish the guilt of this proscribed Missionary. Both these men bear still stronger testimony against Mr. Hamilton, the manager of *Le Resouvenir*, than they do against Mr. Smith. (See *Demerara Papers*, II. pp. 27, 28, 40, 42.) And their testimony is confirmed by Mr. Hamilton's concubine, who charges him, in the most explicit terms, with having been privy to the revolt, and with having counselled and controlled the measures of the insurgents. And yet this very Mr. Hamilton, so accused by the very same witnesses whose evidence condemns Mr. Smith to death, is not arrested; is not arraigned; is not

even called to account by the colonial Authorities. Nay, he appears as a witness on Mr. Smith's trial, along with his concubine Susannah, wholly unaffected by the mass of Negro testimony that had been adduced to prove him an accomplice in the revolt. Mr. Hamilton, fortunately for him, was no Missionary.

But, says the Reviewer, "Mr. Smith, in our judgment, was guilty of the fact of concealing a traitorous conspiracy; and that concealment was calculated to produce, and *did produce*, consequences which were most injurious." Now, the details given above must satisfy every unprejudiced mind that Mr. Smith was not cognisant of the existence of any traitorous conspiracy, and therefore that he could not have been guilty of concealing it; moreover that his concealment, even had he been guilty of it, could not have produced, in the circumstances of the case, any injurious consequences; and that whatever blame, on any view of the case, may have attached to him, attached in a much higher degree to many others,—to Captain Spencer, for example, and even to the Governor himself. The real solution of all the injustice and oppression of which Mr. Smith was the innocent victim, is to be found, there is too much ground to fear, in the fact of his having been a faithful and zealous Minister of the Gospel of Christ.

The Quarterly Reviewer cites as an instance of "the headlong impetuosity" with which some men "hurry on towards a favourite point," a Resolution proposed at the meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, to the following effect:—

"That in the opinion of this meeting, the bondage in which 800,000 of their fellow-subjects are held, is repugnant to the spirit of Christianity, contrary to the soundest maxims of policy, and a gross violation of the principles of humanity and justice," &c.

In reply to the propositions announced in this Resolution, the Reviewer quotes a passage from Mr. Canning's speech of the 15th of May 1823, on Mr. Buxton's motion. This speech, however, does not contain one syllable which goes to deny that slavery is contrary to good policy, and a violation of humanity and justice. Mr. Canning would be wholly incapable of any such denial. He does, indeed, deny the propriety of assenting to Mr. Buxton's Resolution, that "the state of slavery is repugnant to the principles of the British Constitution and the Christian Religion." But in the same breath he affirms, and the Reviewer quotes him as affirming, that "assuredly no Christian will deny that the *spirit* of the Christian religion is *hostile* to slavery." Now, the Resolution of the Anti-Slavery meeting is still more moderate than this proposition of Mr. Canning. It does not go so far as to affirm, with him, "that the spirit of Christianity is hostile to slavery"—though that is a demonstrable truth. It only affirms that "THE bondage," the particular species of slavery existing in our colonies, "is repugnant to the spirit of Christianity." If the major proposition affirmed by Mr. Canning be true, that "the spirit of the Christian religion is hostile to slavery," to slavery in the abstract, to slavery in all its modes; then, *à fortiori*, may the Anti-Slavery Society be allowed, without rebuke, to affirm the minor, that that worst species of slavery which has ever afflicted humanity, the colonial bondage imposed by enlightened and Christian states on the wretched sons of Africa, is *repugnant* to the *spirit* of our pure and holy and beneficent Religion. Does the Reviewer mean to dispute the truth of the proposition? Then is he directly at issue with Mr. Canning. Or, admitting its truth, does he mean to deny that it follows as a corollary, that we are bound to labour "with zeal, activity, and perseverance," in putting a period to this state of oppression and suffering, and

wiping out this foul reproach to the British name and character?" What is it in this declaration to which the Reviewer objects? He may object, and doubtless he does object, to the institution of an Anti-Slavery Society at all. But such a Society being instituted, does he mean to say that it ought not plainly and unequivocally to avow its principles and its objects? Even if we could suppose that these were not at the present moment in strict accordance with the sentiments of the majority in Parliament, is that a reason for disguising them? Would the abolition of the Slave Trade ever have been accomplished, if those who conducted that great conflict had not continued to proclaim, in opposition to repeated decisions of Parliament, that that trade was a shameless outrage on the laws of God, and a monstrous violation of every principle of humanity and justice? Let the champions in the present conflict follow that bright example, and not be deterred from occupying the same lofty and unassailable ground, by the sneers of the Quarterly Reviewer, or by the bitterest sarcasms of parliamentary debaters.

But the Reviewer, lending himself to the views of the West-Indian party, invidiously assumes, without the slightest pretence to any authority for so doing, nay, in direct opposition to all their declarations both in and out of Parliament, that the members of the Anti-Slavery Society are disposed to remove the evil of colonial bondage, "without the necessary precautions;" and he implores them not "to blend their passions and their prejudices with their benevolence," but to listen to the warning voice which would urge them to proceed "gradually and cautiously."

The best reply to this truly West-Indian tirade will be found in the following extracts from two publications of the Anti-Slavery Society, which are recommended to the candid consideration of the Reviewer.

The first extract is taken from the Report of the Anti-Slavery Society, recently published, pp. 21—23, and is as follows :—

“ What measures his Majesty’s Government will adopt in case of that continued resistance which your Committee anticipate on the part of the Colonists, it remains to be seen. In the mean time, their language implies that they mean to wait in the expectation of soon finding in the Assemblies a more respectful and complying disposition.

