

65227

PRICE THREEPENCE.

No. 1 OF ANTI-SLAVERY TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

THE

AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSIONS
AND SLAVERY.

A Reprint

OF THE CORRESPONDENCE IN THE "NONCONFORMIST" NEWSPAPER;

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

AN ARTICLE ON THE FALL OF DR. POMROY,

AND HIS CONSEQUENT DISMISSAL FROM OFFICE,

BY CHARLES K. WHIPPLE, Esq., OF BOSTON, U.S.

EDITED BY

JOSEPH A. HORNER,

HON. SEC. TO THE WAKEFIELD ANTI-SLAVERY ASSOCIATION.

"It is right to have an expansive benevolence—to take into our regard the world and the race; but where foreign charity is but a defence against home kindness it is a base sentimental sham. Thousands will cry over compressed feet in China who are quite unaffected by souls compressed in America. That religion should compel mothers in India to cast their babes into the Ganges shocks every sensibility of some men's souls, who can see no occasion for grief that commerce snatches from the dusky mother, in America, her babes, and casts them forth to slavery,—a worse monster than was ever bred in the slime of the Ganges or the mud of the Nile."—*Henry Ward Beecher.*

LEEDS:—PUBLISHED BY J. B. BARRY & Co., 18, TRINITY STREET,

Printers to the Yorkshire Anti-Slavery Societies.

MDCCLX.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.

THIS Pamphlet forms the first of a Series of *Anti-Slavery Tracts for the Times*, which are especially designed to awaken English Christians to a knowledge of the fact that the American Religious Bodies are the bulwark of Slavery. In this important work the English Anti-Slavery Societies are earnestly invited to unite.

Donations in aid of gratuitous distribution may be forwarded by private friends of the cause, and will be thankfully received.

It is requested that Societies and others taking large numbers will send their orders as soon as possible to JOSEPH A. HORNER, Hon. Sec. Anti-Slavery Association, Wakefield.

March 1st, 1860.

AMERICAN PRO-SLAVERY MINISTERS IN ENGLAND.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—I perceive by your impression of Wednesday last, that at the late meeting of the Congregational Union, the President held out "the right hand of fellowship" to the Rev. Dr. S. L. Pomroy, Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, accompanying it with a "cordial welcome" in the name of the delegates, I cannot say that I was surprised at reading this, for this is not the first time that English Christians have been entrapped into giving a "cordial welcome" to pro-slavery ministers of religion: but I must say that I felt extremely grieved to see the Congregational Union "welcoming" a man who is utterly unworthy of their confidence. Let those who joined in this "welcome" read the following, which appeared in the Boston (U.S.) *Liberator* for March 14, 1859, in answer to some questions which had been asked concerning this Dr. Pomroy and the board of which he is Secretary:

"The second inquiry as to whether Dr. Pomroy—now stealthily in England deceiving the people as secretary of the board—was ever identified with the anti-slavery movement, we answer in the affirmative. He early espoused it, and was for several years an officer in the American Anti-Slavery Society, and also in the New England Anti-Slavery Society; but he at last shamefully apostatised, and was bribed to silence by the proffer of the office he now fills, and has utterly repudiated that movement which he once so warmly advocated. His attempt to make capital for himself, and obtain favour for the American Board on the strength of his old connexion with our cause, is equally dishonest and jesuitical."

From this it will be seen that Dr. Pomroy is thoroughly pro-slavery, and has been bought over by the pro-slavery party. If anything were needed to prove what is stated in the *Liberator*, his conduct during his visit to Leeds, a few months ago, supplies it. At that time he was reminded by Wilson Armistead, Esq., President of the Leeds Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society, and others, of Mrs Stowe's and Dr. Cheever's denunciations of the pro-slavery character of the board he represents. As he continued to make no reference to slavery in public, Mr. W. H. Pullen, hon. sec. of the Anti-Slavery Society, addressed a calm and dispassionate letter to him, requesting him to reply to the charges which had been made and stating that unless he did so, it would of course be assumed that he had *nothing to say in defence*. To this letter he vouchsafed

no answer, and therefore we are compelled to believe him "verily guilty" on his own silent testimony.

The American Abolitionists have long complained of the conduct of Englishmen on the slavery question. We can hold public meetings, and pass anti-slavery resolutions; but when the time comes for *action* we disgrace ourselves by giving "the right hand of fellowship" to the pro-slavery party—thus more than undoing the good we may have previously done. Such shameful inconsistency is deeply to be regretted, as it not only strengthens the fetters of the slave, but also injures the cause of freedom. I need not enlarge upon the subject, but it is painfully suggestive, and at the present time, when the slaveocracy are making systematic attempts to corrupt the moral sentiments of Englishmen, and when the honoured name of Joseph Sturge will be no longer known in connexion with the anti-slavery movement, I would that every man who loves liberty and hates despotism should lay it to heart, and determine to be neither directly nor indirectly implicated in the support of slavery. We have a right to demand proof of anti-slavery antecedents before we give a "cordial welcome" to any American; and until we do this we shall have a repetition of such scenes as the late meeting of the Congregational Union has witnessed.