“ The Committee will most sincerely rejoice should this expectation be realised. The condemnation, however, of the benevolent purposes of Government, continues to be too loud and indignant to justify the hope of the early and effectual co-operation of the Colonial Assemblies. And let it not be forgotten, that the delay thus produced, to the length of which there is no express limit, is of itself a great evil. Beside the dangers to be apprehended from suspense and agitation, the nation contracts additional guilt by the unnecessary postponement of those reforms, the moral obligation of which has been unequivocally admitted. The delay is also a real calamity to the great mass of the slave population. Your Committee can discover no good reason for withholding from the slaves in the other islands the same alleviations, at the least, which have been granted to those in Trinidad. They can see no good reason, for instance, why women should still continue liable to be shamelessly exposed and flogged in Jamaica, Barbadoes, &c. ; why the driving whip should be still employed *there* ; why marriage should still be without any legal sanction in *these* colonies ; why facilities should not be given *there* also to manumissions ; and why the exclusion of the evidence of slaves should continue to be upheld *there* in all its rigour, making it confessedly impossible to give to apparently protecting laws their just effect.

“ The friends of Colonial Reform are accused of impa-

tience and precipitation. They are told that an evil which is the growth of ages, cannot be cured in an hour; and that the termination of slavery, in order to be safe, must be very slowly progressive.

“ But admitting this proposition, the duty is so much the more urgent to commence the necessary work without delay; and it has not even been pretended that what may be safely done in Trinidad or Berbice, is altogether unsafe in St. Vincent's, Barbadoes, or Jamaica.

“ The argument for delay, which has been drawn from the alleged inveteracy and antiquity of the evil to be cured, appears, however, to your Committee to have no force whatever when applied to the case of infant or unborn slaves, or even to colonies of recent formation. What, indeed, in the oldest colonies constitutes the obstacle to emancipation, but the effects produced by the habits of slavery on the character of the individual who has been long subjected to it? To prepare the slaves for the proper use of freedom, is not more difficult because slavery has existed for ages, than if it had first begun at their birth. It is idle, therefore, to talk of slavery being an ancient institution, or of its having been known in all ages and countries, as if these circumstances augmented the difficulties or the necessary delays of its termination in the colonies of Great Britain. So to reason against those who chiefly aim at the freedom of the rising generation, and of children yet unborn, is altogether irrelevant and misplaced. If there really exist any evils for the cure of which a single generation is not sufficient, let them be pointed out; and in the mean time be it recollected, that the difficulty of curing a moral malady, when inveterate, is clearly the strongest argument, not for delay, but for speed in checking its further progression.”

The remaining extract is from the Appendix to the

“ Substance of the Debate” on Mr. Buxton’s motion, pp. 141—145.

“ We freely admit,” says the Committee, “ that the progress has usually been slow by which a whole people have been raised from barbarism to civilization, or from a state of slavery to the enjoyment of liberty. But the great cause of this has been, that the Government, as well as the superior classes, have been, in their degree, as barbarous and uncivilized as the mass of the people. In the dark ages, all classes were sunk in one common abyss of barbarism: there are, therefore, no points of resemblance between the state of Europe at that time, and the situation of the colonies of Great Britain at the present moment, on which to found any fair analogy. The governors were then altogether indisposed, and to the full as incapable as the governed to promote the progress either of civil freedom or religious light. In the present day, at least in this country, the governors are in widely different circumstances. Living in the full blaze of light themselves, they have the means of reflecting the rays of that light on their dependents. Enjoying and appreciating themselves the blessings of freedom, they fully admit also the right which every British subject possesses to protection from injury, and to a participation in their own civil and religious advantages. What, then, has hitherto withheld them from imparting these blessings to the Negro population in our colonies? It will be said in reply, that the slaves were so unprepared for liberty that to have given it to them would have tended to their injury, and not to their benefit. Be it so. But still was it necessary that they should be chattels; that they should continue to be bought and sold; that they should have no rights of property, no marriage, no Sabbath, no moral culture, no education; that they should remain in the class of mere

animals; that they should, like them, be driven by the lash, and bereft of all motive for exertion but the base and servile one of bodily fear? Slow, indeed, must have been their progress while such a state of things was prolonged.

“ The progress of civilization and of freedom, it is alleged, must necessarily be slow in order to be safe. Certainly we are not anxious to precipitate matters, so as to endanger the public safety. But what will be said by those who look to the middle ages for the analogies which are to defend the slow progress of West-Indian improvement, to that more apposite exemplification of what may be safely and beneficially effected for the advancement of the Negro race, which is furnished by the colony of Sierra Leone? There, 15,000 individuals have been raised from the lowest conceivable state of degradation and wretchedness—from the chains, and nakedness, and brutality; the filth, and ordure, and stench of a slave-ship—to the state of men, of free citizens, of voluntary agents, living by their own exertions, and as fully protected by law in their rights of person and property, as the inhabitants of Great Britain itself. Are not these the very men of whom West-Indian slaves are made?

“ Now the slaves in the West Indies are either more or less advanced towards civilization than the wretched beings thus drawn from the holds of slave-ships. If they are *more* advanced, then why the comparatively slow progress in civilization and freedom which they are fated to make on the western side of the Atlantic? If *less* advanced, what does this prove, but the baleful influence of our whole system of colonial bondage?

“ The progress (say the West-Indians) is necessarily slow from barbarism to civilization. If this be so, it surely is the worst plea in the world for perpetuating institutions directly tending to barbarise, or for imposing barbarism needlessly and gratuitously on any individual. Even if,

for the sake of argument, we should allow it to be a valid reason for leaving the existing race of slaves, until death come to their relief, in the state of barbarism which our cruel institutions have entailed upon them, still it can be no reason for reducing more of them to the same state. It can be no reason for subjecting the yet unborn infant, when born, to the same deleterious process of first barbarising and brutifying him by slavery, and then trying to train him and his posterity for a freedom to be given them at some undefined period, when they shall be pronounced fit for it. Surely the more rational and Christian-like plan would be, to begin to fit them to be the free subjects of a free state from their very birth. Why, then, this preposterous reference to the middle ages, in order to supply a plausible pretext for divesting ourselves of the solemn obligations we are under to every infant born within the British Colonies, to educate him to be a member of a free and Christian community?"

The numerous instances of misrepresentation detected in the Sixtieth Number of the Quarterly Review, have led to a closer view of the article on the same subject which appeared in the Fifty-eighth Number, and in which the Reviewer opened his formidable attack on the advocates of the African race. Fully to expose the fallacy of the statements contained in that article, would occupy too much space. A very few observations upon it must suffice.

1. The unfairness of the Reviewer is remarkably manifested in the observations which he makes on Mr. Wilberforce's *Appeal in behalf of the Negro Slaves*. This work, he observes, "is made up in a great measure of general allegation, and must, in plain terms, be pronounced almost equally defective in correctness of reasoning and moderation of language." "What other opinion can be expressed on such assertions as (page 31), that the 'Negroes in our

colonies are inferior to the savages of Africa! or (p. 42) that ‘*it is a rule with the colonial Legislature to discourage manumission by exorbitant fines.*’ West-Indian planters are in the habit of maintaining that their Negroes enjoy even a larger share of comfort than the labouring class in Europe; an assertion which is in part correct, in part otherwise; but Mr. Wilberforce, instead of treating it in that qualified manner, and shewing in a few plain sentences that no enjoyment of physical comfort can counterbalance the absence of civil rights, declares abruptly ‘*that the proposition is monstrous, and implies a total insensibility to the native feelings and moral dignity of man.*’”—Q. R. No. 58, p. 479.

The Reviewer in the above passage professes, by his inverted commas, to give us three quotations from Mr. Wilberforce’s pamphlet. The two first are not to be found in it; the last is unfairly perverted from its object. The Reviewer charges Mr. Wilberforce with incorrectness and intemperance, for stating at his 31st page (corresponding with the 23d of subsequent editions) that the “*Negroes in our colonies are inferior to the savages of Africa.*” The words are not to be found in the pamphlet; nor do they even fairly express Mr. Wilberforce’s meaning. What he actually says is this: “*However humiliating the statement must be to that Legislature which exercises its superintendency over every part of the British Empire, it is nevertheless true, that low in point of morals as the Africans may have been in their own country, their descendants, who have never seen the continent of Africa, but who are sprung from those who, for several successive generations, have been resident in the Christian colonies of Great Britain, are still lower.*” Mr. Wilberforce, it will be observed, confines his remark entirely to the *moral* condition of the slaves. And what is the statement of the Reviewer himself on this subject? He calls it (p. 505)

“ the weak side of the question as regards the West-Indian planters ;” and adds, “ the religious instruction of the Negroes, has hitherto made very little progress, or, to speak plainly, has been *wholly overlooked* until of late years.” And yet, all this notwithstanding, Mr. Wilberforce is, according to him, incorrect and intemperate, for asserting what is substantially his own statement, and although that gentleman supports his assertion by the very best authorities, whom the Reviewer, in the eagerness of his censure, entirely overlooks.

2. The next instance of unfairness is, if possible, still more palpable. Mr. Wilberforce is represented as incorrectly and intemperately asserting (p. 42, corresponding with p. 31 of subsequent editions), that “ it is *a rule* with the Colonial Legislature to discourage manumissions by exorbitant fines.” What the Reviewer may mean by the Colonial *Legislature* is not very clear. He may intend the word to be read in the plural; for otherwise, in the very letter as well as the spirit of the passage, there lurks a fallacy. Mr. Wilberforce uses no such words, nor any words resembling them, either in sound or sense. What he does say is as follows:—“ But the case (with respect to meliorating laws) *in several* of the islands is still more opprobrious. New laws have been passed, which, so far from even exhibiting any shew of a wish to alleviate the pressure of the yoke of slavery, have rendered it more dreadfully galling, and less tolerable, because even more than before hopeless. The individual manumission of slaves by their masters, which has been provided for with so much sound policy as well as true humanity, by the laws in force, in the Spanish colonies, and has there been found productive of such happy effects—those individual manumissions which, while slavery prevailed here, the English law assiduously encouraged and promoted, have been cruelly restrained. They were long since, *in one or two*

of our islands, subjected to discouraging regulations; but were, in most of our colonies, wholly unrestrained till within the last thirty years. Can it be conceived possible, that, even since the mitigation of slavery was recommended from the Throne, in consequence of addresses from Parliament, *several* of the Colonial Legislatures have, for the first time, imposed, and others have greatly augmented, the fines to be paid into their treasuries on the enfranchising of slaves, so that in some colonies they amount nearly to an entire prohibition? Such acts may be truly said to be more unjust in their principle, and more cruel and dangerous in their effects, than almost any other part of the dreadful code of West-India legislation."

For a proof of the accuracy of Mr. Wilberforce's representations on this point, at the time they were written, the reader, and particularly the Reviewer, may be referred to the Appendix to the Debate on Mr. Buxton's Motion, pp. 184—193.

3. Mr. Wilberforce had expressed himself shocked that the West-Indians should have asserted, that "the Negro slaves are as well or better off than our British peasantry" — "a proposition," he adds, "so monstrous, that nothing can possibly exhibit in a stronger light the extreme force of the prejudices which must exist in the minds of its assertors. A Briton to compare the state of a West-Indian slave with that of an English freeman, and to give the former the preference! It is to imply an utter insensibility to the native feelings and moral dignity of man, no less than of the rights of Englishmen!! I will not condescend to argue this question, *as I might*, on the ground of comparative feeding, and clothing, and lodging, and medical attendance. Are these the only claims, are these the chief privileges, of a rational and immortal being?"—And so on, for two pages more, in a strain of eloquence peculiarly his own. And what says the Reviewer to all this? He first

mis-states the proposition of his author, and then blames him for not doing what he actually has done; that is to say, for not shewing "that no enjoyment of physical comfort can counterbalance the absence of civil rights;" whereas, what Mr. Wilberforce actually does shew is, that even if the physical comforts of the slave were superior, *which he denies*, to that of the freeman, he falls so far below him in civil, moral, domestic, and religious advantages, as to take away all ground of comparison. As for the insinuation of the Reviewer, that the whip-galled, branded chattel, called a slave in the West Indies, possesses a superiority of physical comfort to the British peasant, it is in harmony with many other insinuations equally fallacious and unfounded. He must needs even accuse Mr. Wilberforce of "abruptness," although in his small work he gives three pages to this single point!