With sincere respect, I am, sir, your obedient servant,
Wakefield, May 20, 1859. JOSEPH A. HORNER.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—The London newspapers—reporting the annual meeting of the London Missionary Society—state that the Rev. Dr. Pomroy of the American Mission, was one of the speakers on the occasion. Slavery in America is sustained by the religious bodies, and their members visiting England take part in religious movements. While this is the case, it is only fair to all parties to inform the public of the relations which such visitors sustain to slavery. Permit me, therefore, to refer to the position which Dr. Pomroy occupies on this important subject. He is one of the secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Now against that board I bring three charges—First, that one of its slaveholding members murderously proposed, in Virginia, to burn the abolitionists; secondly, that its missionaries baptize slaveholders without requiring them to repent of their slaveholding sins; and, thirdly, that they have declared that the Bible does not prohibit the sale of human beings. These are but a specimen of the numerous charges which the friends of the slave bring against that board. I now submit the proof, and challenge contradiction.

First, that one of the slaveholding members of the board, murderously proposed, in Virginia, to burn the abolitionists. If your readers will please refer to the Key to "Uncle Tom's Cabin," part 4th, chapter 1st, they will read as follows respecting Dr. Plummer—(I have ascertained that he is a slaveholder and a member of the board, and have published it extensively in the United States):

"The Rev. W. S. Plummer, D.D., of Richmond (Virginia), a member of the old school Presbyterian Church, is another instance of the same sort. He was absent from Richmond at the time the clergy in that city purged themselves, in a body, from the charge of being favourably disposed to abolition. On his return, he lost no time in communicating to the 'Chairman of the Committee of Correspondence' his agreement with his clerical brethren. The passages quoted occur in his letter to the Chairman:—'I have carefully watched this matter from its earliest existence, and every thing I have seen or heard of its character, both from its patrons and its enemies, has confirmed me, beyond repentance, in the belief that, let the character of abolitionists be what it may in the sight of the Judge of all the Earth, this is the most meddlesome, imprudent, reckless, fierce, and wicked excitement I ever saw. If abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair they should have the first warming at the fire. * * * * Lastly, abolitionists are like infidels, wholly unaddicted to martyrdom for opinion's sake. Let them understand that they will be caught (lynched) if they come among us, and they will take good heed to keep out of our way. There is not one man among them has any more idea of shedding his blood in this cause than he has of making war on the Grand Turk.'"

I come now to the missionaries—those labouring among the Cherokee & Choctaw Indians. These, it is well known hold slaves, In some instances, a hundred slaves are held by one Indian. In the *Anti-Slavery Advocate* for April last, is a letter from Charles K. Whipple, Esq. of the United States, describing the pro-slavery policy of the above board, from which the following is an extract:

"Complaints had been made that their slaveholding church members were accustomed to sell children away from their parents; and the whole body of missionaries, in a letter signed by the Rev. Eliezer Butler, Moderator, and Rev. S. A. Worcester, Clerk, reply as follows:—'In regard to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark, that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by any express injunction of scripture.'"

The board and its missionaries deserve the severest censure of the civilized world; but ought not that censure to rest with equal weight upon the secretary also—the Rev. Dr. Pomroy?

Thanking you, sir, for an opportunity of placing these charges and proofs before the public, I am, &c.,

Aldbrough, Suffolk, May 20, 1859. EDWARD MATHEWS.

MR. PULLEN'S LETTER TO DR. POMROY.

DEAR SIR,

Leeds, 29th January, 1859.

By public announcements I perceive that you are to lecture, on Monday evening, in the Music Hall, on behalf of the "Turkish Mission Aid Society."

As we are informed that that society has severed all connexion with the American Board, of which you are a secretary, we have no objections to urge against that society whatever. But there are, as regards the American Board, a few difficulties which present themselves to our minds, which we should feel obliged if you could remove.

We understand, that in America the cause of emancipation is greatly retarded by those who, imbibing the spirit of our Divine Redeemer, should be its greatest advocates and supporters. We are aware that in the southern States slavery is fostered in the Church, and promulgated by those who profess to be Christ's ambassadors on earth, that not only do southern but many of the northern Churches refuse to denounce slaveholding as a sin; and that many of the large and influential religious institutions, such as the "Tract Society," "Sunday School Union," &c., pursue the same course of action; that foremost among these is the American Board, which by its apparent pro-slavery policy, has caused much anxiety and trouble to those who are seeking, by righteous and legitimate means, to overthrow this accursed system of oppression.

It has been asserted that the American Board is pro-slavery in policy if not in open avowal, though we fear the latter could be too well substantiated. Having heard this, we feel it our duty, before taking up arms, to examine the charges preferred against it. All the evidence we have received goes far to substantiate the fact, and we call upon you, therefore, for the sake of the peace of the Church—for the sake of equity and justice.—for the sake of the slave held in fetters—and for the sake of our impugned Christianity—*if it be possible, vindicate the policy of the society you represent.* If not, labouring under earnest convictions reluctantly arrived at, we feel it our duty not to remain silent upon the subject. We consider the Choctaw and Cherokee Indian tribes a living proof of your pro-slavery missionary efforts. From your own reports we gather the principles which have actuated these efforts. We have the testimony of Dr. Cheever, Mrs. Stowe, and others whom we greatly esteem; and all these tell us that your board has pursued a most dishonourable course of action, making it unworthy of a Christian name or Christian support.

If this be the case, it must not be said that you were openly welcomed in England, and our Anti-Slavery Societies were silent spectators of the scene.