4. But Mr. Wilberforce is charged with being incorrect in his reasoning, and also, it is insinuated, in his assertions. It will be difficult, however, for the Reviewer to point out one material proposition in Mr. Wilberforce's pamphlet, which is not capable of the most satisfactory proof. But the declared object of that pamphlet was not to reason out the case, or to prove it; but to make known to the world the author's settled convictions on the subject. After having been engaged for thirty-six years in investigating the subject of Colonial Slavery, he might fairly consider himself entitled to state to the public the general result of his long and painful inquiries, so as to leave with them, before he quitted the stage of life, and after the most full and dispassionate review and comparison of all the testimony, whether favourable or adverse, which it was in his power to make, his solemn, deliberate, and as it were his dying testimony respecting the nature and effects of that most vicious institution. No one now questions that the opinions promulgated by Mr. Wilberforce thirty-five years

ago on the subject of the Slave Trade, were correct, and in the strictest agreement with the voluminous evidence which had been collected on that subject. The truth of those opinions was at first, however, disputed. He was assailed on account of them with far more fierceness by the Reviewers of that day, than he has been assailed for his opinions on slavery by the Reviewers of the present. He was, moreover, opposed in Parliament far more generally and effectually in his attempt to abolish the Slave Trade, than in that he is now making to abolish Slavery. Falsehood, exaggeration, intemperance, fanaticism, were all then charged upon him in terms far more unmeasured than are now thought decorous, at least on this side of the Atlantic. Journals raged, Pamphleteers abused, Government frowned, and Senators sneered, or coughed, and refused to listen. But every fact which from the first he had asserted, and every principle which from the first he had maintained, were at length recognised by Parliament, as they had long before been by the bulk of the people; and the doom of that accursed traffic was for ever sealed. Is there not then a presumption, a strong presumption—nay, a presumption amounting almost to proof—that his conclusions on the kindred subject of slavery, formed early in life, and matured by successive discussions, and by the growing experience and testimony of upwards of thirty added years, cannot be very erroneous? Is it not probable that they have the same solid basis of fact and principle on which to rest, which had previously secured the final triumph of his conflict with the Slave Trade? And when he comes forward and tells the country, on the faith of an honest man, that he has examined, investigated, and compared the facts of the case, and carefully weighed the conflicting evidence, neglecting no means within his reach, of ascertaining the truth, will he not be considered as having a strong title to be heard with respect, and reverence, and attention? This

is what Mr. Wilberforce has done, and what the Reviewer seems to condemn him for having done. But what has been the conduct of the Reviewer himself? He, a nameless writer, very respectable without doubt, but having no knowledge of the subject himself, and deriving his information from interested parties, thus concludes a long exposition respecting the treatment of the slaves (p. 494): “After this enumeration of facts and argument, is it too much to ask, whether the statements given to the public and to Parliament, by the advocates of abolition, are not *fundamentally erroneous*?” It certainly is a little too much; for what are the facts and arguments on which the Reviewer builds his claim to credit, and his sweeping anathema on the statements of his opponents? First, a scrap of a letter from Sir R. Woodford, and from two nameless clergymen; who, in fact, prove nothing by attempting to prove too much—Sir R. Woodford stating, what it is most certain he cannot prove, that he has known “Negroes continue slaves, rather than, with ample means, to purchase their freedom, or even to accept it;” and the clergymen telling us that they view the temporal state of the Negroes “*with complete satisfaction.*”—Complete satisfaction!!! Who are these clergymen? Are they slaveholders themselves? For all that the Reviewer says besides, on the subject of the treatment of the slaves, what proof does he adduce beyond his own *ipse dixit*? Not one. For no one will say that the scrap of a letter from an “*intelligent planter,*” or from an “*experienced planter;*” or a reference to the report of three or four planters of Jamaica, formed into a Committee; or of two or three Tobago slaveholders (and these are literally the whole of the witnesses he adduces to support what he calls his facts and argument); no one will say that this is proof, or any thing approaching to proof. It is absolute fudge! The Reviewer has been most grossly imposed upon

There is scarcely one perfectly correct statement from the beginning to the end of his delineation. He has confidently affirmed what he cannot himself have known to be true, and what he most certainly has not proved to be true.

It would be a mere waste of time to dwell on the Reviewer's extraordinary discovery, that the only difference (a difference very slight, it would appear, in his estimation) between slavery in Jamaica and freedom in England, is, that in the former the labourer is paid by "*maintenance*," and in the latter by "*wages*." In one sense this is true; and it is undoubtedly one of the circumstances which degrade the Negro to the level of the brute. What is the difference, it may be asked, between the farmer's cart-horse and his labourer? It is only that the one is remunerated by *maintenance*, and the other by *wages*. And it is the *Quarterly Review*, our grand instructor in sound views of political economy, who propounds this absurdity in favour of Negro slavery, with all the confidence with which he would advance the most undisputed political axiom!—But it is time to conclude. The object of these pages will be accomplished, if they should tend to weaken the authority of the *Quarterly Review* on colonial questions; and especially if they should shew how materially it differs on such questions from the Government. And this seems the more necessary, because it has been generally supposed that that journal was set on foot, and has been conducted, by men politically connected with his Majesty's Ministers, and who may, therefore, be considered as speaking their sentiments on subjects of foreign or domestic policy.

APPENDIX.

THIS Appendix is intended to contain a few memoranda, which could not be conveniently introduced into the notes, on the subject both of the free Black and Coloured, and of the Slave population of the West Indies.

I. And, first, a few words more respecting the Nottinghams. Samuel Nottingham's original deed of manumission is dated in June 1776. He then lived at Long Island, in the province of New York. Owing, probably, to the war which existed at that time between Great Britain and her Colonies, eight years passed before the deed was transmitted to Tortola. It was enrolled in the Roll-office of the state of Pennsylvania, on the 28th of April, 1784; and it was not recorded at Tortola until the 15th of July, 1784. The deed itself is thus superscribed:

“Tortola, July the 15th, 1784, Recorded in the Registrar's office, to and for the Virgin islands, in lib. B, folio 76, 77, 78, 79, and examined by George Leonard, Registrar.”

It does not clearly appear how soon after the transmission of the above deed to Tortola, the slaves of Mr. Nottingham were put in possession of their freedom. A farther deed, however, appears to have been necessary, to give validity to the former. This deed bears date at Wellingborough, in Northamptonshire, on the 3d of October 1789, and purports to be that of Hannah Abbott, the sister, and residuary legatee of Samuel Nottingham, and the executrix (in conjunction with Henry Gandy, of Bristol) of his last will and testament; in which deed she conveys and confirms “to the late servants” of her deceased brother a plantation called Longlook. This deed is superscribed as follows:—

“Tortola, 16th June, 1790. Recorded in the Register-office of and for the Virgin Islands, in lib F, folios 109, 110, and 111 and examined by Mark Dyer, Deputy Registrar.”

In both these deeds, the number and names of the Negroes who were the objects of them, are specified. In that which was executed in 1776, but not enrolled till 1784, the number is twenty-six; but in that which was enrolled in 1790, fourteen years later than the date of the manumission, the number is stated as only twenty. In the interval, therefore, between 1776 and 1790, during at least eight or nine years of which the Nottinghams continued in a state of slavery in the hands of agents, their number appears to have been reduced from twenty-six to twenty, being above the average rate of decrease among the slaves of Tortola at that period. But from whatever cause this decrease may have proceeded, it would seem, from the deed of Hannah Abbott, that in 1790 the Nottinghams were only twenty in number—viz. eight males, and twelve females. In 1823, however, the number which had sprung from these twelve females, including such of the original stock as were yet alive, amounted to forty-four. The increase, therefore, had been at the rate of 120 per cent. in thirty-three years.

II. With this statement, let us contrast what has taken place among the slave population of Tortola in the same time.

In 1788 the slave population of that island amounted, according to the Privy-Council Report, to 9000. From the returns made to the House of Commons in subsequent years*, it appears, that from 1790 to 1806, 1009 slaves had been imported into that island from Africa, and retained in it. The imports from 1790 to 1796 are wanting. Taking, however, the number imported to be no more than the returns actually made specify, namely, 1009, the whole number to be accounted for will be 10,009. But in 1822, when the last census was taken, the slave population amounted only to 6478, being a decrease, in 34 years, of 3531, from which the manumissions which have taken place in that time, amounting to 304, are to be deducted †. And let it not be imagined, that this ratio of decrease is a diminishing ratio. On the contrary, the decrease in the four

* See papers ordered to be printed on 18th March 1790, 19th May 1802, and 2d and 16th July 1806.

† See papers ordered to be printed 4th March 1823. p. 114.

years from 1818 to 1822, has been in full as high a proportion; as will appear on a reference to the returns of the registry of slaves in that island, made by Mr. Richard King, the Registrar. According to these returns, the slave population in 1818 amounted to 6815. But the slaves belonging to two estates—namely, those of the deceased Arthur Hodge, amounting in 1822 to thirty-nine, and those of Mrs. Simpson, amounting to forty-seven, having been omitted, the number ought to have been 6901.

In 1822 the total number in the island proved to be only 6478, leaving a deficiency in four years of 423. The number of manumissions, however, in these four years having amounted to 101, the real deficiency is so much less—namely, 322; making a decrease of upwards of four and a half per cent. in that time.

This, however, is only the average decrease. If the returns of particular estates are examined, the mortality will be found to be much greater. To take a few instances—

1. On the estates of the late Mrs. Ruth Lettsom, on which, in 1796, there is said to have been 1120 slaves, the number is stated in the Registry of 1818 to be 708, but in that of 1822 only 641. Here we have a decrease in four years (one slave having been manumitted) of sixty-six; being nearly nine and a half per cent. in that time, or two three-eighths per cent. per annum.

2. In 1818 Richard Hetherington possessed 458 slaves. This number in 1822 had been reduced to 404, being a decrease in four years (one having been manumitted) of fifty-three slaves, or upwards of eleven and a half per cent. in that time, or nearly three per cent. per annum.

3. In 1818 Thomasson and Thornton possessed 145 slaves. These in 1822 were reduced to 125; a decrease of twenty, or nearly fourteen per cent. in four years, or three and a half per cent. per annum.

4. On the estate of Archdeacon Wynne in 1818 there were 121 slaves, the remains, it is said, of a gang much more numerous: but in 1822 they had decreased to eighty-nine; a decrease of thirty-two, or of nearly twenty-seven per cent. in that time, being at the rate of six and three-quarters per cent. per annum.

As the result in this last case is particularly disastrous, it

may be useful to examine it. The venerable Archdeacon who is the owner of these slaves, resides in Ireland, and has never visited the West Indies. His estate, therefore, has been managed by agents, to whom he is said to have uniformly conveyed the most anxious instructions, to consult the well-being and comfort of his slaves. At the same time he is said to have derived little or no profit, for many years, from this distant possession. How happens it that the mortality on this gentleman's estate should have been proceeding at so frightful a rate? One cause is, he has been non-resident. He has been under the necessity of seeing and hearing through the eyes and ears of others; who may have been either wholly neglecting his injunctions, or abusing his delegated authority. This, at least, seems no unfair inference to be drawn from the facts of the case, as they appear on record. And if such are the effects of the slave system, even in Tortola, where, according to certain statistical returns, the slaves actually wallow in the abundance of all that can contribute to render them both the happiest and the richest peasantry in the world, what must the case be in other less favoured colonies? What security can any non-resident proprietor obtain that his affairs shall be more uprightly and humanely administered than those of Archdeacon Wynne have been? It is impossible to conceive an object of greater commiseration than this venerable clergyman. Is he not bound, however, by every consideration of justice and humanity, either to repair himself to Tortola, or to send some one thither in whom he can confide, to stay this waste of life among his slaves? How infinitely better would it have been in every point of view, if, twenty or thirty years ago, when his slaves were far more numerous than at present, he had acted, with respect to them, as Samuel Nottingham did with respect to his slaves! Had he even parcelled his estate among them, only requiring of them in return a trifling rent, he might have been deriving some income from his property (now yielding little but misery and death); while the wretched slaves, instead of being reduced to perhaps one half their number, might by this time have doubled it; and might be now living in comfort, and drawing wealth from the fields which have proved an untimely grave to so many of them. Their benevolent proprietor, it is confidently believed, will feel, that in proportion to the delay which

has occurred in adopting some such course, is the strength of the obligation which now lies upon him, to take instant measures for averting the further progress of this deathful system among those over whom his power is supreme and uncontrolled.