We await your reply and are prepared to give the matter a calm, unprejudiced, and careful consideration. Much as we regret to oppose a professedly good and holy cause, yet we shall feel called upon to make known our earnest convictions to the world, if those convictions cannot be disproved. Your reply by letter, or in your lecture on Monday evening, would be esteemed a favour,

By your obedient servant,

WM. H. PULLEN,

Secretary of the Leeds Young Men's
Anti-Slavery Society.

Committee Rooms, 7, East Parade.

From the British Standard, May 27, 1859.

REV. DR. POMROY.

"CERTAIN parties are hereby given to understand that we decline to drag this gentleman before the British public as "equally dishonest and jesuitical." Before we can apply such language to such a man we must have far higher authority than Mr. Garrison and his *Liberator*, which for many long years has poured the foul slime of unscrupulous slander and envenomed malignity on multitudes of the wisest and holiest men of the present generation.

That Dr. Pomroy declines to "answer" the insolent letters addressed to him does not prove that he is "verily guilty"; but only that he is a man of sense and verily discreet: standing on his character, and confidently leaving it to defend itself."

NOTE.—As those gentlemen whom the editor of the *British Standard*, in language more expressive than elegant, terms "certain parties," (a la *Punch*) had never asked him to "drag" either Dr. Pomroy's or any other person's name before the limited portion of the "British public" who read his paper, this modest (!) disclaimer was wholly unnecessary.

From the Nonconformist, June 1st, 1859.

THE REV. DR. POMROY.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—The Rev. Dr. Pomroy has found a champion in the *British Standard*, the editor of which paper seems to think that the readiest way of clearing the Doctor's character is to asperse the good name of William Lloyd Garrison. If I were disposed to be uncharitable, I should remind the reverend editor of the *Standard*, that in thus acting he is only imitating the policy of the pro-slavery party in America; but as I do not wish to say one disrespectful word of a deluded person, I shall simply remark that Mr. Garrison is not the man to be frightened by the blast of a penny-whistle, even though it be blown by the editor of the *British Standard*.

The *Standard* ignores the Rev. Edward Mathews's letter altogether, and asks for "higher authority" than "Mr. Garrison

and his *Liberator* before applying such language (*vide Nonconformist* last week) to such a man." There are many who would consider Mr. Garrison the very highest authority, but as the *British Standard* is evidently not of the number, I will adduce further proofs of what I stated last week. The name of Dr. Cheever and his noble exertions on behalf of the slave are "household words" in England, and therefore his testimony cannot but be esteemed. Concerning the American Board of Missions, Dr. Cheever writes:—

"It has been announced that a new Slave State is to be presented for admission into the Union, embracing the territory of the Choctaws and Cherokees, under the teachings of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. It would seem that those teachings have had no little influence in bringing about this event, and consequently a most serious question presents itself as to the attitude and responsibility of the Board in this matter. * * * It cannot be questioned that if, from the outset, the gospel had been plainly set against this sin, the sin, and not the gospel, would have been abandoned."

Besides Dr. Cheever many others have denounced the pro-slavery character of the Board, and amongst the rest, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe has spoken out boldly. In September last Mrs. Stowe wrote as follows in the *New York Independent*:—

"A new Slave State is to be formed of this race, of whom our Missionaries have been so many years the teachers; and their laws, in regard to slavery, are to the full as savage and contrary to the gospel as those defended by the other Anti-Christian Churches of the South.

A new Slave State! What a monument for Mills, and Newell, and Judson to look down on from heaven! and now the Board wish quietly to withdraw from the responsibility of their protégé.

Suppose our missionaries had gone into States, as John G. Fee goes into Kentucky, proclaiming the true gospel of liberty to the captive, and opening of the prison to them that are bound—founding churches on principles of strict anti-slavery communion. They would have been driven out, say you? How do we know? Fee is not driven out of Kentucky. One lone unaided man, with no organised body at his back—with nothing for him but truth and God (alas, that we should always count God as nothing!) John G. Fee is fighting in Kentucky the battle which we weep that it was not given to us and ours, to fight in the Indian territories. He is fighting it successfully—necessities, afflictions, distresses, only make him stronger. Anti-Slavery Churches are rising round him, feeble indeed in their beginning, but mighty in moral force; and every inch which Christianity seems to gain under such auspices, she really does gain.

All progress in moral things, founded on compromise with evil, is like the advance of a runner who is tied to a post by an India-rubber band—he may seem to go on, but the moment he rests, snap comes the pull of a recoil, and all goes back.

When the American Board lets go responsibility for these churches, how long will it be before the multiplied vices engendered by slavery, the licentiousness, the cruelty, the habitual dishonesty, will sweep a polluted flood, overwhelming all that they have done? And deny—dispute it as they may, it will for ever go forth to Christendom,—'This Slave State was educated by the American Board.'

I submit these facts to your readers, and I think that until the *British Standard* can answer them with something more than mere vituperation, the verdict of honest freedom-loving Englishmen will still be "verily guilty."

"By their fruits ye shall know them," and the "fruit" of the teachings of Dr. Poiry and his colleagues is a new Slave State; therefore we "know them" to be pro-slavery, without Mr. Garrison's confirmation of the fact.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,
 May 27, 1859. JOSEPH A. HORNER.

From the Nonconformist, June 15, 1859.

MR. JOSEPH A. HORNER AND THE AMERICAN BOARD.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—Within a day or two I have had my attention called to a letter published in your paper of the 1st of June, signed by Mr. Joseph A. Horner, in which he quotes certain communications of Dr. Cheever and Mrs. Stowe, which appeared in the *New York Independent*. As those communications came before the public last autumn, after I left the United States, I have had no opportunity to examine them. My sole object in this letter is to mention a few facts, which may have a bearing on the interpretation of the language used by the gentleman and lady just named.