III. The following facts, deduced from the Registry of Tortola, will afford some proof of the growing prosperity of the free Black and Coloured population of that island, notwithstanding the unjust and degrading disabilities to which they are yet subject, and all the abuse poured out upon them.

In 1818 the number of free Black and Coloured persons who possessed slaves was eighty-one; the number of slaves owned by them being 546.

In 1822 the number of free Black and Coloured persons possessing slaves had increased to 120; while the slaves belonging to them, in consequence of some large bequests of this species of property, had more than trebled their number. In that year (1822) they amounted to 1766, being more than a fourth; indeed, now—since the deportation to Trinidad of a large body of Creole slaves, long rooted in the island, which has recently taken place—to nearly a third of the whole slave population.

IV. It has proved difficult to obtain a satisfactory account of the progress of population in Demerara. Partial statements have been published by the Registrar, accompanied by elaborate comments. But neither the statements nor the comments have served any useful purpose, beyond that of obscuring the facts of the case. The final result of the last census, as far as it is possible to deduce it from the confusion in which the subject has been involved, appears to be this.

In July 1821 the slave population of Demerara, according to the Registry, amounted to 77,376. A second census was completed in May 1823, three months prior to the insurrection, when the amount of the slave population proved to be only 74,418, exhibiting a decrease, in twenty-two months, of 2958. But this is not the whole decrease. Under the operation of that monstrous Act of Parliament, the fruit of private jobbing, passed in 1817, but now happily repealed, by which the planters of the Bahamas and Dominica were allowed to transport their slaves to the pestilential swamps and aggravated rigours

of Guiana, 1293 victims of that cruel policy appear to have been imported into Demerara in those twenty-two months. Adding these to 2958, the whole decrease will be 4251. What manumissions may have taken place in the interval does not appear. In fourteen years, from 1808 to 1821, the number of manumissions was 384, or twenty-seven and a half per annum. The number in these twenty-two months, if in the same proportion, would be fifty-one. The decrease, therefore, may be taken at 4200 in twenty-two months, being nearly five and a half per cent. in that time, or at the rate of nearly three per cent. per annum. So much for Demerara*. Let us now turn to a still more important colony, Jamaica.

V. In 1749, according to Mr. Long, the Maroons of Jamaica, amounted by actual census to 660. In 1770, it appears by the Privy-Council Report, that they had increased to 885, an increase of one-third in twenty-one years. In 1782, Sir Archibald Campbell, then Governor of Jamaica, found them to be about 1200, having nearly doubled since 1749. In 1796 the Maroon war broke out, on the close of which upwards of 600 Maroons were transported to Nova Scotia, and thence to Sierra Leone; yet in 1810 the number remaining in the island amounted to 893. In 1816 they had increased, according to Mr. Stewart, to 1055; being an increase of eighteen per cent. in six years; and in 1821 the same gentleman computes their number at 1200, being an increase of fourteen per cent. in five years.

Now, it is frankly admitted by Mr. Bryan Edwards, and no change has taken place in that respect since his time, that no attempt whatever had been made by the legislature of Jamaica to civilize or to christianize these people. Neither a chapel nor a school has yet been erected for their benefit. Polygamy still prevails among them. They are the same ignorant, vicious, idolatrous, and brutal people their parents were when first brought from Africa. Such is the picture drawn of the Maroons by Mr. Edwards, himself a planter residing in Jamaica;

* In Demerara there is an excess of male slaves, over females, which would account for an inferior rate of increase in that colony than in the others; but will not account for the very great decrease which occurs there. There is, however, no such palliation in the case of Jamaica, Tortola, or any of the other colonies.

and yet the Maroons, because they are free, as we have seen, increase rapidly.

The slave codes of several of the North-American states, and particularly of Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana, are still more harsh and revolting than our own; and the prejudices there entertained against the African colour are, if possible, still more deep-rooted and inveterate than those of our own colonists; and yet, if we compare the *practical* results of the treatment of the slaves in the two cases, we shall be astonished at the difference.

In 1790 the slave population of the United States amounted, by the census, to 676,696. In 1820 it had risen to 1,531,431, being an increase of nearly 130 per cent. in thirty years.

We have already seen what a contrast the progress of the slave population in Tortola and Demerara forms to its progress in the United States. An actual decrease, indeed, is exhibited in all our colonies, excepting the Bahamas and Barbadoes. The decrease in our other West-India colonies during the years 1818, 1819, and 1820, appears to have exceeded 18,000.

The case of Jamaica, however, will supply a still more marked contrast.

In 1790 the slave population of Jamaica was above 250,000. Without any importations, this population, proceeding at the American rate of increase, ought in 1820 to have grown to 575,000. The actual population, however, in 1820 was only 340,000; exhibiting a deficiency, as compared with the United States, of 235,000 slaves in thirty years. But during these thirty years, or rather during the first eighteen of them, 189,000 slaves were imported into Jamaica from the coast of Africa, and retained in it. Without counting, therefore, on any natural increase from these importations, the number in the island in 1820 ought to have been 764,000, being 424,000 more than were actually to be found there in that year. Without calculating on any increase at all, either from the stock of 1790, or the subsequent importations, the number of slaves ought to be 439,000. The actual population in 1820 was 100,000 less. What a bill of mortality is here to be accounted for!

But let us take another view of the subject.

When Jamaica was captured in 1654, it contained 40,000 slaves. Had these been allowed to increase since that time,

at the rate of the slaves in the United States since 1790, they would now have amounted to upwards of four millions; or even if they had increased at the rate at which the Maroons, a part of their own body, have, when undisturbed, been increasing, they would now amount to three millions. But, besides this original stock of 40,000 slaves, there have been imported into and retained in Jamaica upwards of 800,000 Africans. Had these 840,000 slaves merely maintained their numbers, the slave population of Jamaica would be from two to three times as numerous as it is. But had they gone on increasing at the rate of slaves in the United States, or even at that of the Maroons in Jamaica itself, the population would now have been quite immense.