1. The communications, quoted by your correspondent, grew out of the action of the American Board at its last annual meeting in Detroit, in September, 1858; at which time the report of a Committee was adopted, recommending that "the Board be relieved, as early as possible, from the unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the missions in the Indian territory." These "embarrassments" all spring from slavery, which has existed in the Cherokee and Choctaw Tribes for more than a century. The object of the above recommendation was to bring the missions of the Board, in that quarter, to an end—which will, without doubt, be accomplished at no distant day.

2. Dr. Cheever is a corporate member of the American Board, and he and his congregation have been regular and liberal contributors to its funds till within a year past certainly, and I have no reason to doubt have done the same this year. At any rate, if he or his people have withdrawn, and declined further contributions, it must be of a recent date; I have heard no intimations of it.

3. Both the father and the husband of Mrs. Stowe are corporate members of the Board, and have always been its warm friends and supporters, and I have no doubt are so still. The same may be said of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the brother of Mrs. Stowe, who, with his congregation, has been a regular contributor to the funds of the Board; and so have other members of the Beecher family, so far as I know. I have no reason to doubt that Mrs. Stowe is still a friend of the Board, though she may be anxious to correct what she deems an error in its doings.

4. The *New York Independent*, in which the letters of Dr. Cheever and Mrs. Stowe were published, is an unequivocal friend and supporter of the Board. Its oldest editor has long been among its prominent corporate members; I allude to the Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, Connecticut. Its other editor is the Rev. Dr. J. P. Thompson, of New York City, equally a friend and patron; and so are both the congregations of these two gentlemen. The office editor is the Rev. Joshua Leavitt, whose name is not unknown in this country; he also is among the friends and patrons of the American Board. Dr. Cheever and Mrs. Stowe are among the regular contributors to the columns of the *Independent*. If therefore, the *Independent*, by its defence of the Board, is chargeable with pro-slavery tendencies, what shall be said of Dr. Cheever and Mrs. H. B. Stowe? The fact is, there are some people in the world—I wish the number were greater—who can see a fault in a man, or in an institution, without wishing absolutely to kill either of them, especially when, with a little care and patience, that fault may be remedied.

5. At the last annual meeting, a committee, to whom the general subject had been referred, brought in a report, which was adopted by the Board—I think unanimously—as expressive of its views and wishes. It is as follows:—

“At Hartford, in 1854, the views of the Board were clearly and definitely expressed, in regard to certain laws and acts of the Choctaw government, which were designed to restrain the liberty of the missionaries as teachers of God’s word. All the action of the Board since that date, and so far as we are informed, the action of the prudential committee also, has been in conformity with the principles then put upon record.”

“Your committee have reason to believe that the position of our missionaries among the Choctaws, is one of much difficulty and peril. Among the various religious bodies in the States nearest to the Choctaw nation, there has been, as is well known, within the last twenty-five years, a lamentable defection from some of the first and most elementary ideas of Christian morality, insomuch that Christianity has been represented as the warrant for a system of slavery, which offends the moral sense of the Christian world, and Christ has, thereby, been represented as the minister of sin. Our brethren among the Choctaws are in ecclesiastical relations with religious bodies (the Presbyterians) in the adjoining States, *the States from which the leading Choctaws are deriving their notions of civilisation and of government.* In those neighbouring States, and in the Choctaw nation, the missionaries are watched by the upholders of slavery, who are ready to seize upon the first opportunity of expelling them from the field in which they have so long been labouring. By the enemies of the Board and of the missionaries, our brethren are charged with what are called, in those regions, the dangerous doctrines of abolitionism. At the same time they are charged, in other quarters, with the guilt of silence in the presence of a great and hideous wickedness.”

“It seems to your committee desirable, that the Board should be relieved, as early as possible, from the unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the missions in the Indian territory. Surely the time is not far distant, when the Choctaw and Cherokee Indians, and half-breeds, will stand in precisely the same relation to the missionary work with the white people of the adjacent States; and when the Churches there will be the subjects of home mission more properly than of foreign missionary patronage.”

“On the whole, your committee, with these suggestions, recommend the report of the prudential committee, as referred to them, be accepted and approved.”—*Extract from Report of 1858.*

I will only add that the Indian territory has not been organised into a State; nor has any proposition to that effect been laid before

Congress. Whether it will ever be done, is among the things covered with the mists of futurity. It may be—it may not be. If the attempt should be made, it is quite uncertain whether it would succeed.

Very respectfully yours,

S. L. POMROY,

Sec. A. B. C. F. M., Boston.

7, Adam Street, Adelphi, June 14, 1859.

From the Nonconformist, June 29, 1859.

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSIONS.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

DEAR SIR,—“Save me from my friends” may well be exclaimed by the American Board, for Dr. Pomroy has given his employers “the unkindest cut of all.” He affirms that Dr. Cheever and Mrs. Stowe are staunch friends of the Board, and tries to convey the impression that they write in *its defence*—a flagrant mis-statement, which the extracts in my last letter clearly disprove. But granting, for the sake of argument, the truth of his assumptions, then the Board must be bad indeed when all that they can urge in its *defence* is, that it has led to the formation of “a new Slave State.”