But if we comprehend in our estimate, not only Jamaica but the whole of our slave colonies, and review the progress of population in them all, since their first formation, how appalling would be the amount of human life, in fact of human sacrifice, which they have cost us, and which they are still costing us! And what have been the proximate causes of all this frightful accumulation of misery and death? Without all question, they have been, *severity of treatment, excess of labour, and scantiness of food*. No other causes can be assigned which are at all adequate to the production of such effects as we have been contemplating.

But can it be, many will doubtless exclaim, that the mortality which has so long been depopulating the West Indies, and which is still continuing its ravages, should have been caused in whole, or in part, by *scantiness of food*? Has not the Assembly of Jamaica declared, that one day's labour in that island will produce more food than twenty-five days could raise in Europe? * Has not Mr. Ellis assured us, that the means of subsistence in the West Indies, are abundantly sufficient for the wants of the slaves? † Has not Mr. Barham also told us ‡, that "the labour of a few days," "of a week," "supplies the Negro with food for the year?" And has not the

* In other words, twelve days' labour in Jamaica is equal to three hundred in Europe. See Report of the Jamaica Assembly in 1815.

† See his speech on the 15th May, 1823.

‡ See his pamphlet, pp. 16, 17.

Rev. Mr. Bridges, going beyond even these authorities, affirmed, that "want is unknown to the slaves" in the West-Indies; nay that the numerous free Black and Coloured population of Jamaica live, "without labour or means, upon the spontaneous productions of a grateful soil *alone*?" How then is it possible that the slaves can have suffered from scantiness of food?

It certainly seems scarcely possible, allowing these statements to be true, that such should have been the case; and yet such has most unquestionably been the case, as may be shewn by evidence that is incontestable.

1. In a report of the Assembly of Jamaica, dated November 12, 1788, and laid before Parliament, it is affirmed, that between the years 1780 and 1787, 15,000 slaves actually perished from want in Jamaica alone. And if so many actually perished, starved to death, what must have been the sufferings of the rest! The cause assigned for this dreadful mortality and wretchedness, was the destruction of the plantain trees by hurricanes. But after the first hurricane in 1780, how came the planters to trust to plantain trees, and not to plant yams, and eddoes, and cassada, and corn, articles which a few months would bring to maturity? Twelve days' labour in the year, at most, according to the same Assembly, would have secured abundance to the slaves. Why were these not bestowed, to prevent the recurrence of the same distress during the six succeeding years? And where, in the mean time, were all those spontaneous productions of a grateful soil which are now so abundant, according to Mr. Bridges, as to prove the sole dependence of the free Black and Coloured population?—It is a remarkable circumstance, that during the seven years of inanition and death, which pressed so heavily on the slaves of Jamaica, as actually to destroy 15,000 of them, we are not told that a single White or free person or Maroon perished, or even suffered greatly from hunger.

2. Again; we have in 1811, a petition of the Assembly of Jamaica, in which they allege, that from the low prices of their produce, though their crops of sugar are abundant, they are unable to afford their slaves the usual and necessary comforts in return for their toil. But could this have been the case, had they given them the brief time necessary to provide for their own subsistence? Nay, if we look at the petition of the same Assembly to his Majesty, at so recent a period as December

1822, we shall find the same language still more explicitly maintained. "It is to save," they say, "our labourers from *absolute want*, that we solicit the interposition of our sovereign?" But how was it possible, on their own shewing, that their slaves could be reduced to absolute want in a country where the labour of twelve days in the year would abundantly provide for their subsistence, unless their owners were to deprive them even of that scanty allowance of time? It is for the Assembly of Jamaica to reconcile these contradictions.

3. But let us look at the meliorating laws of the Leeward Islands, in confirmation of the fact that a want of food is often experienced by the slaves, notwithstanding the extraordinary facility of raising provisions admitted to exist there. The act of 1798 affirms in its preamble, that many persons had been prevented from supplying their slaves with food by the encumbered state of their property. But how could this possibly have been the case, had not the planters been so determinately bent on directing the whole labour of their slaves to sugar planting, that they would not substract from that pursuit even the twelve days' labour in the year which the Assembly of Jamaica declare to be sufficient to provide food for their slaves? And besides this, let us look to the weekly allowances ordered to be given to the slaves, by this very meliorating act, (avowedly an improvement of the existing system),—viz. nine pints (about seven pounds) of corn or beans or oatmeal, or eight pints of peas or wheat, or rye flour, or Indian corn-meal, or seven pints of rice, or twenty pounds of yams. At the same time the weekly allowances given by law to the slaves in the Bahamas, where, there being no sugar estates, the labour is infinitely lighter than in the Leeward Islands, were as follows; sixteen pints of corn, or twenty-one pints of flour, or fourteen pints of rice or fifty-six pounds of yams, being about double those of the Leeward Islands. It will sufficiently shew the miserable deficiency of these last, to state, that they are only about half the allowances given to prisoners in the jails of England, and less than half of what the law of Jamaica allows, not to labourers in the field, but to persons confined in the prisons and work-houses of that island. The allowance to the prisoner in Jamaica is twenty-one pints of wheat flour a week; to the plantation slave in the Leeward Islands, it is eight pints a week,

4. The exclusive attention paid by the planters of the Leeward Islands to the cultivation of sugar, while provisions have been neglected, has produced, even recently, the most disastrous consequences. Absolute famine among the slaves was only averted two years ago, by drawing bills on the treasury to buy food for them. And yet, according to concurrent West-Indian evidence, the application of twelve days' labour in the year to the culture of provisions would have completely averted that calamity, and would have secured abundance to the starving slaves.