With a charming simplicity, which would be very refreshing if it were quite genuine, Dr. Pomroy informs us that, in consequence of the “embarrassments” which beset the Board, they intend to discontinue the mission to the Cherokees and Choctaws.

In other words, having encouraged the Indians to commit a great wrong, they wish to escape the censure which the sinfulness of their conduct has evoked by beating an ignominious retreat from the scene of their disgrace. Instead of repenting of their sins, and demanding the release of his victim by the slaveholder, they, like Pilate, wish to wash their hands of the consequences of their own acts. A course of action like this may meet the views of a pro-slavery Board of Missions, but I very much question whether anti-slavery Englishmen will not understand the true nature of this *manœuvre*, however Dr. Pomroy may try to hide its real meaning.

Your readers will mark the characteristic caution with which Dr. Pomroy approaches this subject. He does not venture to deny the charges of Mrs. Stowe, Dr. Cheever, and others. He *dare not* do it. All he can do is to try and destroy their effect by a round-about statement which aims at nothing, and proves as little. One paragraph which he quotes as proof of the anti-slavery position of the Board expresses more than he intended;—

"Surely the time is not far distant when the Choctaw and Cherokee Indians will stand in precisely the same relations to the missionary work with the white people of the adjacent States, and when the Churches there will be the subjects of home missionary more properly than of foreign missionary patronage."

Now Dr. Pomroy cannot deny that slaveholding does exist amongst these Mission Churches, and therefore it follows that the American Board, according to their own declaration, *do not* regard slaveholding as inconsistent with a profession of religion, and that they recognise slaveholding Churches as worthy fellow-labourers in the great field of home and foreign missions.

That the views of the missionaries may be clearly shown, I will give some extracts from their own published opinions. In a letter to the Board, they say:—

"In regard to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by any *express* injunction of Scripture."

Again they say:—

"In regard to rejecting any person from the Church, *simply* because he is a *slaveholder*, we cannot for a moment hesitate. For we regard it as *certain* that *the Apostles, who are our patterns, did receive slaveholders to the communion of the Church*; and we have not yet been able to perceive any such difference between their circumstances and ours as to justify us in departing from their practices in this respect."

With regard to the buying and selling of slaves, they are equally plain-spoken :

"*Occasional* exchanges of masters are so *inseparable from the existence of slavery*, that the Churches could not consistently receive slaveholders to their communion, and, *at the same time, forbid all such exchanges*. We regard it, therefore, as impossible to exercise discipline for the buying of slaves, except in flagrant (!) cases of manifest disregard to the welfare of the slave."

This is pro-slavery enough for the most *ultra* South American; and yet, with a hardihood which is characteristic of the double-dealing of the Board, they add:—

"We trust that we shall not for this be looked upon as advocates of slavery. We are not so. We lament and deplore the existence of such a system,—*our feelings, our example, our influence are against it*. But to make the adoption of all our views respecting it, and a corresponding course of action, a test of piety and a condition of fellowship in our Churches, is what *we cannot in conscience do*."

Your readers may have seen during the great Anti-Corn-law agitation a cartoon, in which Sir Robert Peel was represented with two faces: on one side, he smiled on the farmers with promises of protection, and, on the other, conciliated the masses with the assurance of cheap bread. The American Board are in an analogous position. On the one hand, they are in fellowship with the slaveholder, and wink at his delinquencies, whilst, on the other, they try

to win favour amongst the anti-slavery party by a judicious enunciation of anti-slavery professions which, taken in the aggregate, amount to nothing so long as practice is opposed to precept.

Dr. Pomroy may urge, in reply, that the statements I have quoted were made by the missionaries some years ago; then I say, so much the greater the guilt of the Board in allowing them to act in its name until the present hour.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,
Wakefield, June 17, 1859. JOSEPH A. HORNER.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

ESTEEMED FRIEND,—The last issue of the *Nonconformist* contained a letter from Dr. S. L. Pomroy, intended to ward off the damaging charges made against the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in regard to their complicity with slavery. This letter may be divided into two portions—the one intended to show that the American Board is now desirous of colsing its complicity with slavery; the other, that H. B. Stowe and Dr. Cheever are implicated in the present position of the Board.

[Having quoted the extracts given in the letter above, our correspondent proceeds:—]

Being thus exposed, on the one hand, to the murmurings of their pro-slavery missionaries, and, on the other, to the pressure of the anti-slavery part of their subscribers (which has been the cause of the *talk* against slavery on the part of the committee) it is not to be surprised at, that in 1858, they should be desirous of being relieved from the “unceasing embarrassments and perplexities connected with the missions in the Indian territory.” But can it be considered any proof of *anti-slavery* feeling that they should wish to shift the responsibility on to the shoulders of the “Home Missionary” Society, which would be the result of the admission of these tribes into the Union as a State.

We have seen that, in 1858, the Board endorsed the views expressed in 1854, and that then they had “acknowledged with gratitude to God the *wisdom and fidelity*” with which the Prudential Committee had been *advising* and DIRECTING the missionaries in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence, reported in 1848. It is evident, therefore, that the position of the Board now is much the same as it was eleven years ago. What *that* was has been shown above.

The attempt to implicate Mrs. H. B. Stowe in the proceedings of the Board is as feeble as it is dishonest. It is evident that she cannot be held responsible for the conduct of her relatives; and the fact of her contributing to the *New York Independent* is no

proof that she sympathises with or defends its general policy, particularly as some, at least, of her communications are made in order to expose the pro-slavery character of different religious bodies, one of which is the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

June 22, 1859.

I am, respectfully,

N. N. K.

NOTE.—Although Dr. Pomroy remained in England some months after this, he did not dare to question the preceding facts. This silence proved that he had nothing to urge in reply.

From the Nonconformist, November 9, 1859.

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSIONS AND SLAVERY.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—Your readers will not have forgotten the correspondence which took place in your columns a few months ago, concerning the relations of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to slavery. At that time, Dr. Pomroy, one of the secretaries of the board then in England, tried in a very dishonest manner to evade the charges of complicity in slaveholding which had been brought against them. He did not positively deny the alleged facts—that he dare not do, but being forced to say something, he very clumsily attempted a reply, which was nothing more nor less than a piece of refined jesuitry. My purpose in again referring to this subject is to direct attention to the annual meeting of the American Board, recently held in Philadelphia. Slavery was of course warmly discussed, and those who defended Dr. Pomroy and the board as entirely anti-slavery will do well to remark that the fact of the Choctaw and Cherokee Mission Churches being slaveholding was *never disputed*. Throughout the sittings the speakers were unanimous on that point; and yet Dr. Pomroy told the ministers of Leeds that the board was “*now* (in January last) anti-slavery,” and on the strength of this he was warmly welcomed. The Leeds Young Men’s Anti-Slavery Society protested against it at the time, but all to no purpose; their statements were disbelieved and in consequence the Dissenting Clergy of Leeds rest under the imputation of having extended the right hand of fellowship to the pro-slavery representative of a pro-slavery Board of Missions. I do not suppose for a moment that this was not the result of ignorance. I believe that all those who received Dr. Pomroy are warm friends to the slave, and I only allude to this in the hope that it may act as a warning. No American minister ought to be welcomed to our pulpits who cannot *prove* that he has been an abolitionist when in America. If he is really anti-slavery he will be *proud* to do so.

At the late meeting the Rev. Dr. Cheever delivered a splendid

philippic, in which the truckling of the Board to slavery was made clear as the noon-day. The following extract shows its spirit:—

“The Board ought to have placed themselves in absolute and total opposition to this wickedness in any shape. As a Board of Commissioners for the salvation of the African race, they might annually have renewed their testimony against slavery, and their demand for its abolition in various appropriate and powerful modes. At any rate, they should carefully have avoided sanctioning it even in appearance. They have had it for forty-eight years directly in their way, directly beneath their power, directly calling for action against it. Under the system of inaction and indifference it has so maintained its ground that at length not only the ecclesiastical bodies that maintain the system which makes them the reproach of Christendom stand ready to receive and nourish the slaveholding (Mission) Churches, but the politicians and the whole slaveholding policy and power of the United States are waiting to receive a slave state,—a new slave state—into the Union, from under the favourable tuition and moulding of the religion of the Board during fifty years!”

Dr Cheever moved the following amendment to the report concerning the Cherokee and Choctaw Mission Churches:

“Your committee add, that in the opinion of the board, the holding of slaves should be pronounced an immorality inconsistent with membership in any Christian church, and that it should be required that these missionary Churches should immediately put away from themselves this sin, and should cease to sanction it even in appearance.”

The feeling of the Board on the subject is clearly shown by the fact that this resolution found no support whatever, except that it was seconded by Dr. Cheever's own brother. It was “laid on the table” unanimously. Dr. Pomroy made great anti-slavery professions whilst in England, why then did he not support Dr. Cheever at this crisis?

The conclusion which the board *did* arrive at was in favour of the discontinuance of the Choctaw Indian Mission. Dr. Cheever wanted to hold on to the mission, and purify the churches by expelling the slaveholders. Thus the Board having taught the Choctaws to hold slaves, and having in consequence been denied the subscriptions of many rather old fashioned Christians who could not bring their minds to support a Society for the Propagation of Slavery in Foreign Parts, have now turned their backs on their *protégés*, hoping in that way to escape the unpleasant results of their wickedness. As the *National* (U.S.) *Anti-Slavery Standard* remarks—“They show no signs of repentance; their movement is not made in such a manner as to entitle them to the least credit, or to give the least hope that they are disposed to help their ‘neighbour who lies wounded and bleeding on the other side.’”

Dr. Cheever presented a memorial against the slave trade, which was practically “burked,” being referred to the Prudential Committee, who are little likely to take an anti-slavery position so long as the notorious Dr. Nehemiah Adams, who, in his “South-side View of Slavery,” recommends the re-opening of the foreign slave trade,

is one of the members. It is worthy of note that Dr. Pomroy *opposed* Dr. Cheever's memorial, because, as he said, he thought there was not time to take proper measures—a common excuse in America, for shelving the slavery question, and one that is perfectly transparent.

The *National A. S. Standard* sums up as follows :—

“In conclusion, we beg our readers—and especially the *English* readers of the *Standard*—to remark that the Board have shown their pro-slavery character in these four ways, in the important session which has just closed :—

“1. By their unanimous refusal to adopt Dr. Cheever's resolution, declaring slaveholding an immorality, incompatible with membership in a Christian Church.”

“2. By their evasion of Dr. Cheever's memorial against the slave trade.

“3. By their continued license to the slaveholding churches, and pro-slavery missionaries of the Cherokee mission.

“4. By their continued neglect to enforce measures of Christian reform upon the Choctaw Mission, and by their avowed motive in ultimately discontinuing that mission, namely, not to get rid of sin, but to get rid of trouble!”