Let us now contemplate the facts detailed above. Let us consider the unexampled waste of human life, which the slavery of our colonies continues to produce; together with all the pain and wretchedness and anguish which such waste must necessarily occasion; and then say, whether on any view, not merely of common humanity and morality, but of the most selfish and sordid expediency, it is a system which ought to be tolerated by this country. And this consideration will press more forcibly on every mind not warped by a feeling of personal interest, when he recollects, that, putting the wholesale devastation of the system, with all the anguish and agonies it involves, wholly out of the question, it actually costs us more to maintain it than it would to extinguish it. The fee simple of all our slave colonies, fairly valued, would not require a larger annuity to purchase it than we now pay in the bounties and protecting duties which alone uphold slavery, and in the means of defence we furnish to the planters against the consequences of their own system. Will, then, the parliament and people of Great Britain suffer this system to continue? It is quite impossible. They will demand that the nuisance should be forthwith abated; and that it shall be finally, and at no very distant period, removed.

It has become the fashion to extol the abolition of the Slave Trade as an act of distinguished magnanimity on the part of Great Britain. Its horrors had made a deep impression on the public mind. All who pretend to a single spark of humanity, or a single feeling of justice, now concur in reprobating it. Even the West-Indians have of late been as loud as their neighbours in applauding the measure. And yet, what was there in the Slave Trade, that consummation of wickedness,

which has rendered it at length the common execration of mankind, that on a close inspection, may not be found to characterise the Negro Slavery of our European colonies? There were, doubtless, humane slave-traders residing in London, Liverpool, and Bristol, who would have shrunk from any deed of blood; who gave the strictest orders for the humane treatment of their living cargoes; and who pleaded those orders in defence and justification of their traffic. So we have now humane and benevolent planters residing in England, who issue admirable instructions to their agents, but who cannot by such powerless instruments stay the hand of brutal oppression, or arrest the tide of death which sweeps over their plantations. The evil is not to be cured by such means. The Parliament of England gave the word, and its African Slave-Trade was at once extinguished. The Parliament of Great Britain has only again to cause its voice to be decisively heard, and the guilty system of colonial bondage which pollutes the national character, and converts some of the fairest portions of the empire into a charnel house, will also cease ere long universally and for ever, and with perfect safety to all concerned.

It is plain, from the colonial journals, that by the resident planters, at least, the stir which has been made on the subject of Slavery, in this country, is regarded but as a periodical effervescence of ill-directed zeal, which will shortly subside and leave them, if they are but firm in their resistance, in the undisturbed possession of all their tremendous attributes. They conceive it to be the work of a few individuals, whom, if death should remove, or calumny should succeed in discrediting, the mass of the public would again sink into total apathy on the subject. They are woefully mistaken. They will find that from year to year, nay, from month to month, will the detestation of slavery, and the rooted resolve to extirpate it, become more intense and universal; and that the progress of this feeling will only be accelerated by colonial resistance, or even by undue procrastination. And as for the notion that the cause lives only in the life, or that it depends only on the estimation, of a few individuals, it is an utter delusion. If those who have hitherto mingled as leaders in the conflict were to be removed, it would be but the signal for numbers who have hitherto taken no prominent part, to press forward with new energy and ardour to

fight the battles and achieve the victory of humanity. No man who regards the signs of the times can doubt that the final doom of British Slavery must at length be sealed; and that the time is approaching, when not only every slave in his Majesty's colonies shall be free, but every freeman residing in them, whatever be his colour, shall be admitted to "a participation in those civil rights and privileges*" which are enjoyed by the *White* class of his Majesty's subjects.

But the proposal to repeal those bounties and protecting duties on West-Indian produce, by means of which colonial slavery is upheld, does not proceed from any hostility to the planters. It is to their system, and not to themselves, that hostility is felt. That the downfall of that system, and of the restrictive laws which alone maintain it, would prove beneficial even to the planters themselves, no one can doubt who believes that there is any truth in history, or any certainty in political science. "One obvious benefit," we use the words of a recent writer †; "One obvious benefit which would immediately accrue to the West-Indian cultivator would be, that he would be induced to withdraw his poor soil from sugar cultivation, and to retain in it only those of superior fertility. Inferior soils would be employed in the growth of other articles for which they were adapted, and only the best in that of sugar. The remunerating price of Sugar would thus be lowered. A forced cultivation must always be a hazardous and expensive process; and it can only be supported by a monopoly price both high and permanent.

"Again; the use of the plough has such obvious advantages, that, to a cursory observer, it is wonderful that it has not been generally adopted in West-Indian cultivation. If an English farmer was obliged to keep, during the whole year, all the hands that he required in harvest, he too might employ them with the spade and the hoe in turning up the soil, and might find less advantage from the plough. If the plough were brought into general use, and cattle were therefore more generally employed, the fertility of the soil, by means of a change of crops, of manuring, and good management, would be gradually improved instead of being, as now, continually deteriorated.

* See Mr. Canning's resolutions.

† See "Inquiry respecting the Means of reducing the Cost of Sugar raised by free Labour," published by Hatchard, pp. 17, 18.

“ Various other suggestions present themselves. If, for example, the cultivation of provisions were made universally a first and paramount object ;—if the women were relieved from the constant and oppressive drudgery of field labour, and allowed to give an adequate share of attention to their domestic concerns, as might easily be done were the plough in general use ;—and if various other economical improvements which are obviously practicable were adopted ; there can be no doubt that the state of things in the West Indies would rapidly and very greatly improve. The population would increase *, and their condition would gradually approach that of free labourers. The property of the planter would be no longer estimated by the number of his slaves, who would sink in value ; but by his land, which would proportionably rise in value. His income would eventually be derived from a land-rent paid by Black or White farmers managing their own concerns ; and he would then be able to compete in the sale of his produce with any other country in the world.”

“ On the whole, therefore, it is gratifying to reflect,” adds this writer, that “ the West-Indian planter would thus find the improvement of his own finances to arise from reforms, which would, at the same time, most effectually promote the happiness, and exalt the moral and social condition of his unhappy bondsmen.”

* As this sheet was going to press, the Author's general reasoning received a remarkable confirmation from the official returns of the population of Hayti, transmitted to this country by the Secretary of its Government, and published in the *New Times* of the 29th November, 1824. While the West-Indians have affirmed that that population has been diminishing, the fact turns out to be, that, notwithstanding a succession of sanguinary wars, from 1791 to 1807, it has undergone an astonishing increase. The census of 1824 gives 935,335 as the actual population. The regular troops are stated to be 45,620 ; and the national guards, 113,328.