I submit these facts to the careful consideration of those whom Dr. Pomroy imposed upon in England, and at the same time I would recommend every lover of pure and undefiled religion to place no dependence upon the bare assertions of any American, whether he be a Doctor of Divinity or otherwise. If he says he “hates slavery as much as any one,” and yet cannot prove that he has exerted his influence against it, he is only uttering what he knows to be false. I have learnt by experience that American ministers will stick at nothing in order to gain a welcome when they visit us.

In conclusion, I beg, sir, to thank you most sincerely for your kindness in opening your columns for the discussion of this subject. I have been assured by many ministers and others that some good has been done, and, as an abolitionist, I am grateful to you for having granted the opportunity.

Believe me, dear sir, your obedient servant,
Wakefield, Nov. 5, 1859. JOSEPH A. HORNER.

From the Nonconformist, Nov. 16, 1859.

THE REV. DR. POMROY.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—In addition to what I have already stated, allow me to add that Dr. Pomroy has been boasting of the reception he received whilst in England. According to the newspaper report of the late meeting:

“He (Dr. Pomroy) spoke of the great prosperity of the American Board, and of the favour with which it is regarded abroad, *especially in Great Britain* where its missionaries are regarded amongst the *noblest men engaged in the work of the Lord.*”

Those who welcomed Dr. Pomroy will probably demur to this, as I know that many of them neither regard the spread of slavery

with "favour," nor its propagandists as engaged in "*the work of the Lord.*" I am, your obedient servant,
Wakefield, Nov. 12, 1859. JOSEPH A. HORNER.

"WE have sent our missionaries to all quarters of the globe; but how shall they tell their Heathen converts the things that are done in civilized America? How shall our missionaries in Mohametan countries hold up their heads and proclaim the superiority of our religion, when we tolerate barbarities which they have repudiated? A missionary among the Karens, in Asia, writes back that his course is much embarrassed by a suspicion that is afloat among them, that the Americans intend to steal and sell them. He says:— 'I dread the time when these Karens will be able to read our books, and get a full knowledge of all that is going on in our country. Many of them are inquisitive now, and often ask me questions that I find it very difficult to answer.'—*Harriet Beecher Stowe.*

THE CASE OF DR. POMROY.

WHILE Dr. Pomroy was absent from this city a short time since, the letters received at the Missionary house, directed to him, were opened by one of the under secretaries, as most of them relate to the business of the Mission. Among these opened were some which tended to criminate Dr. Pomroy, shewing that he had either been guilty of criminal acts which would destroy his moral character, or that he was the victim of a conspiracy to extort money. The letters were returned to the envelopes, and placed upon Dr. Pomroy's desk to await his return. On his return he saw that the contents of the letters were known, and he at once made a statement to the other secretaries of what he averred were the facts in the case, and requested them to present that statement to the Prudential Committee. This was done, and Dr. Pomroy himself then went before the committee and made the same statement, which was in substance as follows;— 'Some time since, while he was walking out in the evening, he was accosted by a well-dressed female, and, at her request, accompanied her to her home. Whilst in the parlour conversing with her, a man came in, and under the threat of exposure forced him to sign a note for 500 dollars, which he did, and subsequently paid it. A short time after he was enticed by another female into another house, and there two men assailed him and forced him to sign another note for 500 dollars, which he subsequently paid. Another woman, by the representation that she was suffering with a dissipated husband and destitute children, enlisted his feelings, and he opened a correspondence with her, and subsequently paid 500 dollars to get his letters back, which he did, and destroyed them. He admits these statements to be true, and has placed his resignation in the hands of the Prudential Committee.—*New York Paper.*

WHEN a man in Dr. Pomroy's position, and with his intelligence and experience—not a raw simpleton from some rural district, but a man who has seen much of the world's ways and much of human nature—a man now almost sixty years of age—is involved in such relations with wicked women, more than one or two—that he pays hush money, not only once, but twice, thrice, four times—when he has made the shameful payment, in one instance for the recovery of letters which would have disgraced him, and has done it not at the advice of some timid friend to whom he went with his dreadful burden, but at the advice of so dexterous a lawyer as the late Mr. Choate—when it comes to light that out of limited means he has paid to wicked men,

the vile accomplices of wicked women, an aggregate of some two thousand dollars—when it is announced that the conspirators who obtained his money are known to the police, and may be prosecuted if he will initiate the proceedings—when, under all this, he remains silent, explaining nothing, and not even asking the public to suspend its judgement—surely it is time for us all to acknowledge that, whether the man has or has not committed crimes not yet charged upon him, the exposure which has taken place is far less of an evil than that the man should have continued to wear the mask of concealment. To say that the man who, having brought himself into this position, not only hides the shameful facts from everybody—save his legal adviser—but keeps the office which he cannot keep for a moment, save by that concealment, and not even confining himself to the performance of his official work—volunteers to make himself conspicuous on British platforms, with devout exhibitions of religious sensibility—must not be spoken of as having worn a mask, is not what the occasion requires, in our way of thinking.—*New York Independent.*

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE SEVENTH AND NINTH COMMANDMENTS.

By CHARLES K. WHIPPLE, Esq., of Boston, U.S., Author of *Relations of Anti-Slavery to Religion, &c., &c.**

THE following notice has lately appeared in all the newspapers, religious and secular, in Boston, and thence has been circulated all over the country, and sent over to England:—

TO THE PUBLIC.—Facts have recently come to the knowledge of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, deeply implicating the moral character of Dr. Pomroy, and rendering it impossible that he should longer retain his official position as a secretary of the Board. He has resigned, and is no longer to be recognised as an officer of the Board. The facts referred to have no connexion with his official action. By order of the Prudential Committee. (Signed)

R. ANDERSON, Clerk.

CHARLES STODDARD, Chairman.

Boston, November 29th, 1859.

The explanation of this sudden and decisive action, appearing immediately after the card above quoted is, that the Prudential Committee of the American Board have accidentally discovered that Pomroy has, on three different occasions, paid large sums of hush-money to buy the silence of three women who made charges against him. What wonder that, after this, they should say, it is 'impossible that he should longer retain his official position as a secretary of the Board'!

Whatever may be the faults of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, no one can say that they approve or favor, or apologise for, or acquiesce in, adultery, as far as heathen countries and the free States of the American Union are concerned. In all these regions, they are careful to guard a purity as free from suspicion as from sin; and, as soon as the character of one of their officers falls under the suspicion of this guilt, they feel that he is no longer a suitable person to transact their busi-

* Mr. Whipple is well-known in the United States as the author of several important works on slavery. English readers will find quotations from his writings, in *American Slavery and Colour*, by William Chambers.

ness, and they require his resignation as the alternative of immediate expulsion. If they should ever be charged with favouring the commission of adultery, or allowing it to pass unproved among their *Northern* Corporate and Honorary Members, and especially among their official servants, they can point to the case of Dr. Pomroy as a triumphant vindication.

If a Turk, unacquainted with the peculiarities of the popular American religion, and unacquainted with the lives of Southern members of the Board, should ask the reason of this unsparing severity against adultery, they would tell him that this act is a violation of the *seventh commandment* of the decalogue. He would naturally infer from this, that the whole of this code is held in like veneration, and that the disregard of any other of its provisions would be visited with the same severity. But such a conclusion would show his ignorance of the *peculiarities* above mentioned.

The ninth commandment of the decalogue forbids lying as stringently as the seventh forbids adultery. It is said that a strict constructionist once attempted to excuse his violation of truth by saying that it was committed *for* his neighbour, and not 'against his neighbour.' But no such theory of the meaning of the ninth commandment has been openly assumed as the correct one, even by the New York and Boston Tract Societies, and certainly not by the American Board. They would undoubtedly declare it to forbid *all* 'saying of that which is not.'

This very Dr. Pomroy who has just now, under suspicion of adultery, made a compulsory resignation of his secretaryship in the American Board, told a deliberate lie in regard to their position during his recent visit to England, repeating it as often as he was met by a statement of the facts respecting their Cherokee and Choctaw missions. It had become known to a portion of the English people, that slaveholders were admitted as Christians into the churches established by those missions; that the missionaries insisted upon so receiving them; that the Prudential Committee never at all *prohibited* such admission of slaveholders—and never made the least objection or showed the least repugnance to this wicked practice, until importunate remonstrances were repeatedly made by a portion of their patrons in the northern states; *then* they *hinted* to the missionaries the expediency of taking away the occasion of such complaints, all the time carefully avoiding the giving of 'decisions and instructions,' against the practice in question. And when, in his visit to England, Dr. Pomroy found these facts known, and the knowledge of them (of course) operating to the discredit of the Board; he turned the tide, for the time, by this deliberately false statement—'The Board *now* hold an anti-slavery position.'

The Board soon had information of this lie, told in their behalf and for their credit. The clerical dignity, the solemn and serious aspect of Dr. Pomroy, ('well fitted,' as Rev. John Waddington, of London, remarked at the late Annual Meeting, 'to represent the Board in England,') gave currency to the statement for a time, though investigation soon showed its utter falseness; but neither then nor since have they called Dr. Pomroy to account for this falsehood. Are we to infer that they think the ninth commandment less obligatory or less important than the seventh? or that the violation of some or any of these commandments is palliated, or excused, by being done in advancement of *their* purposes?

These are important questions. We have no hope of their being answered at the call of abolitionists by the prosperous and powerful body in question, who absorb the voluntary contributions of the country at the rate of more than a thousand dollars a day, but expend so much more as to leave them, this year, sixty-six thousand dollars in debt. They are accustomed to seem to ignore *American* abolitionists, while they are secretly working to counteract them. Their position in regard to the anti-slavery movement remains precisely as it was in 1837, when they adopted, and in 1839, when, *after discussion*, they RE-AFFIRMED a resolution forbidding those missionaries, in their employ, who had embraced anti-slavery principles to use the paper and presses of the Board, (the only means of printing within their reach,) 'to print any letter, tract, or appeal' remonstrating against slavery, 'with a view to its being sent to individuals, or communities in the United States.' Their missionaries still labour under this dis-qualification for using their experience of the pernicious and depraving influence of slavery abroad, in direct opposition to the slavery they have left at home. But English abolitionists can, if they will, extort answers to these questions, as well as to the additional questions, which should now demand of the Board, in thunder tones, from every evangelical Church in Great Britain. *Why they did not purge the Choctaw Churches from slaveholders, instead of, or previous to, cutting them adrift?* and—**WHY THEY STILL SUFFER THEIR CHEROKEE CHURCHMEMBERS TO HOLD, BUY, AND SELL SLAVES, WITHOUT LIMIT AND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION?**